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Abstract

As the Campus Landscape Architect for the University of Pretoria, it has been an on-going challenge to gain an understanding and reliable data on the history of the landscape of the University of Pretoria’s Hatfield campus. With the pace of development taking place on the campus, in order to meet the University’s 2025 Strategic Vision, it became very clear that potential significant cultural landscapes on the Hatfield campus could be lost without ever knowing it. This is especially even more so when related to the South African Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999 (SAHRA). The Getty Foundation’s Campus Heritage Initiative’s first grant for a conference in 2000 shared consensus that historic landscape preservation had a very low profile in much of American campus planning.

The hypothesis states that the University of Pretoria’s Hatfield Campus has an undiscovered cultural landscape history that not only could have value to the development of the University, but also to that of the surrounding precincts of the City. The thesis’s aim is to record any sourced data pertaining to the cultural landscape of the University of Pretoria’s Hatfield campus in order to contribute to the institutional repository, and to ascertain what, if any, cultural landscape values exist. A complex descriptive and historiographical interpretative research strategy was followed. A literature, policy and model study was conducted resulting in the main research tool being the U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service’s Cultural Landscape Report (CLR). The limitation to the thesis was Part 1: Site History, Existing Conditions, Analysis and Evaluation of the CLR to the University of Pretoria’s Hatfield Campus for the period 1910 to 1960.

The study highlighted that the Hatfield Campus does contain tangible cultural landscape elements but very little is known or present of the intangible elements. The current political climate of the University places emphasis on equalising the cultural diversity on campuses, perhaps to the detriment of the existing cultural landscape, mainly by the naming and/or renaming of its buildings. A recommendation is that a Management and Preservation Plan encompassing both the architectural and landscape aspects be compiled to inform the future planning of the campus.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Whatever is true for space and time, this much is true for place: we are immersed in it and could not do without it. To be at all - to exist in any way - is to be somewhere, and to be somewhere is to be in some kind of place. Place is a requisite as the air we breathe, the ground on which we stand, the bodies we have. We are surrounded by places. We walk over and through them. We live in places, relate to others in them, die in them. Nothing we do is unplaced.

Introduction

Roger Fisher notes (1999), that Jan Smuts’ rationale for the establishment of a Pretoria campus of the Transvaal University College (T.U.C.), was that the majority of the students who enrolled in the Arts came from rural areas of South Africa and did not find the city, in this case Johannesburg appealing and that Pretoria would be a more suitable environment for presenting these subjects. At the time, the Transvaal had become a Crown Colony falling under the British colonial educational programme. The architects working in the Colony’s Department of Public Works (DPW) closely followed Herbert Baker so much so that their architectural idiom became known as the Baker School. Amongst them was the young architect Piercy Eagle, responsible for the design of Pretoria Boys’ High School’s first buildings (1907-1909) and the Pretoria branch of the Transvaal University College’s Old Arts Building (1909-1911). This commenced the varied collection of architecture on the present day University of Pretoria’s Hatfield Campus with Roger Fisher equating it to a text book of 20th century architecture. (Fisher, December 2010. ‘University of Pretoria, Hatfield Campus’. Para. 3).

However the same level of documentation and insight into the campus’ landscape does not prevail, to the point that very little is actually known of the site on which these varied architectural pavilions sit. With the planned densification and development taking place on the campus, the layers of the cultural landscape are under threat of being lost before they are even identified and documented. The purpose of this study is to document and catalogue the cultural landscape of the Hatfield Campus and conclude in the identification of any residual remains.

This thesis is to serve as an inventory of the significant campus historic resources with specific emphasis on the cultural landscape, to inform a larger Campus Heritage/Preservation Plan, which is all encompassing of the landscape and built structures. This thesis does not propose any recommendations pertaining to the preservation and/or development of the campus - this would be a separate study conducted by a multi-disciplinary team.

Problem in Context

Problem Setting

As the Campus Landscape Architect for the University of Pretoria, it has been an ongoing challenge to gain an understanding and reliable data on the history of the landscape of the seven campuses of the University of Pretoria, specifically for the Hatfield campus. With the pace and densification of development taking place on the campus, in order to meet the University’s 2025 Strategic Vision, it became very clear to the author that potential significant cultural landscapes on the Hatfield campus could be lost without ever knowing it. This is especially more relevant to landscapes that fall within the categories of the 60-year window as prescribed in the South African Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999 (SAHRA).

Maggie Roe and Ken Taylor (2014) note that internationally academics, professionals and in the communities at large, a growing interest in the concept and meaning of landscape, both rural and urban, as the setting for everything that we do, has risen. Siting David Lowenthal, they state that landscape is everyone’s heritage and an essential part of our patrimony (Roe & Taylor, 2014:1). They identify three forces that have assisted in the rise of interest in cultural landscapes (Roe & Taylor, 2014:2):

1. 1992, The World Heritage Convention Process which introduced three categories of cultural landscapes
2. 2000, The European Landscape Convention (adopted in 2000 and came into force in 2004) which identified all landscapes are of potential value to communities
3. The alternative and changing views on the discourse into cultural landscapes as a bridge between culture and nature

In 2000, the Getty Foundation’s Campus Heritage Initiative kicked off with its first grant for a conference with leading campus planners and preservation specialists, organised by landscape architect Robert Z. Melnick, FASLA. Out of this conference came a
consensus that historic landscape preservation had a very low profile in much of American campus planning. It also became clear that despite the Getty Foundation’s commitment to providing grants for the preservation of historic buildings on campuses, these buildings needed to be studied and preserved in a larger context. This meant that their landscapes, inclusive of their spatial patterns, topography, plantings, circulation and water features, had to be part of this context (Martin 2007: 84).

Following this conference the Getty Foundation awarded Campus Grants to 86 historic campuses across the United States of America between 2002 and 2007. The grants were designed to assist colleges and universities in the USA in managing and preserving the integrity of their significant historic buildings, sites and landscapes. The projects focussed on the research and survey of historic resources, the preparation of preservation master plans, and detailed conservation assessments and analyses. (The Getty. ‘Campus Heritage Grants’, para. 1) This initiative sparked a national discussion (in the USA) and effort to identify, assess and preserve campus heritage resources, opening up new terrain for landscape architects in the field of learning landscapes. (Melnick. 2016. ‘Lessons from the Getty’s Campus Heritage Initiative’. Para.8, and Martin 2007:82)

In 2008, The Getty Foundation awarded a grant to the Society for College and University Planning to analyse the grant preservation projects, and to create and maintain a website to access all the resources from the grants, namely www.campusheritage.org, which went live in 2009. (Campus Heritage 2012. ‘About This Community & This Project’.)

A number of important themes emerged from these grants (Turcotte 2011:218-219):

- Architectural style
- Importance of landscape
- Stewardship of the land
- Adaptive reuse
- Mid 20th century buildings
- Importance of additional design elements
- Use of students
- Development of systems used to evaluate and prioritise buildings and landscapes
- Training and maintenance manuals
- Creation of stewardship leaders and champions
- Use of preservation plans, reporting methods, and community involvement

Frank Edgerton Martin notes in his article Learning Landscapes that all of the campus preservation plans “about 15 included a strong focus on landscape history” and that American campuses may well be the best museums of landscape architecture and planning, yet remain outside the scope of traditional historic preservation (Martin 2007:82). He also notes on his blog (Martin. undated),

> Although campus heritage and identity research is a new niche on campus planning teams, its time has come. In the last twenty years, cultural landscape stewardship is now a major focus in American historic preservation. Many campuses that have preserved older pre-war buildings are now discovering the functional and aesthetic importance of the greens, quadrangles, malls, and streets that they frame. These outdoor rooms shape the first impression of campus for visitors; and they are the settings for the rallies, speeches, parties, and protests that are the legacy of every college and university in a democratic society.

In November 2011, the Society for College and University Planning, held a Campus Heritage Symposium in Washington D.C., which included amongst others, the themes (Society for College and University Planning. ‘SCUP Campus Heritage Symposium’, Conference Home.):

- Theoretical basis for campus heritage
- The planning process
- Cultural landscapes

The International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) Cultural Landscapes Committee (CLC)
defines its purpose as the “safeguarding, protection, conservation and preservation of cultural landscapes through technical support, education, research, advocacy and other measures” in collaboration with international organisations with parallel interest, the likes of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), International Society of City and Regional Planners (ISOCARP) and the European Council.

Martin states on his blog (Martin undated) that “[e]very campus has a history and story to tell - and there is no single approach to campus preservation planning.” Thus rather than imposing external standards and styles upon a campus, a planning strategy should reveal the character of the campus. In order to define the sense of place of the campus, research, surveys, conservation/preservation groups, people, places and events that distinguish a university, need to be found again.

The University of Pretoria's Hatfield campus has seen considerable change and development over its first century of existence. These changes have not only been in the physical, tangible realms, but also in the cultural, social and intangible realms. The change of political dispensations in South Africa has resulted in a paradigm shift in the cultural, racial and ideological composition of the academic, student and staff bodies. In parallel with this paradigm shift, has been the expansive boom of development on the campus as a result of long term plans, property acquisition, an increase in student numbers, private and public funding and, new teaching methodologies and technologies.

Whilst attempting to meet the requirements of academic growth (University of Pretoria Vision 2025) and the shift into a new era of the country’s history, the tangible elements (mainly in the form of buildings) of the University of Pretoria’s history are slowly being revealed primarily as a result of having to meet SANS 10400 building regulations. Yet the landscape and the intangible elements associated herewith, do not receive the same (prescribed) acknowledgement, primarily due to a lack of an available repository of documentation.

In the author’s attempts to understand the heritage of the campus and the impact that such developmental and institutional change could have on the cultural landscape, it has been discovered that the knowledge [memory] repository of the campus landscape, resides predominantly within individuals (many of whom are no longer with us), stories and folklore, with physical documentation being sparse. Thus, the stewardship of such a (potential) cultural landscape for the future development and adaptation of the campus is constrained.

In the author’s attempts to understand the heritage of the campus and the impact that such developmental and institutional change could have on the cultural landscape, it has been discovered that the knowledge [memory] repository of the campus landscape, resides predominantly within individuals (many of whom are no longer with us), stories and folklore, with physical documentation being sparse. Thus, the stewardship of such a (potential) cultural landscape for the future development and adaptation of the campus is constrained.

**Study Delineation**

The study area for this dissertation is the University of Pretoria’s original Hatfield campus. The area of the study has as boundaries Burnett Street (to the north), Albert Street (present day Roper Street to the east), College Avenue (present day Lynnwood Road to the south) and University Street (to the west). The study area is inclusive of the two portions of land making up the original campus of the farm Elandspoort 193 Uitval, these being the original southern portion donated by the Pretoria Town Council in 1909 for the establishment of the Transvaal University College (TUC), and the northern portion donated by the State under the Department of Agriculture, upon establishment of the Faculty of Agriculture in 1921 (see Figure 1.02).

The University’s history, as determined by the University of Pretoria Archives has been divided up into four distinct eras (University of Pretoria. 2016. UP Archives):

- The Foundation Years 1889 to 1929
- The Establishment Years 1929 to 1948
- The Expansion Years 1948 to 1982
- The Transformation Years 1982 to 2008
Parallel to this, four volumes of the University’s *Ad Destinatum*, a documented history of the University, have been published in the following volumes:

- *Ad Destinatum: Gedenkboek van die Universiteit van Pretoria*, 1910 to 1960 (published to celebrate the University’s jubilee)
- *Ad Destinatum II*, 1960 to 1982
- *Ad Destinatum III*, 1982 to 1993
- *Ad Destinatum IV*, 1993 to 2000

The study period of 1910 to 1960 has been selected so as to run parallel with accepted available documentation, from the first landing on the present day campus to the proposed master planning of Brian Sandrock and, prior to the physical expansion of the Hatfield campus eastwards over Roper Street following negotiations for land acquisition with landowners. The time frame also coincides with the University’s first 50 years of existence. It also falls within the period prior to the international charters, declarations and principles being promulgated relating to historic sites and landscapes, starting with UNESCO’s Recommendations Concerning the Safeguarding of Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites in 1962. On a political front, the period is prior to the enforcement of the Apartheid legislation and the commencement of South Africa’s isolation from world diplomacy.

This study will make use of an accepted heritage resource inventory model to establish a repository of the cultural landscape of the campus within the confines of the above stated delineations.

**Problem Statement**

### Main Problem

In the South African context, only the Universities of Cape Town, Pretoria and the Witwatersrand have documented repositories for the management and preservation of their historic buildings. However very little of this relates to their sites and landscapes. Across its history, the Hatfield Campus of the University of Pretoria has fallen under the development and management of the Department of Public Works, the Municipal Council of Pretoria, The University, and Technical Services (present day Facilities Management), each imprinting a specific time stamp on the campus. However, these layers of history have either been documented but lost over time and/or not methodically stored, or have not been documented at all, as very little resides in the repository in the form of plans, photographs, text, descriptions and the like. One has to rely primarily on the physical residue that is to be found on the campus. It became evident through the research that a large majority of the ‘repository’ lay within the memories of individuals, most of whom have long passed on.

The notion of ‘layers of time’ and the continuous change that takes place on academic campuses in general makes it essential that a policy for the preservation of plans be adopted. Martin (2007) refers to the cultural landscape of a campus as a kind of aesthetic endowment that can never be replaced. However in order for such a plan to be drawn up, the repository is required. Robert Melnick, FASLA, lists several critical issues campuses face when considering and caring for their heritage resources (Melnick. 2016. ‘Lessons from the Getty’s Campus Heritage Initiative’. Para.3.):

- heritage resource identification, survey, and assessment,
- campus planning and historic preservation,
- community relations and local zoning and;
- institutional leadership, alumni relations, funding, and trustee and legislative priorities.
The challenge is to what extent we can know the past and mainly invisible landscapes, and how we can use this still hidden knowledge for actual sustainable management of landscape’s cultural and historical values. It has also been acknowledged that heritage management is increasingly more about managing change rather than protection, presenting a paradox: to preserve our historic environment, we have to collaborate with those who wish to transform it and, in order to apply our expert knowledge, we have to make it suitable for policy and society (Bloemers et al. 2011). Thus internationally, a need has been identified to document, understand and preserve cultural landscapes.

**Research Problem**

‘Landscape is never simply a natural space, a feature of the natural environment…every landscape is the place where we establish our own human organization of space and time’

(Jackson. 1984:156)

Landscapes cannot be evaluated for historical and cultural value in the same manner as structures due to the intangible and tangible associations and properties assigned with them. The lack of policies and legislation in South Africa pertaining to the historic landscape does not allow for systematic evaluation methods or guidelines for evaluating and determining the cultural historic value of a landscape, rather relying on international methodologies that may not necessarily be locally applicable. The South African Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999 (SAHRA) is the only form of legislation currently available in South Africa that provides a tool for the preservation of cultural landscapes by way of clause 3(2)(d) landscapes and natural features of cultural significance. Müller notes that there is “a lack of guidance in the South African heritage legislation on the nature of intangible heritage” and that South African legislation does not “address aspects of landscape, place, associations and memory” (Müller. 2012:8).

International policies and declarations through UNESCO, ICOMOS and IFLA exist, however are only enforceable by the initiatives and legal application thereof of the signatories. These too focus primarily on the evaluation and preservation of predetermined or recognised structures and/or objects within a place of outstanding (international) value with minimal to little acknowledgment of the setting of these places that is the landscape and its tangible and intangible qualities thereof. Green (2016. Para. 1.) states:

“As soon as a territory is seen as a landscape, it bears cultural values; but these values are not necessarily outstanding and universal. Those landscapes where the interaction between people and their environment is considered to be of an outstanding universal value are World Heritage Cultural Landscapes.”

This presents a challenge in applying a suitable model for the study of cultural landscapes. This challenge is greater for academic campuses, with no precedents to follow from the few institutions that do have repositories. O’Donnell (2008:14) notes:

“Research and scholarship are critical links in the preservation process. The hunt for archival data, the field reviews, and the narratives that capture place are vehicles for shared understanding. …The field is burgeoning and stands on the shoulders of some thirty years of diverse, multidisciplinary contributions. Those engaged in this process continue to peel the onion, and as the layers unfold, new horizons beckon. We move on to discover and communicate more about landscapes of the past, present and future - valued places that offer knowledge and roots in an increasingly global culture.”

Very little resides in the University of Pretoria’s repository on the cultural landscape and development of the Hatfield campus specifically for the period 1910 to 1960, classified as the Foundation and Establishment years of the University’s history. The purpose of this study is to record data that is able to be sourced in order to contribute to the repository of the University, thus adding another layer of time to the knowledge base.

**Hypothesis**

The University of Pretoria’s Hatfield Campus has an undiscovered cultural landscape history that not only could have value to the development of the University, but also to that of the surrounding precincts of the City. It has a ‘spirit of place’ or genius loci interpreted by students, alumni, staff and the public at large, a space
with both defined and undefined boundaries, a sense of belonging having a designated role and function with a suitable setting or an occasion, a collection of tangible and intangible layers of history consisting of a complex dynamic of political, social and cultural changes. Yet it has not been fully documented and preserved for broader community to engage with and utilise.

In order to document the cultural heritage landscape for the University of Pretoria’s Hatfield campus for the period 1910-1960, the U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service’s Cultural Landscape Report, is to be applied via a historiography interpretative research strategy, ‘tracing landscape change and deciphering the successive layers of residue left on the land by human occupation’ via observation, mapping and analysis (Riesenweber. 2008:24), forming the foundation document for the compilation of a further study for the Campus Heritage and Preservation Plan.

Research Questions

The following questions are posed in order to address the hypothesis:

1. What residue does the Hatfield campus hold in its landscape?
2. What residue, if any, can be classified as a cultural landscape on the Hatfield campus?
3. Is there anything of value (to a group, individual, community, culture, aesthetic, national and/or local heritage, uniqueness) in the cultural landscape of the Hatfield campus?
4. If so, is it worth preserving?
5. Is there a reason why there is so little data in the repository on the campus landscape and development?
**Definition of Terms**

**archives**
The non current records of an organisation or institution preserved for their historic value. The term, archives, is often used to refer to the repository where archives and other historic documents are maintained. (Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports. 1998)

**buildings and structures**
A type of landscape characteristic. The elements constructed primarily for sheltering any form of human activities are considered buildings. Elements constructed for functional purposes other than sheltering human activity are considered structures. Mechanical engineering systems conduct utilities within a landscape (power lines, hydrants, culverts). Structural engineering systems provide physical stabilisation in the landscape (retaining walls, dikes, foundation). (Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports. 1998)

**character area**
An area defined by the physical qualities of a cultural landscape and the type and concentration of cultural resources. (Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports. 1998)

**character-defining feature**
A prominent or distinctive aspect, quality, or characteristic of a cultural landscape that contributes significantly to its physical character. Land use patterns, vegetation, furnishings, decorative details and materials may be such features. (Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports. 1998)

**cultural heritage**
Fall into three main categories:
- **monuments**: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- **groups of buildings**: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- **sites**: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethological or anthropological point of view. (UNESCO)

**cultural landscape**
A cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium. The cultural landscape the result. (Carl O. Sauer, 'The Morphology of Landscape', in Leighly, J (ed). 1963. *Land and Life: A Selection from the writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer*. University of California Press, Berkeley. Pp. 343.)

Embraces a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment. Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature. (UNESCO)

A geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein), associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four general types of cultural landscapes, not mutually exclusive: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic
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cultural significance
Aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects (Burra Charter. 2013)

culture
A system of behaviours (economic, religious, and social), beliefs (values, ideologies), and social arrangements. (Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports. 1998)

historic character
The sum of all visual aspects, features, materials, and spaces associated with a cultural landscape’s history, for example the original configuration together with losses and later changes. These qualities are often referred to as character-defining. (Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports. 1998)

landscape
An area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors. (European Landscape Convention/Florence Convention. 2000)
Refers to the broadest sense of the word to include the ground plane of the campus, its character and features, not simply a reference to the plant materials alone; into which the structures, notable historic buildings and various other campus features all play a role in defining the campus context. (The University of Kansas Campus Heritage Plan)

place (sense of place)
A geographically defined area. It may include elements, objects, spaces and views. Place may have tangible and intangible dimensions. (Burra Charter. 2013)

significance
The meaning or value ascribed to a cultural landscape based on the National Register criteria for evaluation. It normally stems from a combination of association and integrity. (Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports. 1998)

Conclusion
The University of Pretoria’s Hatfield Campus has a well documented repository with regards to the campus buildings yet the same does not hold with regards to the campus and its landscape. This became more apparent in the author’s attempts to understand the campus in order to fulfill assigned tasks as the Campus Landscape Architect for the University of Pretoria. The main question raised as a result of this, was to determine if there is any cultural landscape significance to the campus or not and if there is such, does it warrant preservation? It thus became clear that a repository was required to address this and the starting point for such is the sourcing and collating of available data and documents according to prescribed norms and standards. However, this is not entirely possible as there is no definite legislation and/or guidelines available in South Africa for the documentation and preservation of cultural landscapes. The thesis focuses only on the Hatfield Campus from the period 1910 to 1960, excluding residences and property acquisitions outside the study area. The time period of 1910 to 1960 was selected to tie in with the jubilee celebrations of the University in 1960, aligns with the South African Heritage Act’s 60-year preservation status (Section 34(1)), and prior to the expansion of the campus in the early 1960’s.

‘Sense of place’ can be an elusive characteristic, a quality that may include views, vistas, topography, specific campus sites, and buildings all combined. This concept may also include the vitality of the campus, the movement of people, the range of activities, and the overall excitement and experience. It is what people remember after visiting a campus, what endures in the memories of generations of students, faculty, and visitors.

Chapter 2: Research Strategy

We are concerned with the importance of the site to man, and also with his transformation of the site. Altogether we deal with the interrelation of group, or cultures, and site, as expressed in the various landscapes of the world.

Introduction

Martin notes in his blog (Martin undated) that there is no single way to deal with landscape preservation. This is evident in the various methodologies in which the Getty’s Campus Heritage Initiative Grants were tackled. The recognised models available (World Heritage Sites, Burra Charter, ICOMOS and suchlike that are discussed later) all work on the principle that the site is a recognised cultural landscape having world cultural and historic value and thus require preservation. This approach leaves little room for the smaller scale and less significant but by no means of less value sites of cultural and historic value.

O’Donnel notes that, “research and scholarship are critical links in the preservation process. The hunt for archival data, the field reviews, and the narratives that capture place are vehicles for shared understanding” with many universities not only having courses in the field but also high ranking academics conducting research on cultural landscapes and their preservation (O’Donnel. 2008:14) The field is growing and is founded on some thirty years of diverse and multidisciplinary contributions. Those involved are peeling away at the onion to reveal layers of beckoning horizons. She calls on us to, “move on to discover and communicate more about landscapes of the past, present and future - valued places that offer knowledge and roots in an increasingly global culture.” (O’Donnell. 2008:10-14)

Research Aims and Objectives

Aims

The aim of this thesis is to record any data that can be sourced pertaining to the cultural landscape of the Hatfield campus in order to contribute to the institutional repository of the University, and to ascertain what, if any, cultural landscape values exist.

Objectives

• To compile a Campus Cultural Landscape Inventory and Site Analysis, for the period 1910-1960, and to understand the role the site played in the founding and growth of the Hatfield campus;
• To develop the University of Pretoria Hatfield Campus Cultural Landscape Chronology Narrative via text, site plans, mapping, aerial photography and a chronological time line of the development of the campus landscape for the period 1910-1960;
• Identification of periods of significance in which the campus exhibited significant changes in the formative characteristics related to site, architectural and landscape development, based upon the actions of the preceding years.
• Document the most important residual (resources/characteristics) and lost features of the campus to assess the relative importance within the periods of significance.
• Conclude with a statement of significance
Research Questions

The following questions are posed in order to address the hypothesis:

1. What residue does the Hatfield campus hold in its landscape?
2. What residue, if any, can be classified as a cultural landscape on the Hatfield campus?
3. Is there anything of value (to a group, individual, community, culture, aesthetic, national and/or local heritage, uniqueness) in the cultural landscape of the Hatfield campus?
4. If so, is it worth preserving?
5. Is there a reason as to why there is so little data in the repository on the campus landscape and development?

Research Strategy

The strategy approach for this research is to be a complex descriptive and historiographical interpretative research strategy. Deming and Swaffield (2011) describe such a research strategy as lying between objectivist and subjectivist orientations, often including elements of both inductive and deductive theorising, and is thus a diverse, hybrid research model.

Research Instruments

The research instruments to be used for this thesis includes:

- Heritage audit process as per the Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) format
- Research data
- Archival research
- Oral research
- Physical site investigations

- Reference

The following resource material shall be used in this study:

- Primary source materials
- Secondary source materials
- Oral histories
- Contemporary sources

The outcomes of these research instruments are:

- Assimilation of research data
- Intent of design
- Chronology and time line of events
- Circumstances that lead to events
- People involved
- Analysis of status quo and data collected
- Assessment of significance

Research Tool

The U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service’s Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) is to be used as the research tool and guide for this thesis tested alongside relevant South African legislation for relevance. The CLR serves two functions: as the principle treatment document for cultural landscapes and, the primary tool for long-term management of such landscapes. A CLR’s is designed to guide the decisions for the management and treatment of a landscape’s physical attributes, biotic systems, and use, when such use makes a contribution to historical significance. A CLR must also establish preservation goals, which are grounded in research, inventory, documentation, and analysis and evaluation of a landscape’s characteristics and associated features. A CLR identifies the landscape characteristics and associated features, values, and associations that make a landscape historically significant (Page, et al. 1998:3-4). This reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Approach</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Modelling and correlation</th>
<th>Experimentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectivist strategy</td>
<td>Inductive (theory building)</td>
<td>Reflective (theory/practice interactions)</td>
<td>Deductive (theory testing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist theory</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Evaluation and diagnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivist theory</td>
<td>Engaged action</td>
<td>Projective design</td>
<td>Logical systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
methodology was developed by the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation.

The CLR is a flexible document that can be applied to a wide range of cultural landscapes and different management objectives. It can address an entire landscape, a portion of a landscape or an individual feature in the landscape. This variable methodology allows for various site scales and degrees of investigations, even for potential sites that have little in the form of a repository. It is thus a methodology suitable for assessing whether a site has cultural and historic value and to what degree such needs preservation.


A comprehensive Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) includes the following parts:

- Introduction
- Part 1: Site History, Existing Conditions, and Analysis and Evaluation
- Part 2: Treatment
- Part 3: Record of Treatment
- Appendices: Bibliography, and Index

This thesis follows and documents Part 1: Site History, Existing Conditions, and Analysis and Evaluation, as described in the Guide (Page, et al. 1998), so as to adhere to the hypothesis of recording data so as to contribute to the institutional repository. A model outline for Part 1: Site History, Existing Conditions, Analysis & Evaluation is as follows:

1. Site History
   a. Give a historical description of the landscape and its significant characteristics and features

b. Identify and describe the historical context and the period or periods of significance associated with the landscape
c. The text for this is based upon research and historical documentation with sufficient support material to substantiate findings

2. Existing Conditions
   a. Describe the landscape as it currently exists and documentation of landscape characteristics

3. Analysis and Evaluation
   a. Compare findings from the history and existing conditions to identify the significance of landscape characteristics and features
b. Analysis and evaluation may be summarised
c. Statement of significance

Data Collection Resources

The collecting of data for analysing for this thesis shall be sourced from:

1. Primary sources
   a. Historic plans, surveys, atlases, maps, geological maps, soil profiles, aerial photographs, photographs, slides, postcards, drawings and illustrations, engravings, paintings, newspapers, journals, construction drawings, specifications, household records, accounting books and personal correspondence.

b. Archival research of original drawings, plans, surveys, atlases, geological maps, soil profiles, aerial photographs, photographs, slides, postcards, engravings, paintings, newspapers, period literature, journals and other
written records, construction drawings, specifications, household records, account books, correspondence, committee and senate notes and other documents from the University of Pretoria Archives, Department of Public Works, Department of Defence, South African National Air Force, South African National Archives, Sammy Marks Library Pretoriana Collection, Pretoria Boys' High School Museum, personal interviews/oral histories.

c. Field visits, current landscape inventory and existing conditions.

2. Secondary sources
   a. Monographs, published histories, theses, survey data, local preservation plans, state contexts and scholarly articles, special studies and cultural resource inventories.

3. Oral histories
   a. From people directly associated with a cultural landscape can provide a subjective view of its history. Historical information about a landscape can also be collected by documenting changes in the type, location, and composition of ecological systems and vegetation.

4. Contemporary sources
   a. Recent studies, plans, surveys, aerial and infrared photographs, soil and stormwater maps, inventories, investigations and interviews.

Constraints

Ethical Considerations

The following individuals assisted upon inquiry in providing further documentation for this thesis from their respective institution's repositories:

- Brothers Hamish and Riley, Christian Brothers College Pretoria
- Mr John Illsley, Pretoria Boys High School

Limitations

This thesis is confined to the University of Pretoria’s original Hatfield Campus excluding the women’s residences, from Roper Street to University Road in an East-West direction, and Burnett Street to Lynnwood Road in a North-South direction. The study area includes the original area of the University occupied in 1910 up until the commencement of the purchase of the Christian Brothers College and Loreto Convent properties from 1960 and exclusive of properties outside of this study area acquired in the time frame of 1910 to 1960.

As the CLR includes “information spanning numerous disciplines in order to evaluate a landscape’s historical, architectural, archaeological, ethnographic, horticultural, landscape architectural, and engineering features, along with ecological processes and natural systems” (Page et al. 1998:4), this thesis will focus on the landscape architectural aspects only.

The CLR is divided into three parts. Only Part 1: Site History, Existing Conditions, and Analysis and Evaluation, will be addressed and evaluated in this thesis.

The commencement date of 1910 for this thesis runs according to the occupation of the Hatfield campus grounds by the then Transvaal University College, and the erection of the first buildings on the campus, namely the Old Chemistry and Old Arts Buildings.
Chapter 2: Research Strategy

Landscapes are not synonymous with an environment or nature. Landscape is primarily seated in perception; it is a reflection of who we are and how we perceive the world. A cultural landscape is the vehicle for the perpetuation of collective identity and memory. Cultural landscapes are containers or vessels of meaning. It is often the intangible values—the stories, rituals or other meanings attached to a place—which contribute most significantly to its worth.


The concluding year of 1960 for this thesis has been selected for the following reasons:

- It runs parallel to the accepted available documentation.
- 1960 marked the 50th anniversary of the University.
- Martin Smuts’s visit to the United States of America, United Kingdom and European universities and colleges from July-December 1960 was the instigation for the expansive development era of Brian Sandrock resulting in a dramatic change to the character and dynamics of the campus.
- Falls within the period prior to the international charters, declarations and principles being promulgated relating to historic sites and landscapes, starting with UNESCO’s Recommendations Concerning the Safeguarding of Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites in 1962.
- Politically the period is prior to the enforcement of the Apartheid legislation and the commencement of South Africa’s isolation from world diplomacy and commencement of the armed struggle with its drastic changes to South African social structures.
- The South African Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999 section 34(1) states that "No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority". The date stamp (as of 2016) places this at 1956, which falls within the thesis period. As per section 3(2) of the Act, this is to include the landscape surrounding the two previously declared national monument buildings on the campus, namely Old Arts Building and the Old Merensky Library. The current status of these buildings stands as provincial heritage sites.

Conclusion

There is an identified international need for research into the newly established field of cultural landscape preservation for campuses. The Getty Foundation reports highlighted this need further, with the grant reports not following any prescribed reporting format or model, but were rather compiled according to the identified needs (or anticipated needs) of the respective institution. Of the 86 institutions granted funds, only 15 institutions included the campus landscape in their studies, rather focusing on the tangible campus elements, namely the buildings and structures. The composition of the professional teams often did not include the skills of a landscape architect, but some did include the services of a historian or preservationist of some sort. This thesis will follow the accepted format of the National Parks Service’s Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) as developed by the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation. The model will thus be tested against the South African context and legislation for applicability. The complex description and historiography interpretative research strategy via testing the Cultural Landscape Report is to determined whether being a suitable model to follow for such a study.
Every campus has a natural history as well as a cultural one.

Introduction

What we call ‘culture’ or ‘civilisation’ refers to the human capacity to create, to invent or discover new and original applications and to make surrogates. (Vroom. 2006:179)

Cultural landscapes are at the intersection of culture and nature. (IFLA Cultural Landscapes Committee. 2008. ‘An Overview of Issues Facing Cultural Landscape’. Para. 2)

The concept of cultural landscapes has evolved, but is still relatively new in the domain of historic preservation, being simple and complex at once with their studies entailing natural and man-made components of the environment and the ways in which such have changed over time. These components and their relationships are analysed in the physical, functional and associative dimensions. The significance of landscape may be rooted in a single event or in shallow, gradual process, or from a single or multiple phenomenon, or encompass natural settings having special meaning for humans (Longstreath. 2008).

Longstreath (Longstreath. 2008:1) describes the cultural landscape concept as, frequently misconstrued as being synonymous with designed landscape - a garden, park, campus, boulevard system, and the like - or with landscaping - the act of manipulating topography, ground surfaces, and plant material. For some, cultural landscape applies to rural settings or to those created by an ethnic or racial ‘other’…Similarly, some construe the concept’s pertinence to ‘different’ places…but not to their own backyards. Irrespective of such misunderstandings, many preservationists tend to view cultural landscape simply as comprising physical entities…instead of also as a method of considering, analysing, and evaluating places. (University of Delft. 2010. ‘Program Overview: MSc2 Landscape Architecture’, pp. 9).

Defining Cultural Landscapes

A landscape is a cultural image, a pictorial way of representing, structuring or symbolising surroundings. (Daniels & Cosgrove. 1988:1)

The word ‘landscape’, originates from the Germanic root landschaft, which was introduced into the English language from the Dutch landschap in the 16th century and signified a unit of human occupation, resulting from the strong human engineered and community developed flood plains of the Netherlands (Schama. 1995). Schama argues that our entire landscape tradition is a product of shared culture built form a rich deposit of myths, memories and obsessions. Cultures embrace nature and landscape myths to various degrees and with fluctuating vigour and concludes that, “the cultural habits of humanity have always made room for the sacredness of nature. All our landscapes, from the city park to the mountain hike, are imprinted with our tenacious, inescapable obsessions.” (Sharma. 1995:18)

"Cultural landscapes explore landscapes as a product [residue] of time and established spatial qualities [place]" (University of Delft. 2010. ‘Program Overview: MSc2 Landscape Architecture’, pp. 9). Place is bound to memory. Memory is bound to knowing. Knowing is bound to the senses serving as a source of memory (DeLind & Link. 2004:124).

"To be at all – to exist in any way – is to be somewhere, and to be somewhere is to be in some kind of place." (Vroom. 2006:247). Motloch (1991) describes place as a temporal phenomenological concept dependant on the interrelationship of characteristics perceived through the gestalt of stimuli. Vroom (2006) explains place as an environment, in which a number of individual, visible and tangible phenomena are amassed. Places of a cultural origin are defined as genius loci, with the most
meaningful of places being those where culture merges with nature. Thus place is unique. Webster’s 1913 Dictionary (Webster’s 1913 Dictionary, 2003. ‘Place’) defines place as, “[a]ny portion of space regarded as measured off or distinct from all other space, or appropriated to some definite object or use; position; ground; site; spot; rarely, unbounded space”.

Yet place is a concept of many dimensions – a shape shifter of sorts. It can be tangible, sensual. It can exist under our feet; it can literally ground us, anchor us, give us roots. But place can also be social and spiritual. It can be as tangible as history, as creative as culture, as mystical as creation myths. Instead of something absolute, place can be a matter of shifting identities, shared understandings, relationships not only among ourselves but among all living creatures.

(DeLind & Link. 2004:124)

Diana Balmori (Balmori. 2010:119) expands this notion with her 16th manifesto, “[a] landscape, like a moment, never happens twice. This lack of fixity is landscape’s asset”. However, this results in conflict, as social beings seek to preserve the familiar, everyday landscapes the more place changes (Low et al. 2005). The Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter. 2013:2) explains place as having a,

broad scope and includes natural and cultural features. Place can be large or small: for example, a memorial, a tree, an individual building or group of buildings, the location of a historical event, an urban area or town, a cultural landscape, a garden, an industrial plant, a shipwreck, a site with in situ remains, a stone arrangement, a road or travel route, a community meeting place, a site with spiritual or religious connections.

Missouri University campus planner, Perry Chapman, encourages the 21st-century American campus to adopt an ethic of place backed by the principles of sustainability, authenticity, and community. He argues that making better places of college campuses strengthens recruitment and promotes donor support. At an even deeper level, place is where traditions and societal changes that are to be addressed by higher education, meet one another. (University of Missouri. 2014. ‘Pride of Place’. University of Missouri). Schama (1995:19) notes that should be “a journey through spaces and places, eyes wide open, that may help us keep faith with a future on this tough, lovely old planet”.

“Cultural landscapes are landscapes that have been affected, influenced, or shaped by human involvement”. Such landscapes can be associated with a person or event, varying in scale from a thousand hectares to a tiny dwelling. They can be grand estates, industrial sites, parks, gardens, cemeteries, and campuses.

“Collectively, cultural landscapes are works of art, narratives of culture, and expressions of regional identity.” (The Cultural Landscape Foundation. 2001-2016. ‘Places’. Para. 1). Riesenweber (2008:23) notes geographer Arnold Alanen and landscape architect Robert Melnick’s argument that such spaces (places) are to be found “virtually everywhere that human activities have affected the land”, with such definitions treating landscape as a material thing by stressing the impact culture has on nature.

Considered by many as the father of the term cultural landscape, Carl Sauer defined a cultural landscape as early as 1925 as, “fashioned from a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent; the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape the result”. (Wikipedia. 2016. ‘Cultural landscape’. Para. 6. Wikipedia). The Oxford Dictionary of Geography (Mayhew. 2009:115) defines cultural landscapes as “the impact of cultural groups in shaping and changing the natural landscape”. The definition further quotes P.Cloke et al (eds. 2006) that “landscape itself is a cultural image, a way of symbolising, representing, and structuring our surroundings”.

The national Australian Heritage Commission (AHC) recognises the unique position of indigenous heritage and defines cultural landscapes as “[t]heir heritage is intimately linked with the landscape, beliefs, and customs. Indigenous people perceive the natural environment as a cultural landscape which is the product of human activities over at least 60 000 years - time immemorial. Indigenous heritage includes those cultural landscapes and places, intellectual property, knowledge, skeletal remains, artefacts, beliefs, customs/practices, and languages that are important to Australia’s indigenous people.” (Theron. 2013:32)

In 1992 the World Heritage Convention became the first international legal instrument to recognise and
Theoretical Foundation

Cultural landscapes are defined as the combined works of nature and man (UNESCO, 1992-2014). "They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal." (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 1992-2014, 'Cultural Landscapes: History and Terminology'. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation). It is also noted that cultural landscapes embrace a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between man and the natural environment.

Cultural landscapes fall into three main categories (as per the Operational Guidelines, 2008, Annex 3):

**Category 1: Clearly Defined Landscape Designed and Created Intentionally by Man**

This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.

**Category 2: Organically Evolved Landscape**

This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories:

- a relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form.
- a continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

**Category 3: Associative Cultural Landscape**

Is a type of landscape that is linked to cultural traditions, justified by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent, the physical place where intangible aspects of cultural heritage are embodied.


The United States National Park Service defines cultural landscapes as, "[a] geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person, or that exhibit other cultural or aesthetic values" (Page et al. 1998:12). Cultural landscapes are classified into four none mutually exclusive groups:

1. **Historic site**

   A landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person.

2. **Historic designed landscape**

   A landscape significant as a design or work of art; was consciously designed and laid out either by a master gardener, landscape architect, architect, or horticulturist to a design principle, or by an owner or other amateur according to a recognised style or tradition; has a historical association with a significant person, trend, or movement in landscape gardening or architecture, or a significant relationship to the theory or practice of landscape architecture.

3. **Historic vernacular landscape**

   A landscape whose use, construction, or physical layout reflects endemic traditions, customs, beliefs, or values; expresses cultural values, social behaviour, and individual actions over time; is manifested in physical features and materials and their interrelationships, including A Cultural Heritage Landscape accounts for an array of heritage elements that work together to create a whole. It can encompass buildings, structures, landforms, plantings, and views.
patterns of spatial organisation, land use, circulation, vegetation, structures, and objects. It is a landscape whose physical, biological, and cultural features reflect the customs and everyday lives of people.

4. Ethnographic landscape

A landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources.

Literature Review

Barillet et al (2006:15) describe cultural landscapes as the interaction between man and nature by further adding that they "are very illustrative of the relationship that human societies can have with their natural environment". Heritage can further be divided into the material, tangible form, and the intangible cultural form, however they are both closely related. "All intangible aspects such as knowledge systems, the principles of action or the values and beliefs of man, can not be considered as heritage if they cannot be shared, and given a sensible form - words, objects, gestures, representations and even behaviours. Also, material or tangible heritage reaches its full significance when it refers to the knowledge and values that constitute its essence, and give meaning to its production” (Barillet et al. 2006:9).

Geographer Carl Sauer, considered the father of the term cultural landscape, agreed that many of geography's central questions revolved around the relationships between human beings and their environments and argued that people have as great an effect on the physical environment as it has upon them. His formulation was that landscapes, whether physical or cultural, were material things, being real and knowable through the sense of vision. His morphological method of reading the landscape relied heavily on observation of the landscape forms. When reading cultural landscapes, observable landscape forms include features such as population, housing and transportation networks are observed, mapped and analysed with the goal of “tracing landscape change and deciphering the successive layers of residue left on the land by human occupation” (Riesenweber. 2008:24).

This historical approach dominated cultural geography studies in America throughout the first half of the 20th century with many of Sauer's 'Berkley School' students using the approach to emphasise the very stuff with which historic preservation had traditionally been concerned with. One such student, Fred Kniffen, argued that all landscapes were cultural landscapes in that they all contained traces of the ‘cultural strains’ that occupied them. Sauer sought to define regions by mapping a combination of natural and cultural forms while Kniffen sought to delimit cultural regions and reveal cultural relationships through cultural forms alone. (Riesenweber. 2008:24). Another of Sauer’s students, Peirce Lewis, arguing that cultural meaning is present in all landscapes and that this meaning be understood by reading the landscape like a book, with the human landscape being written without us being aware it, documenting our tastes, values, aspirations and fears in a visual and tangible form. Henry Glassie, a disciple of Kniffen, argued that geographical methods rather than traditional historical methods were the best for documenting and analysing material folk culture as they exhibited a "major variation over space and minor variation through time" (Riesenweber. 2008:25). His translation of Sauer resulted in attention to the landscape as a whole rather than its components falling by the wayside.

It was John Brinckerhoff Jackson who made the concept of cultural landscapes familiar within the design professions, specifically through his teachings at Berkley and Harvard's architecture and landscape architecture departments, and being the founder, editor and publisher of the journal Landscape (now the official publication of the American Society for Landscape Architecture) between 1951 and 1968. He has been noted for his unique alliance between the design fields and historic preservation, with the importance that his publication had to preservationists to consider historic districts, entire communities and rural landscapes. Described as "America's greatest living writer on the forces that have shaped the land this nation occupies" (Wikipedia. 2014. 'J.B. Jackson'. Para. 1.), Jackson notes that his experiences on writing and lecturing on the American countryside, towns and cities, led him to finally asking the question of how to describe this topic. He objected to the use of the word environment, for as he puts it, "[in] the sixties, it will be recalled, the environmental movement was shrill and self-righteous, and I had no wish to be identified with it;
and this is still the case" (Jackson. 1980:1). Eventually
the topic was named ““The History of the American
Cultural Landscape” – by which was meant the natural
environment as modified by man” (Jackson. 1980:2).
He explains that landscape is that space on the earth’s
surface which we intuitively know as a space “with
some degree of permanence, with its own distinct
character, either topographical or cultural, and above all
a space shared by a group of people” (Jackson.1984:5).
He maintains that part of our appreciation of historic
landscapes originates from their very endurance and
continuous change, being living and integral parts of the
world in which we live in (Riesenweber. 2008).

This is how we should think of landscapes: not merely
how they look, how they conform to an aesthetic
ideal, but how they satisfy elementary needs, the
need for sharing some of those sensory experiences
in a familiar place through popular songs, popular
dishes, a special kind of weather supposedly found
nowhere else, a special kind of sport or game, played
only here in this place. These things remind us that
we belong - or used to belong - to a specific place:
country, a town, a neighbourhood. A landscape should
establish bonds between people, the bond of language,
of manners, of the same kind of work and leisure,
and above all a landscape should contain the kind of
character, either topographical or cultural, and above all
a space shared by a group of people” (Jackson.1984:5).

Geographers James and Nancy Duncan considered
landscape meaning to be fluid, being shaped by the
observer’s ideas and social position, and the
circumstances of the reading. They write that “[t]exts
are not innocent. They are not transparent windows
through which reality may be unproblematically viewed” (Riesenweber. 2008:27). They stress that these
texts simultaneously hold common understandings and
interpretations that are shared within social groups
or textual communities. Following this line, they
define landscapes as “texts which are transformations
of ideologies into a concrete form” (Riesenweber. 2008:27).

Richard Schein, professor of geography at the University
of Kentucky, writes that a landscape is always in a
process of becoming, never static but continuously
being scrutinised, manipulated, changing and involved
“[l]andscape and culture intermix in various
combinations” with constructed elements dominating
an urban landscape and natural elements dominating
a rural landscape, “organic and synthetic operate as a
gradient of different interstices that forms a continuum
across the surface of the earth.”

William John Thomas Mitchell, the Gaylord Donnelley
Distinguished Service Professor of English and Art
History at the University of Chicago, writes that
“[l]andscape is not a genre but a medium ... a medium
of exchange between the human and the natural,
the self and the other...a natural scene mediated by
culture. It is both represented and presented space,
both a signifier and signified, both a frame and what a
frame contains, both a real place and its simulacrum,
both a package and the commodity inside a package"
Mitchell (2002:5) He calls for the term landscape to be changed from a noun to a verb, asking, “that we think of landscape, not as an object to be seen or a text to be read, but as a process by which social and subjective identities are formed” (Mitchell. 2002:1). Riesenweber (2008:28) surmises that geographers now suggest “landscape is as much an image, symbol, signifier, and materialisation of ideology or discourse as a material thing”.

The International Federation of Landscape Architecture’s policy on cultural landscapes “asserts that cultural landscapes, the combined works of humanity and nature, inherited from the native land and former peoples, are valued, diverse and worthy of professional attention and effective inter-disciplinary collaboration. Cultural landscapes of all types, land and water, as well as all scales, history and meaning and their contexts, are globally, nationally, regionally and locally significant resources” (ILASA. 2013). The urgency of building such an infrastructure is widely recognised in international (science) policy frameworks, such as the Malta Convention (1992), the European Landscape Convention (2000), and the INSPIRE directives regarding the interoperability of spatial data sets and services (2011). Thus the purpose of a Landscape Heritage Plan is to document and plan for the continued stewardship of these valued resources that represent our cultural landscape (ILASA. 2013).

University College London Emeritus Professor David Lowenthal writes, “the past we know or experience is always contingent on our own views, our own perspective, and above all on our own present. Just as we are products of the past, so is the known past an artefact of ours” (Riesenweber. 2008:32). University of Oregon landscape architecture professor Robert Z. Melnick writes that cultural landscapes are central to our personal and collective identities, creating and re-enforcing self-images and value structures (Riesenweber. 2008:32).

**International Context**

Every cultural landscape has a unique complex of cultural and natural values, and is subject to different legal protection frameworks and diverse national management systems and institutional arrangements. The cultural landscape of many European regions is subject to constant changes due to economic and social processes. Such transformations are not a new situation unheard of before, since the character of regions has been developing over many centuries. However, these metamorphoses never proceeded as rapidly, or influenced the landscape as intensely, as at the end of the 20th century and in the beginning of the 21st century, for example in the age of galloping industrialisation and urbanisation as well as of demographic phenomena. (Jaszczak. 2011)

Anne Whiston Spirn (1998:31) on her explanation of the relationship between people and the biophysical realm notes that every nation has its own ‘native’ nature that is worked by physical and mental labour into the landscapes, with which its people identify. She argues that “[l]andscapes affirm or negate memory of a personal past, record a collective, cultural past, even a past beyond individual experiences or human memory” (Spirn. 1998:62) in which memories are transmitted from one generation to the next, concluding that “memory is central to identity” (Spirn. 1998:63). Memory associates people with place and assigns a sense for the purposefully shaped, sensual and aesthetic, the embeddedness in culture, recovering the dynamic connection between place and those who live within it. “The meanings landscapes hold are not just metaphorical and metaphysical, but real, their messages practical; understanding may spell survival or extinction” (Spirn. 1998:11). She further notes that, “Landscapes were the first human texts, read before the invention of other signs and symbols” (Spirn. 1998:15). She argues that the commonly used terms ‘environment’ and ‘place’ used to replace ‘landscape’ are not adequate substitutes as they refer to locale or surroundings and omit people. “Environment and place seem more neutral, but they are abstract, disembodied, sacrificing meaning, concealing tensions and conflicts, ignoring the assumptions landscape reveals” (Spirn. 1998:17). The initial form of the land is expressed by the base rhythm established by natural processes. To this culture responds with new and changing themes, weaving an intricate pattern that are pierced occasionally by nature and art.

*Spirn, A.W. 1998:22*
Thus landscape meaning is complex, layered, ambiguous, and never simple or linear.

To see landscape as mere scenery gives precedence to appearance at the expense of habitability and risks trivialising landscape as decoration - landscaping - concealing the significance of senses other than sight and of parts hidden from view, the deep context underlying the surface. To call some landscapes natural and others artificial or cultural misses the truth that landscapes are never wholly one or the other.

Spirn, A.W. 1998:24

Being able to read the landscape, and its sum of endless dialogues, reveals the past but also has the ability to foretell the future.

Simon Schama’s book *Landscape and Memory* (1995) focuses on the relationship between the physical environment and folk memory by separating the components of the landscape into wood, water and rock, enmeshed in the cultural consciousness of collective memory that are embodied in myths, which he explains are expressed in ceremony and text. While the work is a personal exploration of his own origins through ever widening circles of digressions, it does bring to the fore that although we are accustomed to separate nature and human perception into two realms, they are in fact inseparable. Our complete landscape tradition is a result of shared culture and “by the same token a tradition built from a rich deposit of myths, memories, and obsessions” (Schama. 1995:14) admitting that not all cultures embrace nature and landscape myths with the same verve - “[t]o see the ghostly outline of an old landscape beneath the superficial covering of the contemporary is to be made vividly aware of the endurance of core myths” (Schama. 1995:16) and that all landscapes are inscribed with man’s tenacious and inescapable obsessions.

The design journalist, historic landscape preservationist and planner, Frank Edgerton Martin, writes that as the historic landscape preservation field has existed for only around 30 years, it can assist planners to challenge the old paradigm that historic resources should be frozen in time. It is fundamentally different from the building preservation and museum artefacts curation. Like generations of students and alumni, well managed campus landscapes can be self-renewing, and unlike antiquities and historic buildings, are never quite the same at any point in time. “There remains no one set of best practices in campus landscape preservation - and this lack of resolution may be why its puzzles can enrich heritage preservation discourse overall” (Martin. 2011:168). James Corner (1999:5) argues, “landscape architects and their projects may better shape how a culture evolves and relates to the world. The concern is less for finding a new aesthetic style than for increasing the scope of the landscape project in a broader cultural milieu.” The changing ideas surrounding nature, wilderness and landscape continually inform physical practices of design and building, and in turn, further transform and enrich cultural ideas. The making of the landscape entails cultural vision that cannot be watered down to formal or ecological procedures.

The reciprocal interactions between the built and the imaginary is what lies at the center of landscape architecture’s creativity and contribution to culture… and “[a]s such, landscape has assumed increased popular value as a symbolic image, a picture laden with signs that lend cultural uniqueness, stability, and value to a particular place or region.

Corner, J. 1999:10 & 13

Steen A.B. Høyer (Høyer. 1999) notes, with relation to the Danish landscape, that priority is giving on an increasing scale to urban areas with the limited funding remaining spent on the preservation of culturally historic monuments as opposed to the everyday landscape. He notes that the “character of a specific place is not necessarily native or unchanging but rather always subject to evolution and human agency” (Høyer. 1999:73). Similar to Schama, he explains that the present landscape is experienced through all the senses and interpreted primarily through instinct and intuition.

Alexandru Calcatinge’s complex book *The Need for a Cultural Landscape Theory: An Architect’s Approach*, (Calcatinge. 2012) is research as a result from an intellectual curiosity in terms of knowledge surrounding the concept of cultural landscapes and a aspiration to clarify and extend the knowledge of the term. He develops a theoretical path in reading the cultural landscape as a result of the lack of constructive rigidity of cultural landscape studies and the process
of investigating and identifying cultural landscapes is often uncertain, ambiguous and subject to subjective approaches. He remarks that the scientific approach needs to be both phenomenological and semiotic, on a descriptive and an interpretative level. A large portion of his book looks into defining the term (concept) cultural landscape and explaining the origins of the term and its pioneers, primarily from the geography professions. One of his concluding remarks is that the future study of the concept of cultural landscapes, lies in the professions of architecture, landscape architecture, urban planning, sociology and futurology.

**ICOMOS**

*International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964)*

Article 1 of the Charter states,

> The concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilisation, a significant development or a historic event. This applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past which have acquired cultural significance with the passing of time”. Thus the intention of this Charter is for the safeguarding of such monuments as works of art and historical evidence.

Article 16 concludes with,

> In all works of preservation, restoration or excavation, there should always be precise documentation in the form of analytical and critical reports, illustrated with drawings and photographs. Every stage of the work of clearing, consolidation, rearrangement and integration, as well as technical and formal features identified during the course of the work, should be included. This record should be placed in the archives of a public institution and made available to research workers. It is recommended that the report should be published.

**ICOMOS Statutes, Moscow 1978**

Article 3 of the Statute defines the terms used and to be used in further charters and memorandums, stating,

a) The term “monument” shall include all structures (together with their settings and pertinent fixtures and contents) which are of value from the historical, artistic, architectural, scientific or ethnological point of view. This definition shall include works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and all combinations of such features.

b) The term “group of buildings” shall include all groups of separate or connected buildings and their surroundings, whether urban or rural, which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of value from the historical, artistic, scientific, social or ethnological point of view.

c) The term “site” shall include all topographical areas and landscapes, the works of man or the combined works of nature and of man, including historic parks and gardens, which are of value from the archaeological, historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.

d) The terms “monument”, “site”, and “group of buildings” shall not include:

- museum collections housed in monuments,
- archaeological collections preserved in museums or exhibited at archaeological or historic site museums,
- open-air museums.

**Historic Garden (The Florence Charter 1981)**

Article 1.

A historic garden is an architectural and horticultural composition of interest to the public from the historical or artistic point of view. As such, it is to be considered as a monument.

Article 2.

The historic garden is an architectural composition whose constituents are primarily vegetal and therefore living, which means that they are perishable and renewable. Thus its appearance reflects the perpetual balance between the cycle of
the seasons, the growth and decay of nature and the desire of the artist and craftsman to keep it permanently unchanged.

Article 3.

As a monument, the historic garden must be preserved in accordance with the spirit of the Venice Charter. However, since it is a living monument, its preservation must be governed by specific rules which are the subject of the Present charter.

Article 4.

The architectural composition of the historic garden includes:
- Its plan and its topography.
- Its vegetation, including its species, proportions, colour schemes, spacing and respective heights.
- Its structural and decorative features.
- Its water, running or still, reflecting the sky.

Article 5.

As the expression of the direct affinity between civilisation and nature, and as a place of enjoyment suited to meditation or repose, the garden thus acquires the cosmic significance of an idealised image of the world, a "paradise" in the etymological sense of the term, and yet a testimony to a culture, a style, an age, and often to the originality of a creative artist.

Article 6.

The term "historic garden" is equally applicable to small gardens and to large parks, whether formal or "landscape".

Article 7.

Whether or not it is associated with a building in which case it is an inseparable complement, the historic garden cannot be isolated from its own particular environment, whether urban or rural, artificial or natural.

Article 8.

A historic site is a specific landscape associated with a memorable act, as, for example, a major historic event; a well-known myth; an epic combat; or the subject of a famous picture.


This document defines, Cultural Heritage refers to monuments, groups of buildings and sites of heritage value, constituting the historic or built environment.

Recording is the capture of information which describes the physical configuration, condition and use of monuments, groups of buildings and sites, at points in time, and it is an essential part of the conservation process.

Records of monuments, groups of buildings and sites may include tangible as well as intangible evidence, and constitute a part of the documentation that can contribute to an understanding of the heritage and its related values.

The reasons for recording are listed as follows:

1. The recording of the cultural heritage is essential:
   a) To acquire knowledge in order to advance the understanding of cultural heritage, its values and its evolution;
   b) To promote the interest and involvement of the people in the preservation of the heritage through the dissemination of recorded information;
   c) To permit informed management and control of construction works and of all change to the cultural heritage;
   d) To ensure that the maintenance and conservation of the heritage is sensitive to its
physical form, its materials, construction, and its historical and cultural significance.

2. Recording should be undertaken to an appropriate level of detail in order to:
   a) Provide information for the process of identification, understanding, interpretation and presentation of the heritage, and to promote the involvement of the public;
   b) Provide a permanent record of all monuments, groups of buildings and sites that are to be destroyed or altered in any way, or where at risk from natural events or human activities;
   c) Provide information for administrators and planners at national, regional or local levels to make sensitive planning and development control policies and decisions;
   d) Provide information upon which appropriate and sustainable use may be identified, and the effective research, management, maintenance programmes and construction works may be planned.

3. Recording of the cultural heritage should be seen as a priority, and should be undertaken especially:
   a) When compiling a national, regional, or local inventory;
   b) As a fully integrated part of research and conservation activity;
   c) Before, during and after any works of repair, alteration, or other intervention, and when evidence of its history is revealed during such works;
   d) When total or partial demolition, destruction, abandonment or relocation is contemplated, or where the heritage is at risk of damage from human or natural external forces;
   e) During or following accidental or unforeseen disturbance which damages the cultural heritage;
   f) When change of use or responsibility for management or control occurs.

**Natchitoches Declaration on Heritage Landscapes (2004)**

Heritage landscapes are unique places that are the prime expression of the richness of the world and the diversity of its culture. Actions to deepen the understanding of the complexity of heritage landscapes, whether productive, commemorative, inspirational, rural or urban, countryside, seascapes, cityscapes, industrial landscapes, routes, or linear corridors, are needed at the international, national and regional levels. The preservation and conservation of heritage landscapes is coming into focus, but international bodies have much to do to address their complexity. Drawn up by the International Symposium of US/ICOMOS, the Declaration is aimed at:

   - Strengthening a concept in evolution and an inter-disciplinary commitment towards heritage landscapes;
   - Recognising, develop a stronger system and provide guidelines for responding to threats to heritage landscapes;
   - Engaging communities with regard to heritage landscapes, and foster co-operation of a national and international level;

**Québec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place (2008)**

This Declaration was adopted, “to preserve the spirit of place through the safeguarding of tangible and intangible heritage, which is regarded as an innovative and efficient manner of ensuring sustainable and social development throughout the world”. It includes the identification of threats; safeguarding and transmitting of the spirit of place.
Rethinking the Spirit of Place

1. Recognizing that the spirit of place is made up of tangible (sites, buildings, landscapes, routes, objects) as well as intangible elements (memories, narratives, written documents, festivals, commemorations, rituals, traditional knowledge, values, textures, colors, odors, and suchlike), which all significantly contribute to making place and to giving it spirit, we declare that intangible cultural heritage gives a richer and more complete meaning to heritage as a whole and it must be taken into account in all legislation concerning cultural heritage, and in all conservation and restoration projects for monuments, sites, landscapes, routes and collections of objects.

2. Because the spirit of place is complex and multiform, we demand that governments and other stakeholders call upon the expertise of multidisciplinary research teams and traditional practitioners in order to better understand, preserve and transmit the spirit of place.

3. Since the spirit of place is a continuously reconstructed process, which responds to the needs for change and continuity of communities, we uphold that it can vary in time and from one culture to another according to their practices of memory, and that a place can have several spirits and be shared by different groups.

ICOMOS-IFLA

The Buenos Aires Memorandum on Cultural Landscapes and Historic Gardens (2001)

5.0 To make the most of the opportunities and benefits that cultural landscapes and historic gardens can provide, it is necessary that proper policies and strategies for their conservation are in place; that resources are available for their implementation, and that those who are involved, should always be looking for ways of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of these policies and their implementation. All forms of development should respect the need to conserve the historic, social, and other cultural significances of the site in question.

8.0 Specialist knowledge, understanding and skills (both practical and mental) are required when formulating and implementing policies for the conservation, management and care of cultural landscapes and historic gardens. Important topics that need to be included in these special requirements are such things as:

i) understanding the landscape and garden heritage and its history;

ii) understanding the concepts that are signified by the key words and terms that are involved in this subject area;

iii) understanding the principles and philosophy of conservation. (These include concepts such as the inter-relationships between the natural and cultural heritage; the holistic, integrated and sustainable approaches to development and conservation);

iv) understanding how the public can engage with and benefit from the landscape and garden heritage, and how public awareness of it can be increased;

v) methods for the identification, surveying and recording of cultural landscapes and historic gardens;

vi) techniques for the assessment of this part of the cultural heritage. (Assessment is the process by which overall and balanced judgments are made about situations in which there are several or many different aspects that need to be taken into account. For example, when deciding on the comparative significance of a place or on the nature of the action, or treatment, that is required);

vii) policy making and implementation. (This includes policies that apply to many sites, as well as those for single sites);

viii) how to improve and manage the availability of information, advice, skills, education and training in relation to the landscape and garden heritage;
ix) how to improve the levels of research on the landscape and garden heritage;

x) how to identify and work with the prevailing circumstances in which any cultural landscape or historic garden exists. This includes topics such as the relevant legislation and cultures.

It is important to understand that the subject of cultural landscapes includes landscapes that are of local, regional and national significance, as well as those that are of international importance or World Heritage Sites.

**UNESCO**

**Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding of Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites (1962)**

The Recommendation defines the safeguarding of the beauty and character of landscapes and sites as,

1. To mean the preservation and, where possible, the restoration of the aspect of natural, rural and urban landscapes and sites, whether natural or man-made, which have a cultural or aesthetic interest or form typical natural surroundings.

4. The studies and measures taken are to be adopted with a view to the safeguarding of landscapes and sites should extend to the whole territory of a State, and should not be confined to certain selected landscapes or sites.

5. Protection should not be limited to the natural landscapes and sites, but should also extend to landscapes and sites whose formation is due to wholly or in part to the work of man. Thus, special provisions should be made to ensure the safeguarding of certain urban landscapes and sites which are, in general, the most threatened, especially by building operations and land speculation. Special protection should be accorded to the approaches to monuments.

6. Measures taken for the safeguarding of landscapes and sites should be both preventative and corrective.

**Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)**

The opening statement of the Convention states,

Considering that it is essential for this purpose to adopt new provisions in the form of a convention establishing an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organised on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods.

Article 1 of the convention defines ‘cultural heritage’ as:

monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.

Article 2 of the convention defines ‘natural heritage’ as:

natural heritage and man, and creations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view;

geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation;

natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.
The Convention aims at the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value.

**Convention For the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)**

Article 1 of the Convention explains the purpose thereof,

being to safeguard, ensure respect, raise awareness and to provide international co-operation for the intangible cultural heritage.

Article 2 defines the intangible cultural heritage as,

1. The practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development. It further explains that such is manifested in oral traditions and expressions; performing arts, social practices; rituals and festive events; knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; and traditional craftsmanship.

2. The “intangible cultural heritage”, as defined in paragraph 1 above, is manifested inter alia in the following domains:

(a) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage;

(b) performing arts;

(c) social practices, rituals and festive events;

(d) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe;

(e) traditional craftsmanship.

**Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (2011)**

I. Definition

3. Urban heritage, including its tangible and intangible components, constitutes a key resource in enhancing the liveability of urban areas and fosters economic development and social cohesion in a changing global environment. As the future of humanity hinges on the effective planning and management of resources, conservation has become a strategy to achieve a balance between urban growth and quality of life on a sustainable basis.

8. The historic urban landscape is the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting.

9. This wider context includes notably the site’s topography, geomorphology, hydrology and natural features, its built environment, both historic and contemporary, its infrastructures above and below ground, its open spaces and gardens, its land use patterns and spatial organisation, perceptions and visual relationships, as well as all other elements of the urban structure. It also includes social and cultural practices and values, economic processes and the intangible dimensions of heritage as related to diversity and identity.

10. This definition provides the basis for a comprehensive and integrated approach for the identification, assessment, conservation and management of historic urban landscapes within an overall sustainable development framework.

11. The historic urban landscape approach is aimed at preserving the quality of the human
environment, enhancing the productive and sustainable use of urban spaces, while recognizing their dynamic character, and promoting social and functional diversity. It integrates the goals of urban heritage conservation and those of social and economic development. It is rooted in a balanced and sustainable relationship between the urban and natural environment, between the needs of present and future generations and the legacy from the past.

12. The historic urban landscape approach considers cultural diversity and creativity as key assets for human, social and economic development, and provides tools to manage physical and social transformations and to ensure that contemporary interventions are harmoniously integrated with heritage in a historic setting and taking into account regional contexts.

Florence Declaration on Landscape (2012)

The declaration calls upon intergovernmental agencies and secretaries responsible for United Nations programmes and international conventions together with non-governmental organisations concerned to:

- strengthen the global awareness of the need to safeguard and improve landscapes as an integral element of sustainable development processes;
- share information and make expertise available;
- establish effective partnerships

South African Context

The only relevant South African legislation pertaining to the protection of and/or classification of (cultural) landscapes is the National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999. It makes no direct use of the term ‘cultural landscape’, rather the defined terms ‘land’ and ‘place’ inferring to the landscape surrounding a heritage resource or an area thereof, is of an inferred heritage status. The Act defines place as:

(a) a site, area or region;
(b) a building or other structure which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such building or other structure;
(c) a group of buildings or other structures which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such group of buildings or other structures;
(d) an open space, including a public square, street or park; and
(e) in relation to the management of a place, includes the immediate surroundings of a place;

Section 3(2) and 3(3) of the Act states:

(1) Without limiting the generality of subsection (2), the national estate may include:

(a) places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance;
(b) places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
(c) historical settlements and townscapes;
(d) landscapes and natural features of cultural significance;
(e) geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;

(i) movable objects, including—

(j) objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens;
(ii) objects to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
(iii) ethnographic art and objects;
(iv) military objects;
(v) objects of decorative or fine art;
(vi) objects of scientific or technological interest; and

(vii) books, records, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic, film or video material or sound recordings, excluding those that are public records as defined in section 1(xiv) of the National Archives of South Africa Act, 1996 (Act No. 43 of 1996).

(3) Without limiting the generality of subsections (1) and (2), a place or object is to be considered part of the national estate if it has cultural significance or other special value because of:

(a) its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa’s history;

(b) its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage;

(c) its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage;

(d) its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa’s natural or cultural places or objects;

(e) its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;

(f) its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;

(g) its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;

(h) its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa; and

(i) sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

Section 7(1) of the Act provides for grading categories for heritage resources, either at a national or provincial level, as:

(a) Grade I: Heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance;

(b) 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

(c) Grade III: Other heritage resources worthy of conservation

Section 28(1) and 28(2) of the Act provides some measure of greater inclusion of the landscape as a heritage resource, stating,

SAHRA may, with the consent of the owner of an area, by notice in the Gazette designate as a protected area:

(a) such area of land surrounding a national heritage site as is reasonably necessary to ensure the protection and reasonable enjoyment of such site, or to protect the view of and from such site; or

(b) such area of land surrounding any wreck as is reasonably necessary to ensure its protection; or

(c) such area of land covered by a mine dump.

A provincial heritage resources authority may, with the consent of the owner of an area, by notice in the Provincial Gazette designate as a protected area:

(a) such area of land surrounding a provincial heritage site as is reasonably necessary to ensure the protection and reasonable enjoyment of such site, or to protect the view of and from such site; or

(b) such area of land surrounding any archaeological or palaeontological site or meteorite as is reasonably necessary to ensure its protection.
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The landscape does not receive any general protection measures as per part 2 of the Act, instead the elements/structures found in the landscape receive such protection, namely structures; archaeological and paleontological artefacts; meteorites, burial grounds and graves; and public monuments and memorials.

Section 31. (1) of the Act requires,

A planning authority must at the time of revision of a town or regional planning scheme, or the compilation or revision of a spatial plan, or at the initiative of the provincial heritage resources authority where in the opinion of the provincial heritage resources authority the need exists, investigate the need for the designation of heritage areas to protect any place of environmental or cultural interest.

Section 34(1) of the Act states,

No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.

As any historic building or new development must be viewed in its spatial and social context, therefore it can be argued that one must view it in its ‘place’. Thus the contents (heritage resource) of a ‘place’ are inclusive of (as per the Act’s definitions) archaeological, cultural significance, grave, land, living heritage, object, palaeontological public monuments and memorials, site, and structures, and accordingly subscribed to the same stipulations as any historic building.

Council of Europe

European Landscape Convention

The preamble of the document states,

Noting that the landscape has an important public interest role in the cultural, ecological, environmental and social fields, and constitutes a resource favourable to economic activity and whose protection, management and planning can contribute to job creation;

Aware that the landscape contributes to the formation of local cultures and that it is a basic component of the European natural and cultural heritage, contributing to human well-being and consolidation of the European identity;

Acknowledging that the landscape is an important part of the quality of life for people everywhere: in urban areas and in the countryside, in degraded areas as well as in areas of high quality, in areas recognised as being of outstanding beauty as well as everyday areas;

The Convention defines landscape as,

an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors. Article 3 states as the aims of the Convention to promote landscape protection, management and planning, and the organising European co-operation on landscape issues.

Current Models

UNESCO: World Heritage Convention

In 1992 the World Heritage Convention became the first international legal instrument to recognise and protect cultural landscapes. The Committee acknowledged that cultural landscapes represent the “combined works of nature and of man” designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal.

The term “cultural landscape” embraces a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment. Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature. Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use and can maintain or enhance natural values in the landscape. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. The protection
of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore helpful in maintaining biological diversity.

Cultural landscapes fall into three main categories (Operational Guidelines 2008, Annex3), namely:

The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man. This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.

The second category is the organically evolved landscape. This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories:

- a relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form.
- continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

The final category is the associative cultural landscape. The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.

(i) represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;
(ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;
(iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;
(iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;
(v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;
(vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);
(vii) contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;
(viii) be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth’s history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;
(ix) be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;
(x) contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of Outstanding Universal Value from the point of view of science or conservation.

Article 77

The Committee considers a property as having Outstanding Universal Value (see paragraphs 49-53) if the property meets one or more of the following criteria. Nominated properties shall therefore:

Figure 3.06: The Burra Charter Process: Steps in planning for and managing a place of cultural significance
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Article 78.

To be deemed of Outstanding Universal Value, a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding.

The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter 2013)

The charter provides “guidance for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance (cultural heritage places), and is based on the knowledge and experience of Australia ICOMOS members.” The charter follows a process or sequence of collecting and analysing information, developing a policy, and the management in accordance with the policy of the place. Steps 1 and 2 could be considered as the equivalent to Part 1 of the National Park Services as per below.

The Charter defines:

1.1 Place means a geographically defined area. It may include elements, objects, spaces and views. Place may have tangible and intangible dimensions.

1.2 Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations.

Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects.

Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.

This model has been tested in South Africa through the Heritage Audit Union Buildings Estate, July 2005 by Newtown Landscape Architects


The National Register of Historic Places documents the appearance and importance of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in our prehistory and history. These properties represent the major patterns of our shared local, State, and national experience. To guide the selection of properties included in the National Register, the National Park Service has developed the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. These criteria are standards by which every property that is nominated to the National Register is judged.

The criteria for evaluation are:

That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The criteria for consideration are:

A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or

A building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or

A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life; or

A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
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A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or

A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or

A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance. (To apply this to the South African context, this shall be 60 years as per the South African Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999, clause 2).

This model has not been tested in South Africa to the best of the author’s knowledge.


Developed for the National Park Service by the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation, the Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) serves two important functions, being the primary treatment document for cultural landscapes and the primary tool for long-term management of such landscapes. “The CLR guides management and treatment decisions about a landscape’s physical attributes, biotic systems, and use when that use contributes to historical significance” (Page et al. 1998).

The format has followed a long history since the early 1960’s from ‘Historic Grounds Reports’ with the inclusion of the term ‘cultural’ adopted over that of ‘historic’ in 1975. In 1984, Cultural Landscapes: Rural Historic Districts in the National Park System was published. The National Park Services definition of a cultural landscape (see definition of terms) divides such into four categories, namely:

- Historic sites: a landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity or persons.
- Historic designed landscape: a landscape significant as a design or work of art, that was consciously designed and laid out either by a master gardener, landscape architect, architect or horticulturist to a design principle.
- Historic vernacular landscape: a landscape whose use, construction or physical layout reflects endemic traditions, customs, beliefs or values; expresses cultural values, social behaviour, and individual actions over time.
- Ethnographic landscape: a landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources.

The report is divided into three parts:

Part 1: Site history, existing conditions, and analysis and evaluation
Part 2: Treatment
Part 3: Record of treatment

The Olmsted Centre has completed over fifty such reports for a variety of landscapes in size and nature in the United States.


The Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI), a comprehensive inventory of all cultural landscapes in the national park system, is one of the most ambitious initiatives of the National Park Service (NPS) Park Cultural Landscapes Program. The CLI is an evaluated inventory of all landscapes having historical significance that are listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, or are otherwise managed as cultural resources through a public planning process and in which the NPS has or plans to acquire any legal interest. The CLI provides a management inventory of evaluated cultural landscapes, as per Section 110(a) (1) of the National Historic Preservation Act, NPS Management Policies, and the Cultural Resource Management Guideline. As such, the CLI aids park managers in planning, programming, and recording treatment and management decisions.

This document is designed for use for National Park Service’s park landscapes.
Model to be used for Thesis

For the purposes of this thesis, *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process and Techniques* (Page et al. 1998) will be the guiding document for the findings and is to be tested against current South African legislation pertaining to cultural landscapes. The Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) serves two functions:

- the principle treatment document for cultural landscapes
- the primary tool for long term management of those cultural landscapes

The Cultural Landscape Report’s purpose is to guide management structures in their treatment decisions for a landscape’s physical attributes and biotic systems, and the application thereof when applied to a site of historical significance. The Cultural Landscape Report establishes goals for the cultural landscape which are grounded in ‘research, inventory, documentation, and analysis and evaluation of a landscapes characteristics and associated features’ (Page et al. 1998:4). The Cultural Landscape Report may include information crossing various disciplines for a landscape’s historical, architectural, archaeological, ethnographic, horticultural, landscape architectural, and engineering features, along with ecological processes and natural systems, to be evaluated. This is done to outline appropriate treatment for a landscape that is consistent with its significance, condition and proposed use.

The Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) has a flexible format so that it can be used for various landscape types, address different management objectives, and guide treatment activities. While every CLR should be similar in format and content, not every CLR needs to contain the same level of information or have the same outline of contents. The level of investigation refers to the type and extent of information gathered and processed during three activities conducted for a CLR. The three activities are historical research, existing conditions investigation, and analysis and evaluation.

This thesis is to follow the Exhaustive Historical Research level of investigation, the purpose being to develop a historic context defining the significance of a landscape, to compose a site history that describes and illustrates the appearance of a cultural landscape through relevant historic periods.

Exhaustive historical research makes use of all primary sources of known or presumed relevance, inclusive of:

- historic publications, unpublished manuscripts and historic correspondence
- all pertinent historic graphic records e.g. drawings, plans and photographic materials
- interviews conducted with knowledgeable persons

Secondary sources are also reviewed e.g. studies, reports and topical publications. All the gathered information is compiled and then documented chronologically in an illustrative narrative. (*Landscape Lines 2: Levels of Investigation. Pp. 5*)

A comprehensive Cultural Landscape Report includes the following parts:

- Introduction
- Part 1: Site History, Existing Conditions, and Analysis and Evaluation
- Part 2: Treatment
- Part 3: Record of Treatment
- Appendices: Bibliography, and Index

The three main parts of the report should be completed sequentially however information and findings acquired whilst completing latter parts of the report will result in possible revisions to earlier sections of the report.
Model Outline to Be Used for Study

Part 1: Site History, Existing Conditions, and Analysis and Evaluation

Site History provides documentation about and evaluation of landscape characteristics and associated features, materials, and qualities that make a landscape eligible for the National Register. The site history, existing conditions, and analysis and evaluation sections identify the historical values associated with the landscape, document extant landscape characteristics and associated features, and define the significance and integrity of the landscape. (Page et al. 1998) Where applicable and necessary, the model will be adapted to South African requirements in order to fit into the contextual framework of the study.

Part 1: Site History, Existing Conditions, Analysis and Evaluation

Site History gives a historical description of the landscape and all significant characteristics and features. The text is based on research and historical documentation, with enough support material to illustrate the physical character, attributes, features, and materials that contribute to the significance of the landscape. This section identifies and describes the historical context and the period or periods of significance associated with the landscape.

Existing Conditions describes the landscape as it currently exists, including the documentation of such landscape characteristics as land use, vegetation, circulation, and structures. It is based on both site research and site surveys, including on-the-ground observation and documentation of significant features. Contemporary site functions, visitor services, and natural resources are described to the extent that they contribute to or influence treatment.

Analysis and Evaluation compares findings from the site history and existing conditions to identify the significance of landscape characteristics and features in the context of the landscape as a whole. Historic integrity is evaluated to determine if the characteristics and features that defined the landscape during the historic period are present. A statement of significance for the landscape is included, and the analysis and evaluation may be summarized in the identification of character areas, or the development of management zones. (Page et al. 1998:36)

Conclusion

The study of landscapes is an eclectic discipline, requiring us to cast a necessarily broad net to capture the many nuances of Cuba and Cubanidad (Cubanness).


The literature highlights the various definitions for the term cultural landscape due to the various professions involved in the study of the concept. The varied nature of the professions thus results in the varied interpretation of the concept of cultural landscapes. Consensus has thus not been achieved as to an accepted definition for the term. What is evident is that the application and interpretation of the data in spite of the models and definitions, is contextual to the site, the region, the country and the continent. It is also a process that involves a variety of expertise in the understanding of the concept. Whilst there are numerous charters, conventions and the like in place, the only one of these that holds any legal integrity is the World Heritage Convention, however only after such legislation has been put in place by the host nation. The rest are mere guidelines that are accepted on a voluntary basis.

The literature has identified the need for the establishment and management of a comprehensive and integrated cultural landscape repository for tertiary institutions worldwide, to inform and guide the future planning of such institutions. This lack is resulting in the loss of precious oral traditions, customs and, tangible and intangible associations to the landscape.

The various models and charters available are primarily focused towards the recognition and management of cultural landscapes at an international level, with a gap in the process for the mere identification of cultural landscapes at a site, local, regional land/or national level. The Burra Charter is an appropriate model to follow except that it works on the principle that the site has already been identified as a cultural landscape as per the UNESCO and/or ICOMOS charters. The Cultural Landscape Report model however, follows a process for the identification of a possible cultural landscape on various scales (Part 1), working towards the possible registration thereof on the National Register of Historic Places. Once registered, the implementation of the
management thereof follows (Part 2 and 3 of the report). For this reason and that the model has not been tested for the South African context to the best knowledge of the author, this model has been selected for the thesis.

The level of investigation is influenced by a number of factors. Ultimately, the level of historical research should match the level of decision making to be directed by a CLR. (Landscape Lines 2: Levels of Investigation)

This thesis will document the cultural landscape of the University of Pretoria’s Hatfield campus for the period 1910 to 1960 according to the National Parks Service’s Cultural Landscape Report Format, focussing on Part 1 of the format, namely the documentation of the landscape and its present state. This will be done via archival research, preparation of period plans, inventory and documenting existing conditions, historic plan inventory, site analysis, evaluation and identifying significance. Patricia O’Donnell notes that when writing on the current situation of cultural landscapes that her thoughts moved directly to the current challenges in cultural landscape preservation, ‘addressing, documenting, and researching cultural landscapes; changing focus according to scale and scope; integrating culture and nature; incorporating tangible values of places and intangible values of people and traditions; confronting the dynamics of rapid change and threats to the recent past; assessing and managing the impact of heritage tourism; and marrying preservation and sustainability.’ (O'Donnell. 2008:10)

Fiene and Sabbatini (2011) note that the most enduring contribution that designers and planners can make is to "know intimately what makes our campuses special and how best to advocate designs appropriate for our times with the care, detailing, and human scale that are so appreciated in our older structures." (Fiene & Sabbatini. 2011:137). They note that what is critical is the way in which building occupy land, the space that such buildings create, and the way in which such spaces are used and loved. "Buildings style is less important than the creation of enduring memorable spaces with a scale and palette that support the campuses' values and identity." (Fiene & Sabbatini. 2011:137).
Chapter 4: Research Results

To see the ghostly outline of an old landscape beneath the superficial covering of the contemporary is to be made vividly aware of the endurance of the core myths.

Chapter 4: Research Results

Introduction

Part 1 of the Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) provides documentation about and an evaluation of landscape characteristics and associated features, materials and qualities. The site history, existing conditions, and analysis and evaluation sections identify the historical values associated with the landscape, document extant landscape characteristics and associated features, and define the significance and integrity of the landscape. All three sections (site history, existing conditions and analysis and evaluation) of part 1 need to be completed before any treatment decisions for the landscape can be made. (Page et al. 1998)

Line drawing, photography, and videography are techniques for graphically documenting cultural landscapes. Line drawings, such as measured plans, sections and elevations, and black and white photographs are the types of graphics used in a Cultural Landscape Report to accurately record the appearance of a landscape at a particular time. (Landscape Lines 5: Graphic Documentation)

Site History

The site history provides a description of the landscape through every historic period up to the present, and it identifies and describes the historic context and period(s) of significance associated with the landscape. The site history documents the physical development of the landscape, focusing on human interaction with, and modification to, the natural landscape. It describes the physical character, attributes, features, and materials (the landscape characteristics and associated features) that contribute to the significance of the landscape. Other types of historical information, such as stylistic trends, social history, the history of technology, and cultural history are detailed in the report if they have a direct bearing on the physical development of the property. This is often the case with vernacular landscapes. The site history should include the experiences and stories of all individuals associated with the physical development and use of the landscape, including those who have traditionally been under-represented. (Page et al. 1998)
Site History Chronology

The cultural landscape site history chronology of the Hatfield Campus follows six narratives, namely:

- a text narrative
- a site plan narrative
- a mapping narrative
- an aerial photography narrative
- a photographic narrative
- a chronological time line narrative (See Appendix A)

Text Narrative

The text narrative makes use of a cross-referencing system to the Chronological Time Line Narrative (Appendix A), with the reference in a bold bracketed font behind the associated activity/event. The referencing system works as follows:

Example of cross reference (A7-1939):

- Letter A refers to the row classification
- Number 7 refers to row number
- Date 1939 refers to column year

Background: The Site

The geology of Pretoria is dominated by major mafic intrusive rocks of the Rustenburg Layered Suite (covering over 66 000km² with its geographic centre located north of Pretoria at around 25°S and 29°E) of the Bushveld Igneous Complex (containing some of the richest ore deposits on Earth and aged at around 2 billion years). Rock types include gabbro, norite, pyroxenite and anorthosite, with shales and quartzites of the Pretoria group also contributing. Mainly vertic melanic clays with some dystrophic or mesotrophic plinthic catenas and some freely drained, deep soils. Pretoria falls within the transition of the grassland and savanna biomes comprising of the Marikana Thornveld (veld type classification number SVCb6) veld type with altitudes ranging from 1050-1450m from Rustenburg to the east of Pretoria. Vegetation is dominated by Acacia karoo woodland, occurring in valleys and slightly undulating plains and some lowland hills. Shrubs are more dominate along drainage lines, on termitaria, rocky outcrops and areas protected from fire. Important taxa include Acacia burkei, A. caffra, A. gerrardii, A. karoo, A. nilotica, A. tortillas subs heterocantha, Celtis africana, Combretum molle, Diospyros lyooides subs guerkei, Dombeya rotundiflora, Eleuca crisp subs crispa, Eleuca undulata, Ehretia rigida subs rigida, Grewia flava, Olea europaea subs africana, Pappaea capensis, Pappetta gardenisfolia, Peltophorum africanum, Searsia (Rhus) lancea, Searsia (Rhus) pyroides subs pyroides, Terminalia sericea and Zaziphus mucronata.

The veld type’s conservation status is threatened with a target of 19%, less than 1% statutorily conserved. There is considerable impact on the veld type’s area with 48% being transformed mainly for cultivated lands and urban/built-up areas. Erosion is very low to moderate. Alien invasive plants occur in localised high densities, especially along drainage lines. Climate is summer rainfall with dry winters, mean average rainfall is between 600 and 700mm. Frost is frequent in winter. Mean monthly maximum and minimum temperatures for January and July is 32.8˚C and -1.0˚C respectively (University of Pretoria Experimental Farm, Mucina & Rutherford. 2006). Winds are dominated by north-easterlies with the windiest months in September and October.

Approximately 300-400 years ago the southern Ndebele people under the chieftainship of Chief Musi occupied the Pretoria region. From 1815-1832, a period known as the Mfecane (isiZulu) or Difeqane (Sotho), Nguni groups fleeing the Zulu kingdom’s expansion drive, moved across the Drakensberg mountain range into Lesotho, the Highveld and Swaziland, resulting in clashes and conflicts amongst the black chieftains in south-eastern Africa. This led to the changing of settlement and political patterns in these areas, and influencing the ethnic structures of these people of the region. One of the main protagonists of the Mfecane on the Highveld was Mzilikazi, founder of the Ndebele kingdom. Mzilikazi made Pretoria his military base on the southern side of Meintjieskop (Union Buildings) from around 1827-1832. Two military kraals were built in the area, “enDinaneni” situated north-west of Pretoria on the Hartebeespoort Dam road, and “enKungweni” along the Daspoort range of hills to the east.

Figure 4.03: Plan of Pretoria showing the property of the Pretoria Estate and Market Company. 1896.

The street plan shows the Uitval site of the Hatfield Campus with the Lorenzo Marques railway line running through. At this time, the area was on the very limits of the town of Pretoria.

With the arrival of the Voortrekkers in 1836, Mzilikazi’s enemies started forming alliances with the white trekkers, led by General Hendrik Potgieter, resulting in devastating attacks on the Voortrekkers at Vegkop in October 1836. The Voortrekkers managed to ward off their attackers, but suffered great loss of life and livestock. Potgieter launched a counter-attack on the Ndebele at Mosega, managing to recover a considerable number of their livestock. In November 1837, Potgieter and Piet Uys launched another attack on Mzilikazi and his tribe. This battle, together with the one waged by Dingane a few months earlier, forced Mzilikazi to flee across the Limpopo River, building a new capital in the Matopo Hills called Bulawayo, leaving the land open for the advancing trekkers to occupy.

Although some Tswana tribes returned to the Apies River area after the departure of Mzilikazi, there is no evidence of large communities occupying the area that is now the Pretoria Metro. The first white settlers in Pretoria, from 1840, were the brothers Lucas (registering the farm Groenkloof) and Gert Bronkhorst (registering the farm Elandspoort). Groenkloof encompassed the Fountains Valley area, while Elandspoort extended from the south to Daspoortrand in the north and from Pretoria west through to Hatfield in the east. Only later did Andries Pretorius, after whom Pretoria is named, arrive in the area. Through his efforts, the British recognised the independence of the Voortrekkers north of the Vaal River, which became known as the Transvaal, resulting in the signing of the Sand River Convention of 1852. Andries Pretorius’s son, Marthinus Wessels Pretorius, purchased the farms, Elandspoort and Koedoespoort, with the intent of establishing a new capital for the Transvaal in 1852. In November 1853, the two farms were declared a town, which came to be known as Pretoria.

Establishment of the University of Pretoria

Prior to the South African War of 1899-1902, Paul Kruger’s Zuid Afrikaanse Republiek (ZAR, South African Republic) Volksraad (House of Assembly) resolved to the establishment of a university, but the war prevented this from being carried out. In 1902 the Normal College was established, mainly for the training of teachers. In 1904 the Transvaal Technical Institute in Johannesburg was opened, with the emphasis on mining education programmes, some of which were offered by the sister Pretoria Institute branch. In 1906, the Transvaal Technical Institute adopted the new name of the Transvaal University College (T.U.C.), consisting of the Johannesburg and Pretoria branches.

After 1907, General Smuts, then Minister of Education and colonial secretary in the Botha government in the Transvaal Colony, vigorously pressed for the establishment of a university institution in Pretoria. The Pretoria branch, predecessor to the University of Pretoria, commenced classes in the Arts and Sciences on 10 February 1908 in the house, Kya Rosa, at 270 Skinner Street (central Pretoria) with a residence, Kya Lami in Schoeman Street. Both houses where built and owned by Leo Weinthal, editor of the local weekly, The Press, and founder of The Pretoria News in 1898, before the 1899-1902 war. After the war they fell under Colonial Administration and earmarked for educational purposes. Staff complement was 4 professors, namely H. Th. Reinink (Dutch), J. Purves (Scottish), A.C. Paterson (Scottish) and D.F. du Toit Malherbe (South African), 3 lecturers, a total of 32 Afrikaans and English speaking students, and no furniture. On 4 March 1908, the Transvaal University College became officially known as the Pretoria Centre of the Transvaal University College, later becoming an independent institution apart from the Johannesburg branch on 17 May 1910. In 1930 the University became the fully-fledged University of Pretoria and in 1932 an Afrikaans only medium university. Roger Fisher (1998:224) notes that, “we can discern in it all the components that would characterise the University of Pretoria - a city-based, white, Afrikaans tertiary institution serving the needs of a farming community”.

Figure 4.04: View from Meintjies Kop looking south onto the Uitval Grond of the University of Pretoria’s Hatfield Campus and Pretoria Boys High.

The tents in the central and left foreground are a British Military Hospital set up during the 1899-1902 war and is the present day site of Pretoria Boys’ High School and the Hatfield Campus of the University of Pretoria. The photograph illustrates the barren (treeless) quality of the site.

Pretoria Boys’ High School Archives. Undated and untitled photo, but possibly taken during the British occupation of Pretoria from June 1900.
Campus Chronology

<1910

The Hatfield campus lies in what was originally part of the farm Elandspoort (No. 193) that was inspected in August 1841 for J.G.S. (Gert) Bronkhorst (M28-<1880). This farm included the whole of the present day Pretoria, east of the Apies River. In 1857, the farm was divided into 6 portions of which the portion that the Hatfield campus currently lies in, fell under the ownership of Jan François Schutte (M29-<1880). James Edward Mears purchased this portion on 22 July 1875, subject to certain servitudes (M30-<1880). During his tenor, the land acquired the name Sunnyside. On 20 June 1887, Mears had the land measured out into erven with the intent of proclaiming it into the town of Pretoria, which was done so in 1888 (M28-1887). Arcadia had been incorporated the previous year (R47-1889). During this time, Mears and his neighbours, E.P.A. Meintjes (Arcadia) and P.J. Kotzé (Uitval Grond [fallout ground] No. 67, present day Brooklyn) disputed the servitudes, resulting in the State issuing a new proclamation for Sunnyside, of which Mears was not entirely happy with (M28-30-1889). These grazing lands (servitude) of Mears, lay approximately between the present day University Road and Roper Street (the boundary of Uitval Grond [fallout ground] No. 67 commenced), and a line to the north roughly where the present day road between the Mathematics Building (K18-1930) and Natural Sciences 1 runs, and to the south along College Street, on the ridge behind Pretoria Boys’ High School. Splitting these two grazing lands was an old wagon trail from the current Park Street in Arcadia to the farm Hartebeestpoort No. 304, which a century earlier belonged to Captain Johan Marius Struben. This trail was later known as College Avenue, present day Lynnwood Road (M28-29-1890). In 1894 the Delgoa Bay railway line was completed splitting the Sunnyside dorpsgronden (town grounds) from the rest of the State’s land that stretched to Kirkness and Park Streets (M28-1894).

These grounds were in the possession of the State by 1889. Elandspoort 193 Uitval Grond was then sold to James Brook (Brooklyn portion) and Johan Rissik (Rissik Dorp renamed Hillcrest) in 1902 (M28-1902). The latter portion was used as a British hospital during the Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902 (T54-1899-1902), in which photographs reflect the site that has been stripped bare of much of the vegetation that was present (ABLEWiki. 2012. ‘Pretoria Boys High School, Roper Street, Brooklyn, Tshwane’. History, para. 2). Following the 1899-1902 war (T54-1899-1902), the ground became Crown Lands according to the Crown Lands Disposal Ordinance of 1903 Transvaal (M28-29-1903), and handed over to the Pretoria municipality, but was only formally signed over in 1910/1911 (M32-1911). In terms of the Town Lands Ordinance (1904) Transvaal, one of the conditions was that the land be used for educational purposes (M28-1904). In 1907, the southern side of the site from the present day Lynnwood Road was assigned for education with Pretoria Boys’ High School occupying one corner of the land in 1908 (M28-29-1907). The remainder of the land remained free until 1909 when the site was made available to the Transvaal University College (TUC) (M28-1909).

Figure 4.05: View looking onto Pretoria Boys High School buildings upon completion 1910

View looking south onto Pretoria Boy’s High School from roughly the present day van der Graaf Accelerator/AE du Toit Auditorium. The dirt track in the foreground is suspected to be the track to Captain Struben’s farm, later passing on the northern side of the Old Arts Building.

Pretoria Boys’ High School Archive
1910-1919

On 27 May 1909, the Brooklyn site east of Pretoria, known as Uitval Grond (fallout ground) was finally selected for the erection of the T.U.C. buildings to which Jan Smuts mentioned in his speech upon the opening of the Pretoria Boys’ High School on 15 April 1909 (R47-1909), would be the finest in South Africa. A budget of £50 000 was allocated for these buildings (M28-1909). On 14 August 1909, the building plans prepared by Percy Eagle of the Department of Public Works, were approved by the Council with Jan Smuts signing them off on 17 December 1909 (L18-19-1909). On 17 May 1910, JJ Kirkness was awarded the tender for the construction of the Old Arts and Old Chemistry buildings on the newly proclaimed T.U.C. campus (L19-1910-1911). The Governor-General of the Union of South Africa, Herbert John Gladstone, laid the foundation stone for the Old Arts Building on 3 August 1910 (L20-1910) with students and staff moving into the building from September 1911 (N35-1911). At this stage there were 7 professors, 6 lecturers and 62 students.

The site was described as consisting of thorn and Karoo trees, shrubs and long grass on the whole ridge. “Toe in 1911 die eerste twee universiteitsgeboue klaargekom het en betrek is, was die omgewing nog goe e en leeg. By die uitleg van die terrein en die aamplant van bome is dit vanselfsprekend dat ook aan ‘n sportterrein gedink is” (By 1911 when the first two university buildings had been completed and occupied, the surrounding environment was formless and empty. Along with the setting out of the site and the planting of trees, it was obvious that sports fields had been considered, Author’s translation. Rautenbach et al. 1960:421) (M31-1911). In 1912 the Council was informed of this opportunity and promised that everything possible would be done to achieve this. The first of these were three tennis courts built in 1912 for which the Council provided £72 towards (M30-1912). Primarily due to the lack of funding, the general setting out of the campus progressed slowly. The ground was very hard and occasionally dynamite was required to get through the rock. Trees were first planted and the roads were laid out before the sports fields received any attention, but the exact timing of the rugby (football) field is unknown. In 1916 the SRC complained that the field was not complete and in 1917 the field is described as “grasruigte” (dense grass. Author’s translation) (M29-1916-1917). In 1919, three additional tennis courts were constructed (M29-1919).

In 1911 the Department of Public Works drew up a ‘Town Commons’ plan for the area north of the campus (Old Agriculture Building site), Pretoria Girls’ High School and the Rissik Street station (M30-1911). The plan was revisited again in 1918 with the planning and building of the Old Agriculture Building (M28-1918). The Municipality of Pretoria donated the land for Old Agriculture to the College on condition that it was to be used for the Faculty of Agriculture (M29-1917). In April 1920 a further site development plan was presented to the Council for which it made £100 available for implementation (M28-1920). This plan included a rugby field. At the same time, a Terreinkomitee (Site Committee) was established to look into the landscape around College Residence, with £100 allocated for this (M29-1920). The new main entrance to the campus moved to the Old Agriculture axis leading from Burnett Street (M29-1920).

Shortly after taking on the site, a committee was established in June 1910 consisting of H. Crawford and T.N. de Villiers, tasked to determine the boundaries of the site from the Department of Public Works. In July of the same year, the sub committee reported that the Department estimated the site to be 37 morgen (approximately 31.7 hectares), an estimate that ended up being too high (M29-1910). The boundaries were described as,

ontho by a road recently constructed by the Public Works Department [it is possibly to interpret this as the beginnings of Burnett Street], on the south and west by University Road [to the south this is present day Lynnwood Road and the west is University Road which was not in existence yet], and on the east by Albert Road [present day Roper Street].

Rautenbach et al. 1960:265

A site plan drawn up by the Department of Public Works in 1910 reflecting the tree planting recommendations was submitted to the Building, House and Equipment Committee, with the recommendation that the Minister of Education be approached to acquire the necessary funds for implementation (M30-1910). It is not clear if anything was implemented as per this plan
but in June 1911 J de V Roos reported to the Council that he along with the secretary of the Department of Public Works, Charles Murray, visited the site and was waiting upon the Department for another site plan. A plan was presented to the Council a week later for which the “centre portion in front of the main building” was approved (Rautenbach et al. 1960:265), with the rest of the plan being forwarded to the Building Committee for approval (M30-1911). Thus, the origins of the ‘grasperk’ (Aula lawn) commenced. In 1912, the site survey was completed with the site now measuring 20 morgen and 539 square rood (approximately 18.5 hectares) with this being the ground handed over to the TUC, prior to the Faculty of Agriculture’s ground being included in 1918 (M31-1912).

Tree planting commenced in 1912 (M29-1912). The Council approved that the Department of Forestry be approached to advise on tree species and positions, but then itself suggested,

that Plane trees be planted in the Avenues in front of the Main Buildings and that Gums be planted on the North, South and Eastern boundaries of the Grounds.


Planting began later in that year under the auspice of J de V Roos, with the use of convict labour. The ground was so hard that in places dynamite was required for the excavation of tree holes. The dynamite blasts sometimes became a welcome distraction for the students during class. There was mixed success with the newly planted trees but the veld grass quickly took over resulting in the landscape. Three gates were eventually installed: one at the main entrance on the Old Arts axis opposite the railway line crossing, one “near the monastery” (Rautenbach et al. 1960:266) (what can be interpreted as near the Chapel building) and one opposite the Boys High School, possibly on the north-south axis (Tukkiebaan/Tukkie Avenue). These were thus the access points into the campus totalling a cost of £415 (M28-1921). At this time two of the four metal sculptured T.U.C. monograms donated by the University of the Witwatersrand (WITS), were installed at the main entrance gates, Old Arts Building axis entrance. It is however believed that these two monograms were later stolen by the Witsies years later at an Intervarsity event. The main entrance into the College was from University Road on the Old Arts axis (M29-1919).

The establishment years of the campus fell within the droughts of 1907-1923 and the below average sporadic monthly rainfall from 1925 to 1934. The Skakelblad (Skakelblad. Jaargang 2. No 3. Oktober 1955:9) notes that the only remnants of the original vegetation left on the campus were present behind the present day Theology Building. In 1918, the TUC was formally incorporated into the University of South Africa. (N34-1918) and Advocate A.A. Roberts was appointed as the first full time registrar in 1919 (N34-1919). Prof A.C. Paterson was appointed as first rector of the college in October 1918 (H14-1918). During this period the Faculties of Agriculture (J16-1917), Law, Theology (J16-1918), Arts, Natural Sciences and, Trade and Public Administration (J16-1919), were established.

Figure 4.07: Lentedag 1925(?) exiting from the Old Agriculture gate onto Burnett Street

The wooden gates are no longer in existence however the stone walls are still, except for the column alongside the pedestrian gate. Note that no signage is present on the stone columns in contrast to Figure 5.72 and the front cover of this thesis. From 1920, this became the new main entrance to the campus off Burnett Street (and the railway crossing), taking over from the Old Arts entrance off University Street.

UP Archives Photographic Collection
The following buildings were built in this period: Old Chemistry (1911) (L18-1910-1911), Old Arts (1911) (L19-1910-1911), Caretakers Cottage (1911) (L20-1911), and College Residence (1915) (L18-1912-1915).

1920-1929

Brother McEvoy of the Christian Brothers’ College describes the suburbs of Arcadia and Brooklyn around the University and Christian Brothers’ College, as being the extreme limits of the city and one “could step out from the [CBC] College building straight on to the veld - and keep going” (Christian Brothers’ College, Pretoria: Anecdotes). Electricity was not yet available and thus oil lamps and candles were still used. Sanitation was still in the form of sanitary buckets. Stormwater rushed down open gullies alongside the streets, which were still not surfaced, causing a fine dust to settle on everything. The severe thunderstorm on Christmas Day 1923 (R47-1923), caused severe damage to Christian Brothers’ College, Girls’ High School and the University’s buildings, where “so many roof tiles were either broken or damaged” (Christian Brothers’ College, Pretoria: Anecdotes).

In 1920, the Senate came to realise that the College Residence grounds were not what they should be. A Site Committee was established without any funding which was unable to achieve much. In 1920, the Department of Public Works (author unknown) gave the campus some attention with the drawing up of a general site plan for which the Council provided £100 of the requested £500 for the execution thereof (M28-1920).

In the same year, a fantastical long-term vision plan was drawn up, the author and drawer of such is unknown. This plan provided for the layout of a rugby (football) field. The unanticipated gradient of the campus resulting in considerable earthworks. This led to the University requesting the field to be constructed on the Pretoria Boys’ High grounds, for which permission was not granted. Eventually, the earthworks for the rugby and hockey fields commenced in 1921/22. In 1922, a visitor notes “hoe’n groep van honderd rooie-mandiebeït was om met pikke te klap” (how a group of a hundred red shirt convicts were busy digging the ground with picks. Author’s translation. Rautenbach et al. 1960:422) for the construction of a rugby and hockey field (M29-1922). The first field was completed in 1922 but was already insufficient. The T.U.C. however did make use of the Oostelike Sportterrein (Eastern Sports Grounds, present day Loftus) practice fields until 1930. In 1926 the rugby club requested another field for which a proposal was to convert the existing hockey field into a rugby field and a new hockey field be constructed on the western side of the existing rugby field. This did not come to be (M28-1926). Instead, the rugby field was constructed in the south-western corner of the site in 1931 (M30-1931), where the tennis courts were, the site being the predecessor for the New Administration Building.

In the mid 1920’s, athletics grew in popularity resulting in the DPW again revising the site plan to accommodate an athletics track with input from students, staff (under Prof Plummer) and the DPW (M28-1925). In 1925, the secretary of the T.U.C. Sport Association, J.B. Osburn, approached an executive lecturer from the University of Illinois, to assist with the layout of an athletics track, which was nothing short of a stadium. It included a rugby field within an athletics track, a swimming pool and the requisitely buildings (M28 & M30-1925).

Whether this plan was ever accepted is unclear but the Property Committee did in 1927 approve that “a scheme for the complete lay-out of the Sports Grounds” (Rautenbach et al. 1960:423) be investigated, especially in light of the upcoming Dalrympale track event scheduled for Pretoria in 1930 (M28-1927). A plan was prepared, author unknown. The proposed track for the 1930 Dalrympale event did not materialise and thus the event did not take place at the T.U.C.

An athletics track was constructed some time in the 1920’s but the details of this is unclear. A protest letter from the South African University Athletics Federation under Mr Saul Suzman, to the construction of an athletics track around a rugby and hockey field, which was against the South African Athletics Association’s standards, was not taken to heart, as such a field around the hockey field existed already (M30-1925). Since 1926 some funding was provided for the upkeep of the track. However, when out of season, the track received no attention resulting in the track having to be redone from scratch virtually every year. The popularity of athletics grew even more after the T.U.C. won their first Dalrymbeker in 1928 (O39-1928). In 1926, an additional rugby field was requested. Instead, one of the hockey fields was converted to a rugby field with a new hockey field to be built west of this field, which did not happen (M28-1926). Construction of a new rugby field commenced in the late 1920’s in the south...
western corner (known as Die Gat – The Hole) and was completed in 1931 (M30-1931). Up until then, the surrounding sporting facilities were made use of for example Pretoria Boys’ High, Loftus, and CBC.

In 1924 the Department of Forestry was approached again for suitable tree species to be planted on the site. They advised that the existing Eucalyptus viminalis (Manna Gum) be removed and replaced with Eucalyptus polyanthemos (Red Box) for the boundaries and that Pinus longifolia (now P. roxburghii, Chir Pine) be planted internally (M28-1924). In 1925 Prof F.E. Plummer and his students drew up a site plan for the campus (appearing in the 1926 year book) in conjunction with DPW, reflecting the campus landscape prior to the huge changes of the 1950’s (M28-1925). The sports fields were the dominating factor in determining the landscape character of the campus at this time. Rugby practice fields were used at the Eastern Sports Grounds until 1930. The irrigation pipes on the T.U.C. campus were insufficient and ineffective for irrigating the sports fields, with the services of the Department of Agriculture called in to assist in this regard. In 1923, A. Allen (M28-1923) became the grounds supervisor followed by J.S. Joubert.

By 1929, the T.U.C. grounds were no longer maintained by the DPW (M33-1910-1929). 1924 also saw the origins of the University’s Botanical Garden by Prof Barend Albrecht (M32-1924), specifically with the gift of a cycad sucker (Encephalartos transvaalensis) by the Queen Modjadji I, which is planted in the Old Agriculture Building courtyard (M29-1924). Prof Albrecht planted numerous trees and shrubs on the campus but commenced with a collection of Pavetta species from 1924 onwards. The Botanical Garden was officially started in 1930 (M39-1930-1931). The University suffered a leaderless period from 1922-1926, which impacted on decision-making, planning and execution of plans on the campus. Dr Hoogenhout served a short spell as rector from 1926-1927 followed by Prof A.E. du Toit (R14-1926-1934). Prof du Toit was the driving force behind the conversion of the College into a fully-fledged Afrikaans medium University, which gained momentum in the late 1920’s (N34-36-1929) following the recognition of Afrikaans as an official language in 1925 (T56-1925). In 1923 the first Commemoration Day was held on 10 August, celebrating the College moving into the buildings on the Hatfield Campus, which continued until 1930 (O38-1923). 1921 saw the last Year Book written in Dutch (N34-1921) and the Jool (Rag) tradition commenced in 1925 (P43-1925).

The Faculty of Music was established in 1923 (J16-1923).

The following buildings were built in this period: Old Agriculture Building (1921) (L18-1917-1921), Insect Research Building (1920) (L19-1919-1920), College Dining Hall (1921) (L19-1921), Old Agriculture east wing (1923) (L18-1923), Dairy Research Building (1923) (L18-1922-1923), College House Parents House (1924) (L19-1924), Old Mathematics and Physics Building (1924) (L20-1920-1924) and Greenhouses (1929) (L18-1929).

1930-1939

By 1930, the Council realised that some future planning was required for the campus and as such, £150 prize money was offered to an architect to draw a master plan for the campus, inclusive of future buildings. After a few months with no respondents, the request was made again and this time the architect Gordon Leith (who had served at the Department of Public Works from 1902-1908) was awarded the task for the sum of 100 Guineas. This led to the 1930 Master Plan of the campus (M28-1930). A drawing by Leith in the Tukkiana Collection shows Leith was inspired by the Greek Revival University of Virginia of Thomas Jefferson, but in South Africa styled on his contemporary at the Cape and first Architect in South Africa, Louis Thibault’s French Mannerism or French Revolutionary Style. Leith had proposed a number of similar pavilions on the cross-axis of the campus, but only the main axis was built (Artefacts. 2010. ‘University of Pretoria, Hatfield Campus’. Para. 7) (M28-1930).

From 1930, the University grounds were being maintained on goodwill by the Department of Botany (for ornamental planting and new installations), taking over from the Department of Public Works (M33-1932). The maintenance of the sports fields was still poor. The irrigation pipes were too small for effective irrigation and from time to time the Department of Agriculture was approached for advise on fertilising the campus. “Daar was altyd ‘n gebrek aan geld en geen gebrek aan klage nie” (There was always a shortage of money...
In 1936, the B rugby field was ploughed and replanted (M28-1936) with,

Minstens drie pare muile het hulle oad gewerk op
die velde. In 1933 het die Raad £30 beskikbaar
gestel vir die aankoop van 'n nuwe paar en in 1944
weer £60 - misken 'n aanduiding van hoe die prys
van muile in tien jaar getygt het.

(At least 3 pairs of mules were worked hard on
the fields. In 1933 the Council provided £30 for
the purchase of a new pair and again in 1944 £60 –
perhaps an indication of how the price of mules
increased within 10 years. Author’s translation.)

From 1931, Prof Elbrecht planted material on the
western side of the campus, as it was generally not
maintained. These included an Acacia galpinii (Monkey
Thorn, which was struck by lightning in January 2012)
and 8 sheets of the present day NW1 building and an Acacia
sieberiana (Paperbark Thorn) in the Administration
courtyard (M29-1930-1931). The nursery was sited in
the area south west of the Botany building towards the
present day A.E. du Toit Auditorium, with many of the
trees grown being planted on the other surrounding
campuses. To the west of the Old Botany, a classical
symmetrical garden was laid out, with some of the
residue being an Ehretia rigida (Monkey Puzzle Bush)
and Cassonia spp. (Cabbage Tree).

In 1930, the University’s athletics track was not ready
for the scheduled Dalrymplebeker event and was thus
held on the Caledonian track. The track was planned
according to a similar design as that of the University
of Illinois (M28-1925). The Sports Association, under
Prof M.W. Henning, placed continuous pressure on
the Council for the layout of better sports fields even
offering £500 towards the construction of a pavilion,
which never came to be (M30-1930). Instead the funds
were used for the construction of Die Klubsaal (Club
Hall) (L19-1929-1936). In the 1930’s the track was
considered as one of the best in Pretoria however by
1937 when the University was again to be the host of the
Dalrymplebeke, it fell yet again into neglect (M31-
1937). The Council provided £100 for the upgrades and
the event was eventually held on the University’s track.
By 1937, the sporting facilities on the campus consisted
of 2 rugby fields, 1 hockey field, 1 athletics track, 1
softball field, 6 tennis courts, 1 tennis practise wall
(where Theology is today), and a few showers (M31-
1937). By 1939, the rugby fields consisted of A field
(surrounded by the athletics track), B Field (west of A
field) and C field, in “Die Gar” (The Hole), present day
Administration Building. The C field was funded by the
University and the Northern Transvaal Football Union
(M30-1931). In 1939, the Council provided £500 (£250
of which came form the Northern Transvaal Football
Union) for the construction of a new B rugby field west
of the existing field (M28-1939).

Even with the new rugby field completed in 1931, there
was a shortage of fields and as such the University made
use of the surrounding schools’ facilities with reciprocal
agreements. The Northern Transvaal Football Sub
Union provided a yearly sum of money for maintenance
as the fields were also used for league games. Prof
Davel arranged that the University make a yearly sum of
money available from the Intervarsity entry fees, for the
maintenance of the fields.

During the Depression Years, the railway crossing
entrance from Burnett Street dominated discussions.
In 1931, the Railways wished to build a bridge over the
railway lines at the Burnett Street/Park Street entrance.
The University objected to this proposal rather insisting
that the line be excavated deeper or totally removed
for the scheduled test beds for asphalt emulsions research
(M28-1932). The line was excavated deeper and
completely removed at the Burnett Street/Park Street entrance.

In 1930, the University’s athletics track was not ready
for the scheduled Dalrymplebeker event and was thus
held on the Caledonian track. The track was planned
according to a similar design as that of the University
of Illinois (M28-1925). The Sports Association, under
Prof M.W. Henning, placed continuous pressure on
the Council for the layout of better sports fields even
offering £500 towards the construction of a pavilion,
which never came to be (M30-1930). Instead the funds
were used for the construction of Die Klubsaal (Club
Hall) (L19-1929-1936). In the 1930’s the track was
considered as one of the best in Pretoria however by
1937 when the University was again to be the host of the
Dalrymplebeker, it fell yet again into neglect (M31-
1937). The Council provided £100 for the upgrades and
the event was eventually held on the University’s track.
By 1937, the sporting facilities on the campus consisted
of 2 rugby fields, 1 hockey field, 1 athletics track, 1
softball field, 6 tennis courts, 1 tennis practise wall
(where Theology is today), and a few showers (M31-
1937). By 1939, the rugby fields consisted of A field
(surrounded by the athletics track), B Field (west of A
field) and C field, in “Die Gar” (The Hole), present day
Administration Building. The C field was funded by the
University and the Northern Transvaal Football Union
(M30-1931). In 1939, the Council provided £500 (£250
of which came form the Northern Transvaal Football
Union) for the construction of a new B rugby field west
of the existing field (M28-1939).

Even with the new rugby field completed in 1931, there
was a shortage of fields and as such the University made
use of the surrounding schools’ facilities with reciprocal
agreements. The Northern Transvaal Football Sub
Union provided a yearly sum of money for maintenance
as the fields were also used for league games. Prof
Davel arranged that the University make a yearly sum of
money available from the Intervarsity entry fees, for the
maintenance of the fields.

During the Depression Years, the railway crossing
entrance from Burnett Street dominated discussions.
In 1931, the Railways wished to build a bridge over the
railway lines at the Burnett Street/Park Street entrance.
The University objected to this proposal rather insisting
that the line be excavated deeper or totally removed
for the scheduled test beds for asphalt emulsions research
(M28-1932). The line was excavated deeper and
completely removed at the Burnett Street/Park Street entrance.
in 1934 (M29-1933-1934).

The Agriculture Faculty submitted a motion in 1937 in which the campus grounds were described as “betreurenswaardig” (lamentable. Author’s translation). At the Senate and Council it was demanded that a full time qualified person be appointed to set out and maintain the grounds – the first time that there was a felt a need for a qualified individual to care for the landscape. Protesting against the Senate’s “negative attitude” on the matter, a number of lecturers, namely Profs. Henning, Ross, Duminy, Hugo, D E Malan, L C de Villiers, Davel and J C Bosman, submitted a memorandum on 9 April 1937 in which they declared that the grounds were scandalously neglected, that weeds and saplings dominated the grounds, fences had fallen down, weeds grew instead of lawns and planting beds, and that it would be costly to repair the rugby and athletics fields (despite the athletics track being one of the best in Pretoria in the early 1930’s). They pleaded that the grounds be executed and maintained according to a fixed plan and that a competent person be appointed for the execution thereof. Trees and shrubs should be planted to suit the architectural language and those that do not, should be removed. The Council gave in and the grounds keeper was discharged and a superintendent appointed. However, this did not result in much success. Large areas of the unforested parts of the campus were untidy, especially the Roper Street side (Rautenbach et al. 1960:267) (M29-31-1937).

The Botanical Garden was officially established in 1930 under Prof Elbrecht starting with the planting of trees and shrubs around the Administration Building (M29-1930-1931). From 1932, he and his students started the Rock Garden (along the western boundary of the campus) and Generic Karoo Garden (south of Administration Building) (M28-1932-1933). The extention of the Gardens were driven by the construction of the Botany Building in 1936, which housed the Department of Botany (L20-1936-1940). During this time, the campus was being partially maintained by the Department of Botany with most of the new gardens commissioned, being designed and installed by the Department.

With the completion of the Old Agriculture Building, the railway bridge dispute settled, and the Leith master plan approved, the new main entrance to the campus moved to the Old Agriculture axis, which partially fulfilled the vision of DPW’s ‘Town Lands’ plan of 1918 (M31-1931). A number of pavilions on the cross axes were proposed by DPW but only the main axis was built, thus partly following Leith’s plan. The students also started agitating for a student social centre, and to this end started their sourcing of funding from around 1930 (M31-1930).

1932 saw a dramatic change in the University’s structure officially changing to an Afrikaans medium university and the name changing from the Transvaal University College to the University of Pretoria (the name change being accepted on 12 November 1929), and with it the revised University Act (N35-1930 and N36-38-1932). This change ignited a number of nationalist activities and associations forming on the campus formulating a number of traditions, some still in place today, for example Lentedag (Spring Day) formerly Commemoration Day, celebrating the establishment of the University of Pretoria (P43-1932). The years 1936–38 saw the Great Trek Centenary celebrations with numerous activities taking place on the campus, including the handing over of the replica ox-wagon Louis Trichardt to the University on 12 December 1938. The ox-wagon wheel marks embedded in the concrete panel outside the Merensky Library took place on 13 December (M29-1938 & P43-1938). The ox-wagon was handed over to the new Student Representative Council annually until 1950, when the ATKV (Afrikaanse Taal en Kultuur Vereeniging) donated the full ownership of the ox-wagon to the University. Honorary doctorates where issued to J.C. Smuts, Anton van Wouw and Hans Merensky in this period (N35-1930, N35-1936, N36-1939) championing the Afrikaner nationalist cause since the revision of the University’s Act.

On 1 February 1931, Henry Whitby Bateman commenced work at the University, establishing the Technical and Maintenance Services Department of the University. His involvement in the design and implementation of buildings on the campuses, grew significantly (M33-1930). During this period there was a considerable increase in the number of student organisations, groups, publications and activities consequent to nationalist ventures such as the translation of the Bible into Afrikaans (T55-1933) and the Voortrekker Celebrations (R47-1938). This period also showed low student numbers at the University (N34-1931-1936). Access to the campus improved with
the City Council approving the tarring of roads to the east and west of Pretoria (R46-1935). Gerard Moerdyk was instrumental in the legal right for Afrikaans to be used in the documentation of construction documentation (T59-1932).

The Faculty of Education was established in 1937 (J16-1937).

The following buildings were built during this period: Administration Building (1931) (L18-1930-1931), Club Hall (1936) (L19-1929-1936), Merensky Library (1938) (L18-1930-1938), and the Weather Services Building (1939) (L21-1936-1940), Old Botany (1940) (L20-1935-1939) and Moerdyk’s Rondawels (1940) (L18-1940). With the Second World War commencing in September 1939, the development of the University was hindered going into the next decade.

**1940-1949**

The Council notes of 12 March 1940 recommended that the control of the campus grounds lay exclusively with the Rector and that Gerard Moerdyk was tasked with approaching the Pretoria Council for the removal of the Delgoa Bay train line in the eastern suburbs. In August 1940, Gerard Moerdyk prepared a campus site plan. This plan indicated possible future planning besides from the underpinnings of the “graapak” (Aula lawn). It can be interpreted as a snapshot of the campus at the time "Daar bestaan egter 'n plan van die Universiteitsterrein van 1940 deur Moerdyk geteken, waar 'n goeie beeld gee van die sportterrein." (There is a plan of the University campus from 1940 drawn by Moerdyk, giving a good indication of the sports fields. Author’s translation). The Faculty of Education was established in 1937 (J16-1937).

The Faculty of Education was established in 1937 (J16-1937). The Department and Institute for Physical Education were established, and in 1947 recommended that all the sporting facilities were a prerequisite for the effective functioning of the department, especially in the south western corner of the campus (M28-1940). A site committee under the chair of Prof B.V. Lombaard was established, and in 1947 recommended that all the sports fields fall under the control of the Director of the Institute, namely Prof Claude Smit, who was later promoted to the Director (M28-1947). He remained in charge until 1950. From 1940, the head caretaker of the grounds and then later superintendent of the grounds, Doep du Plessis, commenced employment, retiring in 1972 (I15-1940-1960). A formidable and large character, he often instilled fear and respect in his staff and students alike.

The Pretoria Council regarding the site plan. Prof Davel and Moerdyk were instructed to continue with such discussions for the preparation of a site plan for presentation to the University Council. It was also proposed that the road running east of Old Agriculture, in front of Old Arts and Merensky Library to Lynnwood Road (present day Tukkieelaan/Tukkie Avenue) be tarred (M30-1941). Council notes of 19 June 1941 instructed Prof Davel and Moerdyk to continue negotiations with the City Council for the preparation of the site plan, and that £400 was allocated for the tarring of the proposed road (M29-33-1941).

On behalf of the Council, Prof Duval commenced negotiations with the Pretoria Council in late 1941, resulting in an agreement in 1942, in which the Pretoria Council would maintain the University’s roads and sports fields for a yearly fee (in 1945 at a yearly cost £1 800 and 1947 £2 700), and that the University’s gardener would fall under the Pretoria Council’s supervision. The agreement also included the labour force for this maintenance (M28-1945). There was an improvement in the general condition of the landscape during this time but was still not ideal. This agreement remained in place until the end of 1949 after which a University Committee of Control managed the grounds with the Rector as chair, reporting to the Finance and Properties Committee of the University Council. In 1946, the Council established a committee consisting of Prof Davel and Gerhard Moerdyk, to negotiate with the Pretoria Council with regards to the layout of the sport fields, which produced very little results (M29-1946).

The sports fields entered a new era when the Department and Institute for Physical Education were established in 1946 (J16-1946). This required that proper sporting facilities were a prerequisite for the effective functioning of the department, especially in the south western corner of the campus (M28-1940). A site committee under the chair of Prof B.V. Lombard was established, and in 1947 recommended that all the sports fields fall under the control of the Director of the Institute, namely Prof Claude Smit, who was later promoted to the Director (M28-1947). He remained in charge until 1950. From 1940, the head caretaker of the grounds and then later superintendent of the grounds, Doep du Plessis, commenced employment, retiring in 1972 (I15-1940-1960). A formidable and large character, he often instilled fear and respect in his staff and students alike.
The condition of the sports fields was very poor during the war years (1939-1945), with the fields surrounded by the athletics track described as “meer ‘n sandpad as iets anders” (more of a sandpit than anything else. Author’s translation. Rautenbach et al. 1960:425), the two upper rugby fields (fields A and B) were not of a standard size, the lower field (C field) still only half complete, the jokskei fields were being neglected and their orientation was wrong, the hockey field had been out-played and also used for cricket, and the softball field’s orientation was also wrong. In 1946, Prof Smit instigated improvements and recommendations for better grassing and enlarging the rugby fields, a new hockey surface, a new athletics track, new softball and netball fields, new jokskei fields, 12 new tennis courts and seating alongside the athletics track. The athletics track received attention first with tests being conducted to determine the best grit mixture to be used and the track upgraded. The track was inaugurated for the Dalrymple event in May 1948 at a cost of £2 000 (M30-1948). In 1948, a proposal was put forward for the rugby fields to be moved to the Experimental Farm opposite the Doll House, which the Council turned down (M29-1948).

With the assistance of the Department of Surveying, a new contour plan of the fields was surveyed as the previous plan “uit die dae van die Republiek” (from the days of the republic. Author’s translation. Rautenbach et al. 1960:425) was not accurate. This may also be referring to the 1951 topographical survey that was conducted by the surveying students (M28-1951). The Arts 2 Building (Theology) is situated where the tennis practice walls were (L20-1945-1951).

In 1944, the Council approved the sum of £2 500 for the implementation of further tarred roads and the improvement of the lighting on the campus (M29-1944).

In 1936, a morgen (8 567 m²) of ground in the southernmost corner of the campus, was sold off to the Weather Bureau as the University, unwittingly, had no clear idea for planning thereof (M29-1936). A few years later, the Council realised that additional land would be needed for the growth of the University. In 1941, the Council requested Prof M.C. Botha, Gerard Moerdyk and J Postmus, to approach the Pretoria Council for the acquisition of the land between Burnett Street and the railway line (present day PRASA House) (M32-1941). The attempt dissipated in September 1942, but in 1947 a new committee was established after the University again required additional land (M29-1947). In the meantime, the thought of moving the University, or parts thereof, to the Proefplaas (Experimental Farm) was gaining support for a number of reasons. On 27 June 1949, the Council voted in favour of the eventual move of the University to the Experimental Farm. This however seemed to fizzle out in spite of the building programme from 1949 onwards, which was that there was sufficient land available on the Hatfield campus for development (M29-1949). The Weather Bureau land was eventually re-acquired in the 1960’s.

From 1948, under H.W. Bateman, the Technical Services Department started gaining a greater role and input into the planning of new buildings on the campus. Later in 1952, F.W. Meerkoetter took more responsibility for the planning of new buildings and the supervision thereof, as well as the building of specialised apparatus that generally was not available for the University’s academic staff. 1948 also saw the commencement of the first Tuksie rector, Prof C.H. Rautenbach’s 22-year term as rector of the University on 9 April 1948 (H14-1948-1960). Throughout his tenure, a strong relationship...
between the administration of the University and the student body was established. The year 1943 saw the employment of Martin Smuts, firstly as an assistant accountant but later on as Registrar and the Director of Physical Planning in the 1960’s and 1970’s (I15-1943-1960). After the war, the student numbers gradually increased requiring additional facilities and ground for expansion (N35-1945). The National Party came into power in June 1948 resulting in not only the country but the University taking new paths that would have dramatic changes to the institution, for example in the way Universities received funding (N35-1948).

The Faculty of Medicine and School of Architecture and Quantity Surveying was established in 1943 (J16-1943) and the department of Physical Education was established in 1946 (J16-1946).

The following buildings were built during this period: Botany Building (1940) (L20-1936-1940), Chemistry Building (1943) (L18-1942-1943), extensions to Old Mathematics and Physics Building (1943) (L19-1942-1943), Old Mathematics and Physics Building north-west wing (1943) (L19-1947), Physical Education Building (1948) (L18-1946-1948), and Bateman building (1949) (L19-1948-1949).

1950-1960

The planning and supervision of the campus grounds fell under a Committee of Control, which was chaired by the rector Prof Rautenbach. Along with the planning of the new Mathematics and Sciences buildings in 1953, the Building Committee and the campus architect, Prof A L Meiring, began planning for a quadrangle surrounded by future buildings and incorporating the College Residence (L18-1912-1915), Club Hall (L19-1929-1936) and with the Old Arts building (L19-1910-1911) as the set piece, opposite a revised entrance from the west (M29-1950). A problem was identified in the breaking of the symmetry of the space, especially due to the building of the Merensky Library (L18-1929-1936). The building pavilions had in the past been haphazardly placed, following the stylistic desires of the Council or architect. This resulted in an unordered nature in the placement of the buildings and a lack of unity in the architectural style prior to 1950. After 1953, the quadrangle gave some order to the future planning and placing of buildings with the likes of the Engineering 1 (Sandrock, 1975) and Mineral Sciences buildings (L19-1951-1955) at the western entrance. In 1955 it was decided that the older buildings framing the quadrangle, namely College Residence (L18-1912-1915) and its dining hall (L19-1921), and Club Hall (L19-1929-1936), did not complete the new architectural style and were thus given a new plaster and paint finish (M29-1953).

In 1954, a proposal was sent to the Council for rugby fields to be constructed on the Experimental Farm, which were initially denied but later approved by the Building Committee under the chairmanship of Prof Rautenbach (M28-1953-1954). Following on from this, the Pretoria Municipality approved the proposal of the moving of the University to the Experimental Farm in 1958 (M29-1958).

In August and September 1951, the 3rd year land surveying students (W. Bosman, D.J. Viljoen, D.M. Smit, J. van Zyl and M. Wentzel) prepared a

Figure 4.14: Nuwe Pad en Tuinuitleg by Wis- en Nat. Gebou se Lesingsale. 1957. Meiring & Naudé

(New Road and Garden Layout at Mathematics and Natural Sciences Building’s Lecture Halls. Author’s translation.)

Plan showing the proposed courtyard design inspired by the Brazilian landscape architect, Roberto Burle Marx. The design was not implemented. The plan shows the Jacaranda tree avenue on the northern side of College Residence, and the Victoria amazonica water lily pond.

Drawing W-SCAN1688. University of Pretoria: Department Facilities Management Archive
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topographical and contour plan of the campus, which for the first time clearly represented the landscape in form, scale and composition (M28-1951). In 1954 Strauss Brink were appointed to prepare a master plan for the campus (M30-1954) and in 1955 Prof Meiring presented the plan for the quadrangle, taking specific cognisance of the placement of the proposed future student centre which would live out onto the quadrangle. The general master plan, which was approved by Council on 2 November 1956, showed the widening and tarring of internal campus roads, for which work had already commenced that year, with the roads around the quadrangle being completed in 1958 (M28-29-1955). The famous half moon wall and circle in front of the Old Arts Building (L19-1910-1911) was removed and paved. A canon from the Second Anglo Boer War was placed in the centre in line with the flagpole in its place.

The widening of the road running in front of Old Arts (L19-1910-1911) to Lynnwood Road (tikkeriaan) was completed in early 1959 (M29-1959). The new western entrance, named Elandspoort, after the name of the farm on which the campus lies (M28-<1880), with its four white columns was completed in September 1958 with entry/exit roads on either side of the outer columns and a monument plaza between the inner two columns. On the opposing faces of the columns facing the roads four mosaic works were placed: the crest of the ZAR, crest of the T.U.C., crest of the Union of South Africa and crest of the University. The columns were supposed to be completed for the University’s 50th anniversary celebrations 1960, but were completed early to complete the quadrangle (L18-1958).

Prior to 1961, the majority of the landscape maintenance and new installations on the campus were executed by the Botany Department, mainly under the guidance of Albert Berg. In 1961 it was officially declared that the Botany Department would be responsible for new landscape installations and the Botanical Garden on the Hatfield campus. (Planting Science’s Archive letters. Viewed 31 October 2014). It is noted in Ad Destinatum III (Bergl et al. 1996) that the previous two editions of the Ad Destinatum, gave very little if any attention to the Division Terrain and Buildings, thus institutional record keeping of the division’s achievements are few and far between.

In 1956, 12 new tennis courts were constructed on the C rugby field, Die Gat (The Hole) (M28-1956). In 1959, the athletics track and a large portion of the grandstand pavilion were lost to the construction of the Musaion complex (M29-1959). In 1954 a number of unidentified trees (possibly pine trees) were lost due to the construction of the Geography Building (L20-1954-1957 & M31-1954) with Albert Berg of the Department of Botany, designing the Geography courtyard in 1957 (M29-1957). He was also responsible for the new gardens around the extended Administration Building in 1955 (L18-1930-1931 & M30-1955). In 1959, boreholes were drilled to supply irrigation water to the campus (M32-1960).

In the 1950’s the present day Monocotyledon Garden consisted of pathways and a rose garden in the centre with the surrounding areas lawned and two palms planted in the north-west corner (possibly still in place). Later the walkways were removed and an open lawn area with a planted area in the centre consisting of a Dodonea viscosa (Narrow-leaved Sand Olive) as a focus plant (Uit Ons Tuin. No 1. Jaargang 3. Januarie 1987. Manie van der Schijff Botaniese Tuin, Univeirseteit van Pretoria) (M33-1950-1960). During this period and further into the 1960’s Albert Berg of the Department of Botany, was chiefly responsible for the design of the new garden layouts of the Botanical Garden and campus as a whole. This was formally implemented from July 1961 between the University and the Department of Botany, which included the maintenance aspects of the Botanical Garden (Department of Plant Sciences Archives, general correspondence letter, viewed 31 October 2015). Documentation reflects he was credited with designing the Administration Building courtyard and surrounds (L18-1930-193), Building Sciences Building (however a later dated plan by Prof Rolf Botha seems to have overridden this plan, and if implemented as such, was the first work completed on the campus by a landscape architect) (L20-1959-1960), Geography courtyard (L20-1954-1957), and the new Botany courtyard (L23-1958-1959) (M30-1955, M31-1960, M29-1957, M31-1959), The A.E. du Toit Auditorium courtyard (L18-1956-1957), was inspired by the Brazilian landscape architect, Roberto Burle Marx. The plan shows the very characteristic forms of his design style, but makes no indication as to what the proposed plant material or finishes. This plan, drawn up by Meiring & Naude to complement the Brazilian architectural style of the A.E. du Toit Auditorium, was however not implemented (M30-1957).
In 1957, a parking area was completed at the Roper Street entrance to accommodate “1564 cars, scooters, bicycles and motorbikes” due to the increase in traffic volumes to the campus (Skakelblad. Jaargang 4, No 1. Maart 1957:5). On 23 April 1959, Prof Meiring presented a plan (drawing No. 43/W/2) proposing a new gate from Lynnwood Road into the present day Tukkie Avenue. The Building Committee approved this on condition gates be installed, and that between the gates there be a stone wall, and that the gates themselves be made of wood (Boukomitee notule R.1221. pp 4).

In November 1951, Martin Smuts was appointed as the Registrar and Financial Advisor of the University, paving the way for his position of Manager of Finances and Physical Planning for the University. This along with his strong relationship that developed with Brian Sandrock in the 1960’s and 1970’s initiated the development boom of the campus in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s.

In 1954, the University was acknowledged as being the largest university in South Africa with some 4286 students (N34-1954). By 1960 the student numbers stood at 7935 and staff just over 800 (N36-1960).

Afrikaner nationalism grew considerably in this period both on a political and cultural spectrum. The handing over of the ox-wagon Louis Trichardt to the Student Representative Council, resumed on 18 September 1957 in celebration of the 25th anniversary of the University’s adoption of Afrikaans as the official language. In the same year Dr Willem Nicol noted in his speech, 

Ons moet tog uiteindelik een blank volk word, al neem dit nog 'n paar honderd jaar…ons moet mekaar se taal vlot leer praat…ons mekaar se kultuur leer ken en waardeer…dat ons uitgaan en op elke gemeenskaplike terrein ons buurman as ons gelyke ontmoet en met hom hartlik saamwerk aan ons liefelike land die bevelling en op die bou.

(We must eventually be one white nation, even if it takes a few hundred years…we must learn to speak each other’s language fluently…learn and appreciate each other’s culture…that we go out and meet our neighbour as our equal on every community level, and work gladly with him in building our lovely country. Author's translation.)

The Chancellor of the University, Advocate Charles te Water, on introducing the Governor General at the opening of the Aula, notes, 

dit sal ongetwyfeld ‘n belangrike rol in die aktiviteite van die studente en kultuurele van die stad vervul.

(it will undoubtedly play an important role in the activities of the students and cultural life of the city. Author's translation.)


He further made mention of the importance of the campus, saying that, 

die kanselier het op welsprekende wyse uitgewis oor die belangrike plek wat ‘n kampus in die studentelewe inneem en hy het daarop gewys hoe passielik dit is dat hierdie pragtige gebou in die middel van hierdie kampus geplaas is. Hy het gesê dat die kampus die simbool is van die gees en gehalte van ‘n volk se jeug en dat die gebou die kulturele uitbeelding daarvan is.

(The chancellor eloquently elaborated on the important role that a campus has on student life and pointed out how appropriate it is that this beautiful building is placed in the middle of the campus. He said the campus is the symbol of the spirit and quality of a nation’s youth and that this building is the cultural representation thereof. Author's translation.)

whether campus or court, these open spaces by either name, have been defined as the principle grounds between the buildings of a university; or, not inappropriately, in very early English times, as the ground marked out for combat in trial by battle, or described in the Roman ages as the ‘honoris et gloriae campus’, or a wide open space which an orator is permitted to ramble freely ‘licit orator vagary libere’... In our own times these pleasant grounds are designed as a concourse or place of meeting for students, their friends and teachers, where they are enabled to assemble in friendly exchange.


In 1959, the Council approved the motion for the new Agriculture Building to be built on the Experimental Farm along with the first of the men’s residences, and for the planning of a landmark building on the campus to be seen from afar (which in all probability ended up being the inspiration behind Sandrock’s so called ‘tower blocks’) (M30-1959). This was in line with the new vision of purchasing suitable property between the Hatfield and L.C. de Villiers campuses for the expansion of the University (M29-1960). Such actions commenced with the purchase of Pretoria-Oos Laerskool (Pretoria East Primary School) Roosmaryn/Aanhou Wen (Rosmary/Keep on Winning) building in 1954 (M29-1954). This was followed by the purchasing of the properties of the Christian Brothers’ College and the Loreto Convent in the late 1950’s and into the 1960’s (M28-1957-1960).

The biggest driver of development on the campus in this period was the establishment of a Faculty of Engineering in 1956 (J16-1956). It is noted that Prof Rautenbach was informed by J.G. Strydom, the then Minister of Education after whom the subsequent buildings were named, via telephone on 7 December 1955, of the Nationalist Government’s approval for the establishment of the faculty at the University. Development was already under way prior to this notification to serve such programmes but was only intensified as a result thereof. In 1960, Brian Sandrock was awarded the first Master’s Degree in Architecture from the University (N34-1960), paving the way for his appointment as the campus architect and lecturer at the Department of Architecture.

The School of Dentistry was established in 1950 (J16-1950) and the Faculty of Engineering in 1956 (J16-1956).


In 1959, the Council approved the motion for the new Agriculture Building to be built on the Experimental Farm along with the first of the men’s residences, and for the planning of a landmark building on the campus to be seen from afar (which in all probability ended up being the inspiration behind Sandrock’s so called ‘tower blocks’) (M30-1959). This was in line with the new vision of purchasing suitable property between the Hatfield and L.C. de Villiers campuses for the expansion of the University (M29-1960). Such actions commenced with the purchase of Pretoria-Oos Laerskool (Pretoria East Primary School) Roosmaryn/Aanhou Wen (Rosmary/Keep on Winning) building in 1954 (M29-1954). This was followed by the purchasing of the properties of the Christian Brothers’ College and the Loreto Convent in the late 1950’s and into the 1960’s (M28-1957-1960).

The biggest driver of development on the campus in this period was the establishment of a Faculty of Engineering in 1956 (J16-1956). It is noted that Prof Rautenbach was informed by J.G. Strydom, the then Minister of Education after whom the subsequent buildings were named, via telephone on 7 December 1955, of the Nationalist Government’s approval for the establishment of the faculty at the University. Development was already under way prior to this notification to serve such programmes but was only intensified as a result thereof. In 1960, Brian Sandrock was awarded the first Master’s Degree in Architecture from the University (N34-1960), paving the way for his appointment as the campus architect and lecturer at the Department of Architecture.


Figure 4.17: Old Agriculture Building.
Photograph from circa 1959 showing the gardens around the Old Agriculture Building. The mass planting of Canna spp. could have been for the Department of Botany’s purposes. It seems as if the ivy on the building never took hold as on the Old Arts Building. It is also noted that until today, there has been very little substantial planting mass around the building, the main mass being in the courtyard.

Site Plans Narrative Chronology


The influences of Sir Herbert Baker and the Arts and Crafts movement on Eagle, was evident in the original layout of the campus with the first entrance being on the Old Arts axis, which stretched through Pretoria Girls’ High School into Arcadia. No clear date can be assigned to this layout but it is suspected to be circa 1918-1920. There was also a strong focus on the layout of the ‘town commons’ around the Old Agriculture building in the late 1910’s and early 1920’s. It is also reflected that the University did not implement as much of the schemes as the surrounding institutions for example Pretoria Girls’ High School.

Gordon Leith plan 1930.

In 1930, the Council made £150 available for the appointment of an architect by public competition for the master plan of the campus. No interest was received after a few months and thus Gordon Leith was approached with the sum of 100 Guineas for a design. Leith was responsible for the design of the Administration Building, diagonally opposite the Old Agriculture building, in turn leading to a new main entrance to the campus placed on an axis leading into Burnett/Park Streets. Being inspired by the Greek Revival University of Virginia of Thomas Jefferson, Leith styled this master plan on his contemporary at the Cape and first Architect in South Africa, Louis Thibault’s French Mannerism or French Revolutionary Style. He proposed a number of similar pavilions on the cross-axis of the campus, but only this one was built. (Artefacts. 2010. ‘University of Pretoria Main Buildings’. Para. 7) It is interesting to note that the Administration Building’s out of character architecture for the campus never appeared as such on his master plan, the reason unknown.

Gordoon Moeddyk.

This ‘master’ plan drawn up in 1940 was reported to be in the archives of the Department of Public Works around 1964, when Brian Sandrock was compiling the Langtermynbeplanning (Long Term Planning) report for the University. The only copy found of this plan is as it appears in Sandrock’s 1965 report. Little is known of this plan but it is recorded in Ad Destinatum I (Rautenbach et al. 1960) The plan was presented to and approved by the University Council in August 1940, indicating planning per se, except for establishing the idea of the plaza space in front of the Old Arts Building. In essence the plan was a snap shot of the campus at the time.

Public Works plan 1946.

This plan omits all buildings south of the Old Arts Building, namely the Merensky Library, Moeddyk’s Rondawels, Weather Bureau’s Building and all sports fields except for the student tennis courts.

Botanical Garden layout drawings.

These two special drawings are the only records sourced of what the garden’s layout was or could have been prior to the development of the campus in this area.

Survey Plan, 1951.

This plan drawn up by the 3rd year surveying students, is the first drawing of the campus that gives topology, contours and form, and what is reflected in the mapping chronology is an accurately scaled/proportioned site plan.

Meiring Naude

The international/modernism style was a layer added to campus landscape following on from Brazilian influences and negating most of the classical style influences of Cleland and Leith introduced over the previous 50 years. Specific focus was placed on the Old Arts plaza with the Neo Brutalism/Little Brazilian/Cobra styled buildings dominating the campus from the early 1950’s. The classical theme of the Old Agriculture Building and surrounds was retained with the development shift in focus moving further southwards and later eastwards of the campus.
Figure 4.18: General Scheme for the Transvaal University College

Drawn up by the Department of Public Works - Cleland 1910-1921. The drawing indicates the placing and style of possible future buildings, specifically the opposite end of the Old Arts Axis, as well as the tree lined avenues of the internal roads and boundaries.

Transvaal University College Year Book 1921. UP Archives
Figure 4.19: Transvaal University College, Pretoria: Site Plan Showing Drainage.

Undated, estimated circa 1925-1928. Architect noted as J.S. Cleland. Public Works Department, Union of South Africa. Drawing S.D.No818/1. Department of Public Works Archives
Figure 4.20: Map of the campus and Pretoria Boys’ High School 1929

Figure 4.21: Leith Master Plan for the University of Pretoria 1930

UP Archives: Photographic Collection
Figure 4.22: Gerard Moerdyk Master Plan for the University of Pretoria 1940

Figure 4.23: University of Pretoria - Accommodation for Ex-Volunteers, Additional Applied Maths, Physics & Plant Physiology Laboratories. Site Plan Shewing Drainage, Water & Gas Supply. 1946.

Public Works Department, Union of South Africa. Drawing D1752. Department of Public Works Archives.
Figure 5.24: Voorgestelde Plan vir die Plantkunde-tuin U.P.

Undated and unauthored but suspected to be circa 1941 and designed by Prof Elbrecht. University of Pretoria: Plant Sciences Archive.
Figure 4.25: Revised version of the Botanical Garden layout in colour.

Undated and unauthored but suspected to be circa 1941 and designed by Prof Elbrecht. University of Pretoria: Plant Sciences Archive.
Figure 4.26: Section from drawing E.E.8/409/1 Pretoria three Greenhouses (drawn 9 January 1951 and revised 4 August 1953) showing the extent of the execution of the DPW master plan from 1912.

Department of Public Works Archives; Photo Neal Dunstan.
Figure 4.27: Topographical and Contour Survey of the University of Pretoria, drawn up by the third year land surveying students, 1951

First drawing of the campus reflecting the topography of the time. Drawing W-SCAN1801. University of Pretoria: Department of Facilities Management Archive.
Figure 4.28: Gewächshaus-Anlage für die Universiteit van Pretoria Algemene Plantkunde, Pretoria Süd Afrika.1955. Architect Ed Zimmerman, Hamburg, Germany.

© University of Pretoria
Figure 4.29: Meiring Naude Proposed Master Plan for the University of Pretoria 1955.

Drawing W-SCAN1806. University of Pretoria: Department Facilities Management Archive

© University of Pretoria
Figure 4.30: Meiring Naude Master Plan for the University of Pretoria 1956.


© University of Pretoria
Figure 4.31: Stormwater Layout, Universiteit van Pretoria, Terreinplan. Dawson and Fraser(Pty) Ltd Engineers. September 1959.

Drawing W-SCAN 1805. University of Pretoria: Department Facilities Management Archive
Mapping Narrative
Chronology

The following plans are a collection that have been sourced from various records and digitally redrawn to show the development and layers of character of the campus for the study period of 1910 to 1960.
Aerial photography has been used for observation of earth processes and environmental analysis for more than 60 years. It is a technologically advanced form of photography that uses large-lens cameras mounted on either low or high altitude aircraft or orbiting satellites to shoot images of the earth’s surface.

Aerial photographs are also valuable research tools for providing a graphic record of the appearance of a cultural landscape during a particular period. In analysis and evaluation, aerial photographs from known, successive periods can be compared and interpreted to verify and expand on the historical record. (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, Park Historic Structures & Cultural Landscapes. Landscape Lines 5: Graphic Documentation. Undated, pp. 21-22)

The following is a collection of aerial photographs illustrating the development of the campus from 1908 to 1960. The earliest image attained is 1937/38 from the van der Waal Collection at the Merensky Library, University of Pretoria. Original images gained from the South African Air Force archives have also been sourced. From these findings, it was divulged that the Air Force did very little civilian aerial photography during the 1970’s to 1990’s, rather focussing on military installations and any civilian aerial photography conducted was on a consultation/private basis. Prior to this, most aerial photography was conducted by the Air Force on a regular basis.

All aerial photographs have been scaled and centred to be approximately of a similar scale and placement throughout.
Figure 4.32: 1937/1938.

Figure 4.33: June 1939
Figure 4.34: August 1939. 147 013 26600. University of Pretoria: Merensky Library, van der Waal Collection.
Figure 4.35: February 1948.

Figure 4.36: 1949 (C535 Pretoria east 17 October 1949)

SAAF Museum and Archives

© University of Pretoria
Figure 4.37: 1954

Strip S no 117; 1650; 114, 12. University of Pretoria: Merensky Library, van der Waal Collection.
Figure 4.38: 1957.
Figure 4.39: 1961/1962.

C1189 A.E.1186 no205 9337 152,83. SAAF Museum and Archives.
Figure 4.40: Hatfield Campus 2015-06-26.

Photographic Narrative Chronology

Contemporary and historical photographs and slides are used in preparing a CLR. Photographs are graphic documents used to:

• document a landscape at a particular time
• analyse and evaluate the chronological development of a landscape

Photography is a rapid technique for graphically documenting a cultural landscape. Black and white photographs are used to illustrate the appearance of a cultural landscape over time, to update the graphic documentation of a landscape, and to record treatment activities in the landscape.

Because photographs can capture fine textures and realistic contexts, photographs have an advantage over line drawings in conveying an experimental understanding of a landscape. However, photographs also have the potential to portray a landscape with greater subjectivity than line drawings. Without clear understanding of the primary intent of a photograph, the subjectivity in the process of taking the photograph may lead to inaccurate, misleading, or unrepresentational photographs.

The value of photographic documentation depends largely on how well informed the photographer is about the subject and purpose of the project. Additionally, photographic documentation is made more meaningful if the photographer keeps an accurate record of subject, location, and vantage points. Photographs used in a CLR should have captions and both should be included in the park archives.

Black and white photography (small, medium, or large format) is the most durable medium for photographic documentation in a CLR. Colour film is less stable photochemically over time. Due to the visual limitation of black and white images, colour slides are often taken to supplement the data provided by black and white photographs. (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, Park Historic Structures & Cultural Landscapes. Landscape Lines 5: Graphic Documentation. Undated. pp. 13-18)

A photograph can be an instant of life captured for eternity that will never cease looking back at you.

Bridgitte Bardot

The following is a collection of sourced oblique aerial photographs, eye level site photographs and detailed site images of the period 1908 to 1960. Not all images could be accurately ‘repeated’ due to new structures, infrastructure and vegetation. Certain important cultural landscape elements that have not been previously photographed or for which no photographs could be sourced, have been included in this section for the relevance to the study.
Figure 4.41: Campus 1929

View looking north west with Christian Brothers’ College (CBC) and Loreto Convent in the foreground. Note the number and extent of the trees and hedges internally and externally to the campus, most of which have since all been lost. The main entrance road from Old Agriculture Building leading into Park Street is visible. The south eastern side of the campus seems very disturbed, possibly storage or dumping ground.

UP Archives Photographic Collection.
Figure 4.42: Lentedag 1925(?)

Procession exiting from the Old Agriculture main entrance gate onto Burnet/Park Street. The pedestrian gate and stone column no longer exists. Note that no signage is present in contrast to Figure 5.72 and the front cover of this thesis. After 15 years(?), very little vegetation or landscaping is visible for this area of the campus.

UP Archives Photographic Collection

Figure 4.43: Aerial view looking south onto campus and surrounds down Hill Street, circa 1944

The tree avenues are now well established, especially around the athletics track and the Old Arts Axis. The Acacia sieberiana (Paperbark Thorn) at Administration is visible.

University of Pretoria: Merensky Library, van der Waal Collection.
Figure 4.44: Aerial photo of campus looking east along Old Arts axis

View clearly shows the tennis courts, jukkei court, athletics track and rugby field, and double tree lined avenue of the Old Arts Axis, circa 1952. A terraced pavilion is visible at Club Hall looking onto the tennis courts.

UP Archives Photographic Collection

Figure 4.45: Aerial photo of campus looking north-west

Old Arts Axis avenue of trees is visibly carrying through into Pretoria Girls’ High’s grounds, circa 1952.

UP Archives Photographic Collection

Figure 4.46: Aerial photo of campus looking east along Old Arts axis

Note the loss of trees with the construction of Mineral Sciences including the double lined avenue trees of the Old Arts Axis, circa 1954. The extend of the Cyperus and Jacaranda lined avenue north of College Residence is visible. The formal landscape in front of the Merensky Library is visible.

UP Archives Photographic Collection
Figure 4.47: Aerial photo of campus looking south

The Aloe/rockery garden at Administration is clearly visible behind the Administration Building. The present day Monocotyledon Garden shows a formal layout, circa 1954.

UP Archives Photographic Collection.

Figure 4.48: Aerial photo of campus looking east

The weakening of the Old Arts Axis avenue of trees is becoming more pronounced, especially with the Aula and Engineering II now complete. The central axis road has now been replaced with two new roads on either side of the axis. The Old Agriculture entrance and axis is still the dominant entry point into the campus at this stage, circa 1959. The Jacaranda and Cyperus avenue north of College Residence is also showing signs of being thinned out due to new buildings. The north-south tree lined avenue is too showing signs of thinning especially around Club Hall. The athletics track pavilion is very clearly visible with a hedge following the track profile to the south.

University of Pretoria: Merensky Library, van der Waal Collection.
The thinning out of the Old Arts tree avenue due to the drought (1960-1966) is evident. Some of the sports fields have now been lost to new buildings (Musaton) with the tennis courts in ‘Die Gat’ (present day Administration Building) visible. The greenhouse in the foreground sits in a rather barren open space on the campus while another greenhouse is nestled between the Old Agriculture Building and the Dairy Building.

December 1961.

Figure 4.50: Aerial view of the University of Pretoria

The formal garden design with clipped hedges and sloped terraces is starting to take shape in front of the Merensky Library. The ox wagon memorial is barely visible. It can be deduced from this photograph that the formal landscape came after the Great Trek Centenary celebrations of 1936.

University of Pretoria: Merensky Library, van der Waal Collection.

© University of Pretoria
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The now lost succulent and Aloe Garden along the western boundary. The original extent of the rockery was thought to be running from Burnett to the Old Arts axis. This image shows the Old Arts building in the background and must have extended further south along the western boundary.


Figure 4.51: Sukkulente - Tuinafdeling, Departement van Plantkunde.
(Succulents - Garden Division, Department of Botany. Author’s translation.)

Figure 4.52: The Club Hall building circa 1935/1936
The untidy sparseness of the campus is evident.
Universiteit van Pretoria Jaarboek 1937. Pp. xi. UP Archives
Figure 4.53: Aerial view of the campus 1953.

The double tree avenues are now fully established along the Old Arts and Tukkelaan axes. The various sports fields are clearly visible here.

UP Archives Photographic Collection.

Figure 4.54: Construction of the new Mathematics and Sciences 3 Building circa 1953/54

Photo shows the beginnings of the loss of the original double tree lined axis of Old Arts. The tree avenue on the northern side of College Residence is well established.

Figure 4.55: View of the Hatfield Campus looking east circa 1959.

With the completion of the Aula, Mineral Sciences and Engineering 2, the double tree avenue of the Old Arts axis has now been depleted to just a few remaining trees, prior to the onset of the drought from 1960 to 1966. The continuation of the avenue into Pretoria Girls’ High School is however still intact. The rock/Karoo Garden is clear in this image alongside the Botany Building.


Figure 4.56: First official Rag procession exiting Old Agriculture axis 1931

Note the avenue planting following the axis, the dairy and the greenhouse. The formal layout and pruning of the trees suggest these to be fruit/crop trees. The pruned roses suggest that these were used for practical purposes.

Figure 4.57: Old Arts Building circa 1915.

A postcard photograph depicting the campus circa 1915. The described veld and rocky nature of the campus is visible here. The fence to keep the donkeys and other grazers from entering the campus is also visible. The road in the foreground is the suspected track that lead from Sunnyside to Captain Struben’s farm, present day Experimental Farm and Lynnwood.


Figure 4.58: Universiteit van Pretoria Boukundebou.

(University of Pretoria: Building Sciences Building. Author’s translation.)

Possibly the first plan drawn up by a professional landscape architect for the University, by Roelf Botha, November 1960. Earlier in the year Albert Berg also drew up a proposal for the new Boukunde Building, but it is not clear as to which of these proposals was implemented, if at all.

Residue by Repeat Photography

Repeat photography is the technique of locating the site of a dated, historic photograph, reoccupying the original camera position, and shooting a contemporary photograph of the landscape, landscape characteristics and associated features from the same vantage point. Preferably the photographer uses the same focal length camera lens and shoots the photo at the same time of day as the original photograph. This provides the best conditions for comparing the contemporary and historic photographs.

Repeat photographs can be used to interpret the nature, rate, and direction of change in a cultural landscape, to evaluate the cause(s) of perceived change, and to establish new photographic records for future analysis of change. (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, Park Historic Structures & Cultural Landscapes. Landscape Lines 5: Graphic Documentation. Undated.)

All photographs taken by the author make use of the same camera with no filters and minimal software editing.

re.sid.ual

adj.
1. Of, relating to, or characteristic of a residue.
2. Remaining as a residue.

n.
1. The quantity left over at the end of a process; a remainder.
2. often residuals A payment made to a performer, writer, or director for each repeat showing of a recorded television show or commercial.
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Figure 4.60: Old Arts axis looking east, circa 1918.

The ‘ivy league’ quality of the University commences with the ivy establishing itself on the building. The formal edging of the axis road and planting has commenced. The high concentration of shrubs in the planting, which have been lost over time, noticeable.

Transvaal University College Yearbook 1919 UP Archives

Figure 4.59: Old Arts axis 1911

The axis lines up with the last set of steps at the bottom of the terraced gardens of the Union Buildings. Speculation is that this was intentional and/or as a result of the influence of Sir Herbert Baker on the architects within the Department of Public Works at the time. The axis does line up with the intersection of Park and Eastwood and that of Pretoria Girl’s High main school building, the latter designed by the Department of Public Works along with the Department of Agriculture Building (old Agriculture Building) as part of a ‘Town Commons’ from the Rissik Street (now Hatfield) train station. See Figure 5-21.

UP Archives Photographic Collection
Figure 4.61: Old Arts Building axis 1930.

The planting on either side of the axis road have now been removed and replaced with lawn. The ivy has now taken over a large proportion of the Old Arts Building. The defined edge between lawn and road has been weakened.

UP Archives Photographic Collection.

Figure 4.62: Old Arts axis 1941.

Fir/Pine trees have now been planted in the Old Arts quad whilst shrubs have returned and lawn has been removed. The edges are stronger if not well defined still.

UP Archives - Heydenrich Collection.
Figure 4.63: Old Arts axis during a medical congress 1955.

The shrubs have again been removed and replaced with lawn surrounded by a formal clipped hedge. At this time it can be seen how the internal campus roads are now used for parking purposes. The Fir/Pine trees at the Old Arts are no longer in existence.


Figure 4.64: Old Arts axis circa 1959/60.

The central road axis has been removed, now flanking either side of the newly established lawned plaza space, terminating in a planting bed of Canna species, at the Old Arts Building. The ivy on the Old Arts Building is now well established, yet is noted that it did not take hold on the southern wing of the building.

The view line to the Union Buildings has been blocked with the construction of Engineering 1 tower, following on Prof John Fassler's (WITS University) recommendations in 1965. The central road to the axis was removed in 1956 with the roads moving to the outer edge of the 'new' lawned plaza space. The great drought of the early 1960's resulted in a number of the Pine trees dying, being replaced firstly with Yellowwood (Podocarpus spp.) trees, which did not fare well, and then the current Acacia galpinii (Monkey Thorn) trees. The present day water feature was designed by landscape architect Karen Botha in 1990/1991, following on from the refurbishment and maintenance work done on the Old Arts Building, which resulted in the removal of the ivy from its walls.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
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Two iconic elements of the University that have been lost in time namely the ivy clad Old Arts Building, and the ox-wagon. The ivy was removed in the mid 1980’s due to the damage it was causing to the sandstone structure. The ox-wagon was relocated to various locations on the campus but finally returned to the ATKV’s resort at Hartenbosch. The space no longer holds a softer character with the removal of all the vegetation, resulting in a very barren, hard and hot environment.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.

Figure 4.66: Old Arts entrance with the ceremonial ox-wagon ‘Louis Trichardt’.


Figure 4.67: Old Arts entrance.

Two iconic elements of the University that have been lost in time namely the ivy clad Old Arts Building, and the ox-wagon. The ivy was removed in the mid 1980’s due to the damage it was causing to the sandstone structure. The ox-wagon was relocated to various locations on the campus but finally returned to the ATKV’s resort at Hartenbosch. The space no longer holds a softer character with the removal of all the vegetation, resulting in a very barren, hard and hot environment.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
Figure 4.68: Lente Dag 1958(?)

(Spring day 1958?)

Photo taken from Old Arts balcony looking west down the axis showing the breaking up of the tree avenue, specifically around the Aula building. The Elandspoort columns are visible in the background and beyond into Pretoria Girls' High School with the vista terminating in Park Street. The slate paving reflected in the photo has since then been replaced with concrete pavers along with all plant material, except the lawn.

UP Archives Photographic Collection 6-26A.
The pond and associated planting were completed in 1990/91 (designed by Karen Botha) now cutting off the plaza space from the lawn area. The antelope sculpture donated by Anton and Hubert Rupert was originally positioned in a planter in front of Club Hall, the plinth of which is still present. The Pine trees have been replaced, firstly and unsuccessfully with Yellowwood’s in the early to mid 1960’s then the present day Acacia galpinii (Monkey Thorn). In 2008, the planters around these trees was completed for the University’s centenary celebrations. The view through Elandspoort into Pretoria Girl’s High and the city has been blocked off with the construction of Engineering I.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
Figure 4.70: Old College, 1925.

It is interesting to note, that despite the folklore, there are no fig trees visible in this image, but instead palm trees, probably to ‘match’ those planted at Club Hall. The southern side of the building does show signs of a creeper on the building.

UP Archives Photographic Collection.

Figure 4.71: Old College, 2015.

The palms have fallen away and made way for Ficus tree species some time in the early 1960’s. A donated collection of specially bred Clivia species, donated by the family of Dr Daniel Johannes van Vuuren, and formal-type planting has been planted lately, attempting to define the building’s entrance.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
Presently, the view onto the facade and building itself is obscured by the Aula (1958) and its extensions completed in 2013. Vegetation has also partly obscured the building, but does provide respite from the harsh western sun.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
Figure 4-75: Old Agriculture Building, 2015.

The hedge around the greenhouse on the northern side has been lost but the Ginkgo biloba (Maidenhair Tree) trees have been planted on the western side. The northern tree is a female fruit producing tree, of which the Food Sciences students are now making use of in their meals. The ring road now traverses on the western and northern side of the building, that was the greenhouse and dairy. The main axis, and previous main entrance, has fallen away as a road and become a pedestrian ‘boulevard’ forming part of the Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden. The Technical Services/Facilities Management building sits on the site of the dairy.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
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Figure 4-77: Old Agriculture cycad.

Planted in 1921 as a seedling, the Modjadji cycad (Encephalartos transvenosus) has now matured into a very large specimen and now forms the central feature to the internal courtyard to the Old Agriculture Building. The cycad was presented to the University by Queen Modjadji herself, which is believed to be the impetus for the establishment of the botanical garden on the campus.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.

Figure 4-76: Erythrina latissima at Natural Sciences 1.

One of the unique trees on the campus part of the Botanical garden collection, the Broad-leaved Coral Tree, occurring naturally along the eastern coast of South Africa. This tree was planted around the time of NW1 being constructed and is partially a replacement of the avenue of trees removed for the building. On a visit to the Botanical garden in 2014, the then curator of the Kirstenbosch Botanical Garden, Ernst van Jaarsveld, commented that this is one the largest specimens of this species he knows of.

Figure 4-78: Tukkie laan, circa 1965.

A strong vista to Lynnwood Road and the then Fuel Research Institute (present day South Campus) was present. The formal terraced landscaped in front of Old Merensky Library is just visible to the left of the image.

UP Archives Photographic Collection.

Figure 4-79: Tukkie laan, 2015.

The road has now been replaced with a pedestrian walkway with three rows of trees instead of two. The width of the walkway has been roughly maintained. The Pine trees have been replaced with Celtis hybrid species, Jacaranda, Combretum spp. and Praxinus spp. trees. Over time, artworks have been added to the avenue. Entrance definition to the buildings has been lost somewhat due to the redevelopment over time.
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Figure 4.80: Old Agriculture axis entrance circa 1955.

Photograph description is “Nicola Kies ‘n Beroep: Die Hek is oop en die pad lê soom voor die voete van Nicola, die nuweling. Sy kan kies en sy kan keur - wat gaan gebeur? En Nicola het gekies, sommer daardie eerste dag nog: sy het student geword in die Department Huishoudkunde en Dieetkunde. Ons het haar hier en daar afgeloer.”

(Nicola Chooses a Career: The gate is open and the road lies clean before Nicola’s feet, the newcomer. She can select and choose - what will happen? And Nicola has chosen, even just that first day: she became a student in the Department of Home Economics and Dietary Sciences. We peeped at her here and there. Author’s translation.)


Figure 4-81: Current state of the Old Agriculture entrance.

The original wooden gates’ location is unknown. The white name panels are undocumented and their whereabouts unknown. The stonework columns and walls are still present yet hidden behind the new security fence line and thus obscured from view. The pedestrian gate column (to the left in this image) has since been removed. The narrower axis now forms part of the Manie van der Schiff Botanical Garden ‘Boulevard’ and the vegetation has partially obscured the view line that was originally created.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
Residual of the main entrance gates consisting of the stonework walls which held the gates and markings in the paving (unknown as to what). The fence and vegetation (Botanical Garden) has since obscured these walls. The view up the axis to the building entrance has also been obscured by vegetation on the side and in the boulevard itself.

Figure 4-84: Administration Building circa 1956.

The floating effect of the building is clearly visible here along with the ‘dark’ columns. The turning circle in front of Old Agriculture Building cuts very closely to the corner of the Administration Building. The Acacia sieberiana var woodii, is fairly large in this image suggesting that it was planted prior to the building.


Figure 4-85: Mathematics Building.

The access road is now the Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden ‘Boulevard’. The turning circle has since fallen away along with the mass of Canna’s planted in it. These now reside in the Monocotyledon Garden. The Acacia sieberiana sub woodii (Paperbark Thorn) planted by Prof Albrecht, can clearly be seen in the courtyard to the left of the image. Plans indicate that the gardens around the building were designed by Albert Berg of the Botany Department, 1955/1956. Vegetation has since hidden the floating nature of the architecture which is only clearly visible at the entrances.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
Figure 4-86: View of Administration Building from Old Agriculture Building looking south west.

Photo is of the student body singing happy birthday to the rector, Prof Rautenbach, in 1957.


Figure 4-87: Current state of the Botanical Garden surrounding the Mathematics Building.

Note that the Olea europaea subsp Africana (Wild Olive) south of building and Searsia lancea (Karee) opposite the building, are still present from the 1957 photo. The formal planting for entrance definition has been lost over time, whilst the lawned space in front of the building has been converted to the Monocotyledon Garden of the Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden. The road alignment and extend have not changed much during this time.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
The pond, and further in from it, the rockery/Karoo garden, have been replaced with parking to serve the Administration Building. The water lilies were unsuccessfully relocated to the ‘Feetjiedam’ (Fairy Pond) in the Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden. The aloes and succulents in the rockery/Karoo garden were relocated to behind the Engineering Machine Laboratories, then again in 2010 with the new Engineering 3 entrance, to between Boukunde and the Visual Arts Buildings. What little of this material remains, has again been lifted and relocated with the new Javett Art Centre project.

Albert Berg of the Botany Department with a group of parents and grand parents on ‘Besoekersdag’ (Visitor’s Day) 13 February 1962, showing the pond in which the tropical giant water lily, Victoria regia, was grown.


The pond, and further in from it, the rockery/Karoo garden, have been replaced with parking to serve the Administration Building. The water lilies were unsuccessfully relocated to the ‘Feetjiedam’ (Fairy Pond) in the Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden. The aloes and succulents in the rockery/Karoo garden were relocated to behind the Engineering Machine Laboratories, then again in 2010 with the new Engineering 3 entrance, to between Boukunde and the Visual Arts Buildings. What little of this material remains, has again been lifted and relocated with the new Javett Art Centre project.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
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Figure 4-91: Monocotyledon Garden of the Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden.

The majority of the avenue trees have been lost to the Natural Sciences 1 building. The last few Jacaranda and Cyperus trees can be seen in the background along with the construction of the Geography Building. The palm trees are not yet visible in what will be the Monocotyledon Garden, however the rose bed is.


Figure 4-90: View of garden south of Old Agriculture Building and west of Chemistry Building.

Graduation photo taken circa December 1956. The avenue planting of Pine trees, and the Jacaranda and Cyperus trees can be seen in the background along with the construction of the Geography Building. The palm trees are not yet visible in what will be the Monocotyledon Garden, however the rose bed is.


Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.

© University of Pretoria
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Figure 4-93: Sports fields.

The sports fields, consisting of the rugby fields, hockey field and athletics track, with Club Hall in the background circa 1956. The area is now taken over by the Aula, Musaion, Amphitheatre and Engineering 3. The vegetation in front of Club Hall is now mature. The double avenue of Pine trees seems to be thinning out already.


Figure 4-92: The Aloe and Rockery Garden of the Department of Botany.

Unknown exactly where this photo is taken but the rockery ran along the western length of the campus boundary from Burnett past the Old Arts axis and entrance, and then the area south of Administration, now the Mathematics parking area, known as the Karoo Garden. A large proportion of the succulent plants in this collection as a result of a donation from the South African Succulent Society in 1932/33. The continuous moving and transplanting has resulted in this collection being a shadow of its glory days.
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Figure 4-95 and 4-96: Cyperus avenue, A.E. du Toit and Accelerator

The residual of the Cyprus avenue running north of the van der Graaff Accelerator and the A.E. du Toit Auditorium. North of this avenue is the Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden's Herb Garden. These two avenues of trees formed the boundary between the properties of the University (the then Transvaal University College) and the Department of Agriculture. They have slowly been lost due to development on the campus.


Figure 4-94: Jacaranda avenue south of Old Administration/ Mathematics Building.

The residual of the Jacaranda avenue north of Natural Sciences I. Three of these trees were removed in 2014 with only two remaining.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.
Figure 4.97: Merensky Library entrance formal gardens, circa 1940.

The ceremonial ox-wagon wheel tracks from the Great Trek Centenary celebrations (1938) in the concrete panel is centred in this image (right of the small tree before the steps). The formal garden layout of the garden is in its infancy but is complementary to the Merensky Library.

1951. Universiteit van Pretoria. UP Archives.

Figure 4.98: Merensky 1 Library.

Date unknown, suspected circa 1956/7 with the formal gardens now well established. The square geometry of the entrance has been replaced with bell-mouth kerbing, compromising the formal design somewhat.

UP Archives Photographic Collection.
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Figure 4.99: Merensky 1 Library.

The formal layout of the gardens have been lost and replaced with non-contextual sculptures and artwork. A diagonal walkway now bisects the space turning it into an ill defined movement space with no character or relationship to the Merensky Library. The Tukkelaan avenue of trees have been planted since as well. The space is framed with large and prolific flowering Jacaranda trees, perhaps some of the best on the campus, but these too are being lost to age and disease. They are being replaced with out of character and scale Combretum erythrophyllum trees. It is rumoured that the Bougainvillea planted in the planters on the steps to the Merensky Library entrance, are a special hybrid developed by the Department of Botany for this building. This has not yet been confirmed.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.

Figure 4.100: The Pavilion

The athletics pavilion that stretched on the eastern side of the track has been broken into a small residual now looking onto a space created by the Musaion complex. Still well used, the structure is however degrading. It is the only landscape element on the campus that has received recognition with a signage element next to the steps leading into the Musaion music rooms. The water feature is a strong focal element in the space. The spacial edges are poorly defined and do not unify the space.
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Figure 4-101: Ceremonial ox-wagon casting.

The freshly cast ox-wagon wheel tracks, footprints and signatures of the ceremonial celebrations of the Voortrekker Centenary, 1938.

UP Archives Photographic Collection.

Figure 4-102: Ceremonial ox-wagon casting

The ceremonial ox-wagon trail is still present if not lost in the space now as the formal garden layout celebrated their existence. The oddly placed plinth alongside the casting cannot be explained. The foundations of this casting are mirrored on the opposite side of the walkway but nothing purposeful has come from it.
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Figure 4-104: Elandspoort Entrance.

The columns remain but the entrance is no longer a vehicular entrance, but rather a pedestrian entrance with a 'kiss-and-drop' around the columns themselves. The space west of Engineering 1 is now dominated by the Rain Harvesting Garden around the Mining Industry Study Centre within the Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden. The view line and vista into Pretoria Girls' High is no longer. The space has become very barren over time with the removal of most of the trees since the 1960's.

Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.

Figure 4-103: Elandspoort Entrance and Columns, circa 1959/60.

The start of the removal of the double avenue of Pine trees is visible. The Baker design style of light coloured structures and dark background vegetation may have accidentally occurred here. It may be argued that the scale of the trees and the Elandspoort Gate Columns were in conflict. The formality of a vehicular entrance has now been achieved.

The vehicular entrance has been replaced with the new Mining Industry Study Centre and Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden’s Rain Harvesting Garden. The axial view under Engineering I westwards no longer exists but the axial view towards the Old Arts Building has become more focused from within the Study Centre. The columns now fall outside the security line fence and are surrounded by a ‘kiss-and-drop’ vehicular traffic system. The space has become considerably softer than its previous barren, hard and hot landscape setting.

*Photo: Neal Dunstan. September 2015.*
Chapter 5: Statement of Significance and Conclusion

In our own times these pleasant grounds are designed as a concourse or place of meeting for students, their friends and teachers, where they are enabled to assemble in friendly exchange.

Introduction

O’Donnell (2008) notes that research and scholarship are critical links in the preservation process. The search for archival data, field reviews, and narratives capturing place are the vehicles for a shared understanding of the landscape. The cultural landscape and preservation research field is growing based upon the 30 odd years of contribution from a variety of disciplines. “We move on to discover and communicate more about landscapes of the past, present and future, valued places that offer knowledge and roots in an increasingly global culture” (O’Donnell, 2008:14). Such a professional fields and research in South Africa are in their infancy and all contributions are valuable to grow an understanding of the rich cultural landscapes of our multicultural society. When looking at South African university campuses, this thesis is pioneering work in attempting to understand what and how the cultural landscape is, and its significant value it holds to future generations.

Conclusions on the Research Questions

The research questions posed earlier in this thesis (Chapter 3: Research Strategy, pp 25) are:

1. What residue does the Hatfield campus hold in its landscape?
2. What residue, if any, can be classified as a cultural landscape on the Hatfield campus?
3. Is there anything of value (to a group, individual, community, culture, aesthetic, national and/or local heritage, uniqueness) in the cultural landscape of the Hatfield campus?
4. If so, is it worth preserving?
5. Is there a reason as to why there is so little data in the repository on the campus landscape and development?
The conclusions drawn to each of these questions posed is as follows:

1. There is a limited amount of (substantial) residue left on the campus with the largest concentration thereof being of a botanical quality lying within the Botanical Garden. This is most probably because the area lies within the jurisdiction of a Faculty which uses the contents thereof for teaching and practical purposes, and not within Facilities Management. What residue that remains elsewhere on the campus, is in small isolated pockets that are under severe pressure due to development on the campus and a lack of knowledge and/or understanding of the value and significance that it holds for the campus. The largest of these, which does hold significant value, is the Aula lawn. A large proportion of the cultural landscape has been lost due to development, specifically new buildings, or has been re-developed in some way to the extent that the significance and value has been lost e.g. Tukkielaan/Tukkie Avenue and the Old Agriculture Axis. Some of these elements e.g. the ox-wagon tracks, have lost significance and been allowed to disappear into the campus landscapes. Some, the likes of the old pavilion at Musaion, are intensively used, but being allowed to fall into a state of disrepair, possibly as there is no clear understanding of how to deal with such elements.

2. If one follows the notion that man in any way manipulates any ‘wild’ piece of the environment, the ensuing landscape is cultural, then campus is a cultural landscape. This study does not determine what classification of cultural landscape this could or should be, but rather identifies that such landscapes do exist on the campus. If one is to determine this according to South African legislation, namely the National Heritage Resources Act, No. 25 of 1999, then a slightly more definitive grading can be assigned to the cultural landscape of the campus. This is addressed in the Statement of Significance.

3. Yes, albeit heavily weighted towards the Afrikaner nationalist agenda of the time, and the Botanical Garden.

4. All cultural aspects of society in South Africa are in need of some preservation of sorts. South Africa as a less complex society than typical western societies, experiences landscape “through multiple senses: oral recollections, storytelling, touch, olfactory exploration and social experience (Muller. 2012:13). It is not common practice to document the landscape for future generations and other cultures to interpret and/or understand. Due to the political history of the country, the largely Afrikaner dominated cultural aspects present within this cultural landscape may be seen as politically incorrect and as such ignored. Yet if the South African society is to truly become multicultural and accepting, then all cultural aspects of the landscape and society need to be acknowledged, celebrated, preserved, no matter what strength the significance or value of such artefacts may be. This is especially the case on the Hatfield campus when it comes to the intangible elements of the cultural landscape, which are poorly understood and the knowledge is being lost as the individuals who hold this knowledge thereof is being lost. It is the opinion of the author that there are significant tangible elements on the campus that deserve preservation but more still needs to be found and understood of the intangible elements in order to gain a clearer understanding of the true value of the campus’s cultural landscape status.

5. There is no clear answer to this but it can be deduced that a combination of a lack of funding, a low profile status and lack of commitment may have been driving forces behind this. There could have been a factor of lack of interest or identified importance to the documentation of the campus’s (intangible) development, rather focussing on the physical (tangible) elements i.e. architecture, which became the symbols of Afrikaner nationalism, specifically when the Nationalistic government came into power.

The Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) Part 1: Site History, Existing Conditions, Analysis and Evaluation, is a suitable model to be used for the collection, cataloguing, recording, describing, analysis and writing up of the cultural landscape, especially for the South African environment with its various and yet to be
classified, potential cultural landscapes. With regards to the University of Pretoria’s Hatfield Campus attaining a cultural landscape status, there are elements and areas that have the potential for such a status e.g. certain trees/plant species in the Manie van der Schijff Botanical Garden (in 2015 two trees were identified as having potential South African Champion tree status, the conclusion of which is still awaiting official response), the ox-wagon tracks at Merensky 1, the Old Arts and Old Agriculture axes, and various tree avenues.

Relation to Theory

As this is still a relatively new field in the various multidisciplinary fields, there is still no concise and agreed upon interaction of what cultural landscapes are. However, the two continuous traits noted in the various disciplines are man and his interaction with nature by the shaping thereof to meet some need(s) associated with a cultural practice of a community of people.

Theory on the concept of cultural landscapes is diverse due to its relationships with a number of inter-related professions of the built environment, natural sciences and social sciences. As such there is no accepted standard and even definition with regards to the theoretical foundations to the concept. The only accepted elements that are included in the diverse theories is that of the wilderness being manipulated by man to form a landscape. Important to note is that cultural landscapes are very much cultural and environmentally dependent and thus often cannot be compared with each other. Cultural landscapes must thus be seen as vernacular developments of the culture and the landscape that both are associated with.

Statement of Significance

This study shows that the University of Pretoria’s Hatfield Campus does have a cultural landscape that has been developed primarily for the advancement of Afrikaner Nationalism but founded on colonial structures and rule at the time. Many of these elements in this cultural landscape are under threat from the rapid pace of development that is taking place on the campus. The focus of the University structures is the preservation/refurbishment of existing buildings and not the landscape, as these are considered to be of heritage and cultural value. The landscape is also threatened by the need for transformation of the University and thus the removal of artefacts associated with past dispensations. There too is a very poor understanding and lack of knowledge of the campus’s landscape, its significance and its value to the city and the University.

In relation to the SAHRA section 3 sub section (3), the following significance can be drawn out from the study on a point-by-point basis of the heritage considerations listed in the Act for a national estate:

(a) its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa’s history

Medium to high at national level as it has historical associations with the Institution, its personalities and their activities

(b) its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage

Medium at a national level, specifically with the botanical collection which includes a number of rare, endangered and newly described plant species, and historical associations with the Institution and their activities
To contribute to an understanding of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage

Limited medium at a national level, as the architecture took precedence but within its urban context fabric of the city with little or no original intrinsic landscape architectural quality remaining.

(d) its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa’s natural or cultural places or objects

Low to medium at a national level, as the residual of the Baker-colonial design style overlaid with Afrikaner Nationalism remains in places.

(e) its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group

Low at a national level

(f) its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period

None

(g) its strong or special association with particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons

Medium at national level as it has historical associations with the Institution, its personalities and their activities.

(h) its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa

Medium at a national level as it has historical associations with the Institution, its personalities and their activities.

(i) sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa

Not applicable

The statement of significance is drawn up from a cultural landscape perspective. Even though primary material may not necessarily be available or made use of, the position that the author holds within the University of Pretoria and access to the residue, is such that this is an analysis of the primary source.

Limitations

The selected period of this study, 1910-1960, proved to be a challenge for the sourcing of data, especially of original site plans and photographs of the campus - most of the images focused on the buildings and not its surroundings or placement in the landscape. The availability of data was very limited from the various repositories. As a result, most of the plans came from secondary sources. Another limitation was the acquisition of the stories associated with campus as the large majority of these stories were vested in individuals and which have not been documented. Such individuals are also no longer with us. As a result, stories reflected in this study could not always be corroborated with sufficient data. However this study did discover new data that was not previously documented or even known to exist thereby assisting future studies, cataloguing and understanding. As the majority of the research required archival research, the author had limited time in between a full time occupation, to access, extract and retrieve available data from repositories, especially as most repositories operate on conventional business hours. The time allocated for such research was however used as effectively as possible.

A number of Getty-funded institutions report that college and university personnel from presidents to maintenance staff have an increased appreciation for, and understanding of, heritage resources. In some cases, project reports have also served as the basis for renewed support from alumni and donors. At one institution, the information and ideas generated by the report became the foundation for a national alumni relations program.

Recommendations for Future Research

Frank Edgar Martin provides a possible way forward for research and an integrated heritage plan for Universities:

Planning Guidelines

- Development of historic guidelines for the treatment of historic landscapes, natural areas, and buildings
- Development of guidelines for future facilities location and design
- Identification of customized strategies to preserve specific buildings and sites

Capital and Facilities Planning

- Long-term phasing plan for preservation activities
- Development of written text for on-going grant submissions and other fundraising

Public Outreach and Awareness

- Campus history awareness programs through interpretative panels, website and brochure development, and traveling exhibits
- Collaboration with faculty to develop curriculum related to campus history and historic resources

From this it is recommended that a complete Management and Preservation Plan encompassing both the architectural and landscape architectural aspects be compiled to inform the future planning of the campus, especially with regards to the refurbishment of structures and landscapes that fall within the jurisdiction of the South Africa Heritage Resources Act.

Acknowledging that the quality and diversity of European landscapes constitute a common resource, and that it is important to cooperate towards its protection, management and planning:

Wishing to provide a new instrument devoted exclusively to the protection, management and planning of all landscapes in Europe,

European Landscape Convention.

It is noted in some plans and documentation that Dalene Strydom worked with Brian Sandrock (examples include the Nerina Residence and the Sports Centre Complex). Her husband, is believed to have been a former director of the Agricultural Research Council (ARC), with a number of Australian and New Zealand species being introduced on the campuses, possibly as a result of the various interactions and/or visits to these regions. An obvious question raised now is why was there not a closer interaction between Roelf Botha and Brian Sandrock in the campus expansion period of the 1960's and 1970’s?

This thesis highlighted the need for a more substantial repository on the campus landscape as there is currently very limited information available. This could be done by undergraduate, post graduate and academic research projects.

Conclusion

There is no better way to create a mission-based plan for the future than to understand how an institution’s sense of its mission and purpose evolved over time. Historically grounded planning addresses each institution’s historic academic traditions, support base, and constituencies to create a highly refined facilities, academic, and financial roadmap for the future.
Campus heritage research can improve planners' abilities to listen to contemporary constituencies and to find a shared language for developing planning concepts. Once the planning process is underway, historic research, public participation surveys and forums, and identity-related publications are all tools that can lead to a more widely supported, pragmatic, and sensitive campus plan.

While it is recognised that the cultural landscape of the University of Pretoria's Hatfield Campus may not be of 'outstanding interest' as per the World Heritage Convention, there is still significance and value in the smaller and often lesser known cultural landscapes, especially that of university campuses.

The challenge for such institutions is how to go about reading the landscape of its tangible and intangible cultural landscapes, and then interpreting this to inform future planning and character development of the campuses. Most international models work on the precept that a cultural landscape has already been identified and needs preservation, whilst for campuses the need is to identify what the cultural landscape is firstly, and then identify whether it needs preservation or not. The Cultural Landscape Report's part 1 structure for collecting data on the cultural landscape proved applicable, but the conflict in terminology, legal structures and outcomes with South African legislation could prove to be unsuccessful for other applications. South African legislation too does not provide any direction or clarity with regards to the cultural landscape and the intangible elements thereof.

The study highlighted that the Hatfield Campus does contain tangible cultural landscape elements but very little is known or present of the intangible elements. The current political climate of South African universities places emphasis on equalising the cultural diversity on campuses, perhaps to the detriment of the existing elements of the cultural landscapes, as in the case of the University of Pretoria, this is being reflected in the naming of its new buildings. The study also reflected that there has been a poor willingness to address the cultural landscape in spite of reverent cultural initiatives over the years. Most of the cultural organisations established in the formation and establishment years of the University have fallen away. The campus is regarded as a collection of pavilions for its architectural statements with no integration into the environment and spatial definition. If it were not for the efforts of the Department of Botany, the present day character of the campus would have been very different.

Whilst this study has supplied a grounding for the cultural landscape of the Hatfield Campus, it does provide any answers or direction as what to do with the cultural landscape. This would have to form part of further studies. A greater understanding has been attained as to why and when things on the campus landscape developed, but still does not yet provide the full picture.
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