

NOTES OF THE HARDEKRAALTJIE PUBLIC MEETING (3)

24 March 2026, 14:00 – 16:00 | Ravensmead Community Library

ATTENDEES (Attendance Register attached as Appendix 1):

Paul Slabbert – PHS Consulting	Linique Arends – Student at Stellenbosch University
Jenna Theron – PHS Consulting	University
Chefferino Fortuin – Community Representative	Jason Orton – ASHA Consulting
Johannes Bastian - Community Representative	Franken van Wyk - Stellenbosch University
A Adams – Khoi Community Member	A. De Villiers – Community Member
Daylen – Section 2 Community Member	Jurie Dietrich - Community Member
	Valentia Bastian - Community Member
	Carol Goss – Stellenbosch University

Item	Discussion
1.	Opening and welcoming:
1.1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting commenced at 14:10. • This was noted as the third meeting with the community. • Paul Slabbert welcomed all attendees and presented the information as per the Presentation Slides (“The Memorialisation of the Hardekraaltjie Cemetery and Burials: 24 March 2026”). • Jayson Orton Presented on ground-truthing findings.
2.	Purpose and Agenda of the Meeting
2.1.	Paul Slabbert discussed: Purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide feedback to all stakeholders regarding the process to date. • To communicate the latest proposal and the way forward. • To obtain feedback from stakeholders. Agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background/ Recap • Outcome of the Test Excavations / ground-truthing undertaken on Erf 24602. • Revised way forward post ground-truthing and details of proposal. • Summary of the (draft) Conservation Management Plan. • Feedback to be obtained from the Community at each point above. • Next Steps.
3.	Outcome of the Test Excavations / ground-truthing undertaken on Erf 24602.
3.1	Jayson Orton discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified areas were excavated, and no graves were found. • Historically the terrain in the study area consists of uneven sand dunes, and low-lying areas in a floodplain, not suitable for burials.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings support the location of the main graveyard. • It is unlikely that burials would occur far from the main cemetery. • The graveyard is unlikely to have been full. If full, burials would have occurred adjacent to the cemetery, not far away. • Absence of seashells (traditionally used on graves) further suggests no graves. • Additional excavation near the cemetery also yielded no findings. • Acknowledged that the ground truthing cannot completely eliminate the possibility of graves.
3.2	Feedback from Stakeholders - Discussion and Comments
3.2.1	Daylen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question raised regarding awareness of Tygerberg hospital redevelopment. • Paul Slabbert confirmed awareness and indicated that the redevelopment does not fall inside the 50m buffer zone.
3.2.2	Chefferino Fortuin <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Described Jayson Orton’s Report as “inconclusive” in that you cannot say conclusively that there are no graves in the area. • Limitations to ground truthing (as any study) – there will be positives and negatives. • Emphasized the communities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desire for memorialisation of the full 50m buffer area - Opposition to separating people in death – who was inside the cemetery and who was buried outside. - Request for inclusion in decision-making structures - Zoning of the Cemetery needs to be changed to a more appropriate Zoning. <p>Response by Jason Orton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of graves found, though certainty cannot be guaranteed that there are no graves anywhere else. • Terrain and location of study area make burial use to the north of the cemetery unlikely. • Buffer zones are considered standard precautionary measures. <p>Response by Paul Slabbert:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical survey (1910) was considered alongside scientific evidence. • Process followed under guidance of heritage authorities (Heritage Western Cape) who ultimately are the decision-making authority. • Professional expertise was engaged. • The balance of evidence needs to be weighed up. • Tygerberg Hospital does not have the same land use pressure as SU. • The 50m buffer was determined as part of a previous HWC decision (2017). It did not confirm that the buffer consists of graves, it merely stipulated that a S36 application in terms of the NHRA must be followed should any ‘development’ be undertaken within this area. • A Section 36 process has been followed indicating that, in terms of Erf 24602, it is considered highly unlikely that burials occurred outside of the known historical Hardekraaltjie Cemetery.

3.2.3	<p>Johannes Bastian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queried Soil Chemistry/ Testing <p>Jayson Orton responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not standard practice in these instances and would not assist in providing new information helpful to potential burials.
4.	<p>Memorialisation of Erf 15349 & Erf 18228 / Conservation Management Plan (Draft)</p>
4.1	<p>Paul Slabbert discussed:</p> <p>Proposed Memorialisation of Erven 15349 & 18228 - symbolic representation of the Hardekraaltjie Cemetery and Burials.</p> <p>Erf 24602 does not form part of the memorial area. However, a 10m buffer zone is recommended to 1) protect the interface around the Memorial area; and 2) facilitate access and pedestrian flow into the cemetery.</p> <p>The Memorialisation will take place through the approval and implementation of the Landscaping Plan [interpreted alongside the “Do’s and Don’ts” and “Look and Feel”], the Conservation Management Plan & the HMMC.</p>
4.2	<p>Feedback from Stakeholders - Discussion and Comments</p>
4.2.1	<p>Chefferino Fortuin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raised historical concerns regarding land use (since 1971). Asserted that the sports field should be partially memorialised by including the 50m buffer zone which must remain untouched. Stressed the importance of the committee. Said ultimately, they are not in conflict with PHS and that perhaps HWC should make the deciding decision. Chefferino raised the potential of moving the parking area to the north of the sport field or the Basketball/ Tennis courts to the west(?) to ensure space for rugby/soccer field if 50m buffer is included in the memorialization. The Cemetery is already the communities – therefore it cannot be seen as a sacrifice.
4.2.2	<p>Johannes Bastian:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spoke about educational initiatives around Hardekraaltjie. Spoke about the Apartheid government who allegedly removed bones from the cemetery and then sold the land for 10c to SU. Stressed that the communities are use to fighting as historically everything was taken away from them. But he acknowledged that a compromise is needed.
4.2.3	<p>A Adams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stated that all the land historically belonged to Khoi.
4.2.4	<p>Jurie Diedrich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> recalls in 1962 how they use to collect firewood near the Cemetery.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • His mother’s mother was buried there. • Today, however, development has blurred the lines as to where exactly the cemetery was located. Who are we to tell him where his ancestors are buried?
4.2.5	<p>Franken van Wyk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An old member of the Ravensmead Community and working at Stellenbosch University. • Discussed the importance of the memory of Hardekraaltjie. • Discussed the present-day challenges facing SU from an operational aspect. • What would be a sustainable solution? A sustainable outcome is required.
4.2.6	<p>Paul Slabbert:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul indicated that the proposed Memorial Area is approximately 2 hectares which is larger than the original cemetery size established in 1910 (1.7 ha). The potential location of graves on Erf 24602 was determined through a systematic process, and it was established that the likelihood of graves within this area is very low. He spoke about the recreational and sport needs of the medical students that have demanding time schedules and the importance of safety and security in terms of off on-site campus facilities. It was confirmed that the sports field is used for soccer and rugby and therefore a diverse group of students and community members make use of the area. Alternative off-site sports fields were considered for medical students, but none were considered feasible considering time, cost and security constraints. Therefore, on campus solutions are essential and a sustainable solution to accommodate all parties concerned is essential - which the latest proposal encompasses. Through the memorialisation of the 2-ha core site and the provision of a 10m buffer to the north, the aim of this very long process to date is to create a tangible and interactive memorial area with a Grade II status for protection. The formation of the HMMC after approval will be representative of the community, whereby direct input will be provided into the final design, interpretation, events and management of the site. This platform will allow for further debate and discussions amongst various groups to sustain the site in the memory for future generations. • It must be noted that the 50m buffer is being maintained to the south and within the Tygerberg Hospital property which avoids them from undertaking a Section 36 process. The land to the east is vacant Transnet property and the 50m buffer would still apply here. It is only the buffer area to the north, on which extensive research has been undertaken, for which a 10m buffer is being proposed. • The years of research and public engagement around the Hardekraaltjie Memorialisation was emphasised. • At the close of the meeting, further ideas of compromise and sustainable solutions were discussed informally between all parties. Even though research and science indicates otherwise, the notion that the larger buffer area is significant in the communities memories can be interpreted as part of the memorialization, but that sport should continue as a symbol of youth and community development. • Final decision to be made by Heritage Western Cape, considering public input.
5.	Heritage Status and Applications
5.1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial Heritage Site (PHS) status to be determined through Section 36 application. • The proposed area remains subject to this (S36) process. • It was confirmed that SU Supports a Grade II grading for erven15349 & Erf 18228

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The difference between Grade III (Local) and Grade II (Provincial) significance/ grading was discussed.
6.	Closing:
6.1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you to everyone in Attendance. Closing date for public comment submissions: 13 April 2026