

PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT: SECTIONS 1a, 1b, 2, 3 & 4 OF
LEEUVVALLEI 297KT, BURGERSFORT

LIMPOPO PROVINCE

REPORT PREPARED FOR
ANGLORAND HOLDINGS LIMITED
MR. BUKS VAN DER WAL
P.O. BOX 16
OHRIGSTAD, 1122
CELL: 0822590204

AUGUST 2009

ADANSONIA HERITAGE CONSULTANTS

ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICAN PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS

C. VAN WYK ROWE

christinevwr@gmail.com

P.O. BOX 75, PILGRIM'S REST, 1290

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) regarding archaeological and other cultural heritage resources was conducted on the proposed footprint for the residential development on the farm Leeuwvallei 297KT, of five sections, 1a, 1b, 2, 3 & 4, adjacent the town of Burgersfort, Limpopo Province. See Appendix 1, Location of proposed area of development & Appendix 2, Compilation layout of residential development. All the sections under discussion are situated on topographical map 1:50 000, 2430CB, Burgersfort,.

The aim of this report is to identify all archaeological and cultural heritage resources and / or graves which might be affected in the proposed development adjacent to the residential area of Burgersfort, and to document and assess the importance within local, provincial and the national context. Comments and recommendations are made to manage the identified features which might be impacted upon by the proposed development, and to recommend mitigation measures which need to be implemented.

A number of burial sites were recorded on areas 1a, 1b & 3, which fall within the proposed development. An HIA for areas 1a & 1b was conducted previously (February 2005) by Dr. J. Pistorius, but one burial site (in section 1b), was not detected during that study, and is now included in the current report. Recommendations are made to ensure that activities do not impact negatively on the burial sites and that measures are in place to provide access for family members of the deceased, or to relocate the graves.

The bigger parts of sections 1b, 2 & 3 were until recently used for agricultural purposes and have been extensively disturbed. Section 1b has also been extensively disturbed by modern infrastructure. Section 1a was mainly disturbed by recent black settlement in the eastern section. Only section 4 is largely undisturbed although digging / mining activities took place towards the west of the property. The original site of Fort Burgers, was situated on section 3.

It is concluded that the proposed residential development may continue, provided that the mitigation measures as specified in Section F, concerning the burial sites, (LB/GY01 – 05), and heritage features, LB/3: Late Iron Age stone wall, LB/6: Site of Fort Burgers and LB/9: Iron bridge over Steelpoort River, be implemented.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT	4
B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE REGION:	5
Literature review; Museum databases & previous relevant impact Assessments	5
Stone Age	5
Late Iron Age (LIA)	6
European settlement	8
C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY THE DEVELOPMENT	9
Locality	10
Description of methodology	11
D. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES	12
Late Iron Age stone walled sites	12
Graves	12
European history features	13
Discussion on footprint of the proposed residential development: Sites, location, impact by proposed development & mitigation measures	14
E. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA	19
Evaluation methods	19
National Heritage Resources Act	19
Graves: SAHRA policy on burial grounds	19
Field rating	21

F.	RECOMMENDATIONS	21
G.	CONCLUSION	22
	SOURCES	23
	Archival sources, Government publications, Literature, Literary sources, Personal information	
	APPENDIX 1: Location of proposed area of development (topographical Map provided by Mr. Van der Wal).	24
	APPENDIX 2: Compilation layout of residential development.	26
	APPENDIX 3: Location of heritage features & graves.	28
	APPENDIX 4: Photographs	30

PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, BURGERSFORT,

LIMPOPO PROVINCE

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT

Adansonia Heritage Consultants were appointed by Anglorand Holdings Limited (Mr. B. van der Wal), to conduct a phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment regarding archaeological and other heritage resources on the footprint for the proposed residential development adjacent to the town of Burgersfort, Limpopo Province.

This study investigates all possible archaeological and other cultural heritage resources which might be affected in the proposed area of future development, and will make recommendations in terms of the proposed footprint, should any cultural heritage resources be impacted upon. Sections 1a and 1b have previously been assessed by Dr. J. Pistorius.

This study forms part of an EIA / scoping report;

Type of development: Residential;

Contact details of client: Anglorand Holdings, 32 Princess of Wales Terrace, Parktown, Johannesburg.

Mr. B van der Wal, P.O. Box 16, Ohrigstad, 1122; Cell: 0822590204

Terms of reference: As specified by section 38 (3) of the NHRA, the following information is provided in this report.

- a) The identification and mapping of heritage resources;
- b) Assessment of significance of the resources;
- c) Assessment of the impact of the development;
- d) Evaluation of the impact of the development;
- e) Alternatives given to affected heritage resources by development;
- f) Plans for measures of mitigation.

Legislative requirements:

The National Heritage Resources Act, no 25 (1999)(NHRA), protects all heritage resources, which are classified as national estate. The NHRA stipulates that any person who intends to undertake a development, is subjected to the provisions of the Act, (section 38 (1)(a), subsections (7)(8) and (9). It specifies that no person may destroy, damage, deface, excavate, alter, remove from its original position, subdivide or change the planning status of any heritage site without a permit issued by the heritage resources authority responsible for the protection of such sites, (section 27(18)), and that special consent of the local authority is required for any alteration or development affecting a heritage area (section 31(7)).¹

B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY & HISTORY OF THE REGION

Literature review; museum databases & previous relevant impact assessments

Research was conducted by means of collecting primary or secondary literary sources with relevant information on the prehistory and history of the area. In order to place the sites located in the study area in archaeological context, secondary sources, such as ethnographical and linguistic studies by early researchers such as Ziervogel and Van Warmelo were consulted. Other useful sources were that of Theal (pre-historic), De Jongh (ethnographic and historic information in the area), Bergh (historic), a recent publication of Delius, Mpumalanga: History and Heritage, and The Military History Journal on the Sekukuni Wars.

Dr. J. Pistorius conducted an HIA in 2005 (A phase 1 HIA study for the proposed new Burgersfort ext 30 residential and the Burgersfort ext 31 industrial development projects near Burgersfort), on sections 1a & 1b, adjacent the established town of Burgersfort. It was suggested that the Late Iron Age stone walls be further researched to establish the scientific value thereof.

There are no museums in Burgersfort or Steelpoort, and the closest museum with relevant information on the area is the museum in Lydenburg. This museum covers information on the general history and pre-history of the surrounding area, and focuses extensively on the Early Iron Age site of the Lydenburg Heads.

The following historic information was compiled from the sources above:

Stone Age

¹National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999.

The San (or Bushmen) originally roamed the entire area. Unfortunately very little research in this regard has been conducted, although several rock painting sites have been recorded in the areas of Ohrigstad / Blyderivierspoort Canyon, and rock engravings in the area of Lydenburg. In his book, *Geskiedenis Atlas van die Vier Noordelike Provinsies*, Bergh did not record any Stone Age sites in the immediate areas of Lydenburg, Burgersfort and Steelpoort. The closest Middle- and Later Stone Age sites have been documented near Ohrigstad.²

Secondary source evidence of Iron Age sites are lacking, with only one well known site indicated, the Lydenburg Heads site. Evidence of copper mines were also recorded.³

Later Iron Age (LIA)

It is believed that the areas around Lydenburg, Badfontein, Sekukuneland, Roosenekal and Steelpoort were extensively inhabited during the later stages of the Iron Age (from 1500 until historic times). This phase, known as the Late Iron Age, is characterized by large-scale circular and semi-circular stonewalled settlements.⁴ These settlement complexes may be divided into three basic features: homesteads, terraces and cattle tracks. Researchers such as Mike Evers (1975) and Collett (1982) identified three basic settlement layouts. Basically these sites can be divided into simple and complex ruins. Simple ruins are normally small in relation to more complex sites and have smaller central cattle byres and fewer huts. Complex ruins consist of a central cattle byre which has two opposing entrances and a number of semi-circular enclosures surrounding it. The perimeter wall of these sites is sometimes poorly visible. Huts are built between the central enclosure and the perimeter wall. These are all connected by trackways referred to as cattle tracks. These tracks are made by building stone walls, which forms a walkway for cattle to the centrally located cattle byres.⁵

The Pedi is the most famous group to have inhabited the Lydenburg / Steelpoort / Burgersfort areas in historic times. The area in which these people settled is historically known as Bopedi but other groups resided here before the Pedi came onto the scene. Among the first of these were the Kwena or

2J.S. Bergh, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid-Afrika, Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies*, p. 4.

3J.S. Bergh, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid-Afrika, Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies*, p. 8.

4J.P. Celliers, 'HIA, Lydenburg Townlands, reply', jcelliers@thabachweu.org.za 2009-06-18.

5J.P. Celliers, 'HIA, Lydenburg Townlands, reply', jcelliers@thabachweu.org.za 2009-06-18.

Mongatane, who came from the north and were probably of Sotho origin. A second tribe to settle in Bopedi before the arrival of the Pedi was the Roka, followed by the Koni.⁶

Some Koni entered the area from the east and others from the north-west. According to historians, most Koni trace their origin to Swaziland and therefore claim that they are related to the Nguni. After the first Koni settled in the southern part of Bopedi, the area became known as Bokoni. Many people who were previously known as Roka also adopted the name Koni as the name "Roka" was not always held in esteem by other groups.

Historically the Pedi was a relatively small group who by various means built up a considerable empire. The Pedi are of Sotho origin. They migrated southwards from the Great Lakes in Central Africa some five centuries ago. The names of their chiefs can be traced to a maximum of fifteen generations. Historical events can be deduced reasonably well for the last two centuries, while sporadic events can be described during the preceding centuries.⁷

Some 150 years before the Voortrekkers entered the area, some battles took place between the Koni (Zulu under Makopole) and Swazi (under Moselekatse). At that time the MaPedi resided in the Steelpoort area. The Bakoni (Koni) were attacked and defeated by the Matabele and their chief, Makopole, was killed. The Matabele, not yet satisfied with their victory, moved further north towards the BaPedi headquarters. At Olifantspoortjie the whole BaPedi regiment was wiped out as well as the sons of Thulare, the BaPedi chief (except for Sekwati who managed to escape).⁸

After four years, Sekwati together with a few followers who had also managed to escape the Matabele, now slowly started to rise. In 1830 Sekwati invaded some of the smaller groups and eventually the Koni (under Marangrang) were ambushed and defeated. Now the empire of Maruteng (Bapedi) ruled the Koni.

At the beginning of the 19th century, groups such as the Pedi, Roka, Koni and Tau densely populated the immediate areas of Lydenburg, Steelpoort & Burgersfort.

6J.P. Celliers, 'HIA, Lydenburg Townlands, reply', jcelliers@thabachweu.org.za 2009-06-18.

7J.P. Celliers, 'HIA, Lydenburg Townlands, reply', jcelliers@thabachweu.org.za 2009-06-18.

8J.P. Celliers, 'HIA, Lydenburg Townlands, reply', jcelliers@thabachweu.org.za 2009-06-18.

This was confirmed by ethnographical and linguistic studies by early researchers such as D. Ziervogel and N.J. Van Warmelo.⁹

The Pedi (who had their roots in the baKgatla, near the current Pretoria) moved under Thobebe (who was banished from the Kgatla) to Sekukuneland in ca 1650, where they settled alongside the baKoni. There was initially peace, but soon the Koni had to submit to the Pedi. In time, the Pedi also ruled over the baRoka, baTau, Matlala, baMohlala, and others. They ruled over the whole of Lydenburg, Pilgrim's Rest, Middelburg and Polokwane (Pietersburg) districts. This was understandably met with a lot of resistance.¹⁰

The Pedi of chief Sekwati (ca 1860) lived at Phiring (near Polokwane). Sekwati lived in constant fear of the Zulus. The country was unsafe and in an attempt to survive, some of the Koni turned to cannibalism.¹¹ This area was heavily under attack during the Difaqane. The Ndebele attacked this area in ca 1822, and Zwide (Swazi) attacked the Pedi in ca 1825.¹²

European settlement

The Voortrekkers passed the northern boundary of the Leolo mountains (Pedi area) in 1837 when Trichardt looked for a route to Delagoa Bay (currently Maputo).¹³ Trichardt met the Pedi chief Sekwati.¹⁴ When more Europeans settled in the area from 1845, conflict was inevitable.

The Voortrekkers under Andries Hendrik Potgieter, settled at Ohrigstad in 1845. Soon conflicts arose between them and the Pedi leader, Sekwati. The smaller black groups also turned to Sekwati for help against the Voortrekkers. Sekwati moved his capital to the Leolo mountains at Mosego hill. Eventually

9N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. p. 111.

10M. De Jongh, *Swatini*, p. 28.

11N.J. Van Warmelo, *A genealogy of the house of Sekhukhune*, p. 47.

12J.S. Bergh, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid-Afrika, Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies*, pp. 10-28.

13J.S. Bergh, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid-Afrika, Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies*, p. 14.

14G.M. Theal, *History of South Africa from 1873 – 1884*, p. 257.

they signed a treaty and it was decided that the Steelpoort or Tubatse River, would form the border between the Pedi and the Voortrekkers, and peace followed for a while.¹⁵

The conflict in the eastern parts of the country between white and black was of a more forceful nature than in the central areas of the country. The Kopa, Ndzundza-Ndebeles and Pedi were more able to resist European onslaught.

The stressful relationship between the Pedi and Europeans since 1850, continued throughout the 1860's and 70's which lead to war. Sekukune, who took the reign after Sekwati in 1861, played an important role in this. After the Swazi attack on Sekukune in 1869, he moved his capital from Thaba Mosego to Tshate.¹⁶

The relationship between the Pedi and the Afrikaners stayed stressful. In 1876 the Afrikaners attacked the Pedi. A huge part of the Pedi capital was burnt down. In December 1876, the Pedi submitted to the Republic, as it was time to plant their crops and they could not afford to loose this valuable time.¹⁷

A plan had to be constructed to secure the borders of Sekukuni's country, by placing volunteer mercenaries at the Steelpoort River. A fort was built within the junction of the Steelpoort and Spekboom Rivers – Fort Burgers, named after President Burgers. The fort was manned by the Lydenburg Volunteer Corps who were placed under the command of Captain von Schlickmann.¹⁸

On 29 September 1876, Sekukuni attacked Fort Burgers with the object of recovering cattle supposedly looted from the Bapedi. They killed two of the volunteers.¹⁹

15M. De Jongh, Swatini, p. 29.

16J.S. Bergh, Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid-Afrika, Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies, p. 31.

17M. De Jongh, Swatini, p. 30.

18 The Sekukuni Wars, <http://samilitaryhistory.org/vol1025hk.html>, p. 3.

19 Ibid., p. 3.

The British under Shepstone took over the Transvaal on 12 April 1877. At first Sekukune pretended to welcome them, but soon started raiding their cattle and other domesticated animals. In November, the British, with the help of the Swazi, attacked the Pedi, and Sekukune's son and heirs were killed. Sekukune fled to a cave in the Leolo mountains, but was later captured and taken prisoner. He was succeeded by Mampuru (Middelburg district) and Ramoroko (Sekukuneland). Sekukune was killed in 1882 by Mampuru, after his release.²⁰

Several forts came into being to protect the Europeans during this time. Fort Burgers was only one of these. The area around Fort Burgers, eventually became known as the town of "Burgersfort".²¹

C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Five sections of the farm Leeuwvallei are proposed to be developed for residential purposes. The sections are indicated in Appendix 1 (Location of proposed area of development). Section 1a directly borders the town of Burgersfort, and section 1a and 4 are situated south of the R555 road from Burgersfort to Steelpoort. Section 1b is situated on the opposite side, at the corner of the R555 and the R37 (Burgersfort to Steelpoort & Burgersfort to Pietersburg roads), with the Steelpoort River forming the western boundary. Section 3 is north of the R37, with the Steelpoort River forming the western border and the Spekboom River, the northern boundary. Section 2 is situated directly to the east of section 3, bordering the existing town of Burgersfort in the east and the Spekboomriver in the north.

A map of the layout for the proposed developments was supplied by the client, Mr. Van der Wal, (Appendix 2: Compilation layout of residential development) which was used as a guideline for the investigation. 2004 Google Earth images were also studied to assess current and historicly disturbed areas or infrastructure.

Locality

The study area was investigated for all possible heritage related features which might fall within the demarcated sections (see GPS co-ordinates in section D). A visual layout of the location of the proposed development, is provided in Appendix 1 & Appendix 2.

²⁰M. De Jongh, Swatini, p. 30.

²¹J.S. Bergh, Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid-Afrika, Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies, p. 31.

The five areas are situated on topographical map, 1:50 000, 2430CB Burgersfort, on sections of the farm Leeuwvallei 297 KT. The five sections are on both sides of the main road from Burgersfort to Steelpoort (R555) and Burgersfort to Polokwane (R37), and falls within the Limpopo Province. The proposed development for the footprint is situated on the farm Leeuwvallei, as indicated below and in Appendix 1.

One historic feature, the iron bridge over the Steelpoort River, is located on the border of the farms Leeuwvallei 297 KT, and Steelpoortdrift 296 KT.

AREA / FEATURE	EXTENSION NUMBER	FARM NAME & NO.
AREA 1a	Burgersfort Extension 47	LEEUVVALLEI 297 KT
AREA 1b	Burgersfort Extension 31	LEEUVVALLEI 297 KT
IRON BRIDGE OVER STEELPOORT RIVER	Burgersfort Extension 31	Border of LEEUVVALLEI 297KT & STEELPOORTSDRIFT 296KT
AREA 2	Burgersfort Extension 30 & 45	LEEUVVALLEI 297 KT
AREA 3	Burgersfort Extension 30 & 45	LEEUVVALLEI 297 KT
AREA 4	Burgersfort Extension 46	LEEUVVALLEI 297 KT

Description of methodology

In order to reach a comprehensive conclusion regarding the archaeological and cultural heritage resources in the vicinity of the proposed developments, the following methods were used:

Fieldwork and survey was conducted per vehicle and per foot with a two / three person team over five days;

Sections 1b, 2 & 3 was mostly flat and visibility excellent. Most of these three sections are on previous agricultural areas. Sections 1a and 4 are at the foot of the mountain and the vegetation was more dense.

Research was conducted by means of collecting primary or secondary literary sources with relevant information on the prehistory and history of the area;

Mr. Van der Wal assisted by indicating the known historical sites and burial sites, regarding the study area;

Evaluation of the resources which might be impacted upon by the footprint, was done within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 (1999);

Personal communication with relevant stakeholders.

All features in this report, were allocated with a code and number (eg. LB20 / LBGY01 – grave yard or burial site), which indicates the farm name and nearby town (Leeuwvallei, Burgersfort, or if it is a burial site), and number of the sequence during the survey.

The study area was mainly covered by thorny bushveld vegetation and grass, where it is not disturbed by current infrastructure or previous agriculture. The sections south of the R555 (sections 1a and 4), were largely pristine, with thorny vegetation on the side of a hill. Section (1a) was also previously assessed by Dr. J. Pistorius.

Section 1b was extensively disturbed by previous agricultural activities and current industrial infrastructure towards the east, south and west. Small sections on the ridge were still natural thorny bushveld vegetation with minor mining disturbances. The general visibility in this section was good. This section was also previously assessed by Dr. J. Pistorius.

Sections 2 & 3 were extensively disturbed by previous agricultural fields and citrus orchards on the entire two sections (see Google Earth image, Appendix 3). The soil had been ripped extensively for farming purposes and also to remove the citrus trees. Pioneer vegetation has taken over the entire section. A monument marks graves of the Voortrekker era, and the location of the historic site of Fort Burgers is directly towards the west (also situated on section 3). A water furrow runs in the southern sections of areas 2 & 3 almost parallel with the main road (R37). Visibility in these sections was excellent.

D. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES

The aim of this report is to identify all archaeological, cultural heritage resources or graves which might be affected in the proposed residential development adjacent to Burgersfort, and to document and assess the importance within local, provincial and the national context. Comments and recommendations will be made to manage any archaeological and other cultural heritage resources or graves which might be impacted upon, and to recommend mitigation measures which need to be implemented.

The proposed residential development is earmarked for the western border of the town of Burgersfort. All comments should be studied in conjunction with the Locality plan (Appendix 1), and the layout of the proposed development (Appendix 2), which indicate the areas, and which corresponds with the discussion below. GPS co-ordinates were taken with a Garmin etrex summit model, datum WGS 84. The accuracy varied between 4-5 meters.

AREAS INDICATED IN APPENDIX 3	CO-ORDINATES	COMMENTS ON FIELD SURVEY: ARCHAEOLOGICAL / CULTURAL HERITAGE FEATURES
AREA 1a	Elev: 705m S24° 39' 55.3" E30° 18' 28.0"	LB:GY01 Burial site (site GY01 in Pistorius's report), approximately 40 graves, the majority of which consist of stone dressing. The visibility in this area was excellent. An enamel mug was found on one of the graves. According to Mr. John Matladi who lives near the grave site, several members of his family were buried in this cemetery. Only one grave in the cemetery has a tombstone with the following inscription: 22
	Elev: 695m S24° 39' 53.0"	LB:GY02 Burial site (site GY02 in Pistorius's report) consist of three graves covered with stone dressing, no headstones. According to Mr. John Matladi who lives nearby, one of the deceased was known by the

22J.C.C. Pistorius, Phase 1 HIA for the proposed New Burgersfort Development, p. 20.

23J.C.C. Pistorius, Phase 1 HIA for the proposed New Burgersfort Development, p. 21.

AREAS INDICATED IN APPENDIX 3	CO-ORDINATES	COMMENTS ON FIELD SURVEY: ARCHAEOLOGICAL / CULTURAL HERITAGE FEATURES
	Elev: 711m S24° 39' 55.9" E30° 18' 21.1"	LB:GY03 Burial site (site GY03 in Pistorius's report) (approximately 18-20 graves, associated with the Mnisi family. The majority of graves consist of stone dressing, but two graves are fitted with concrete edges. 1)Johannes Mnisi, Waz 14-02-1895, Was 24-05-1984, Ps 23, Etle Hirhula Nkosa;
	Elev: 712m S24° 39' 57.7" E30° 18' 20.7"	LB/1: Rectangular stone, mud and lime foundations close to above the grave site, associated with recent settlement. The remains of this settlement are spread out over this entire section, but it is difficult to establish the number of houses involved. Some dwellings consisted of two or more rooms around a central verandah. ²⁴
	Elev: 721m S24° 40' 02.0"	LB/2: More rectangular stone, mud and lime foundations in the close vicinity of the above burial sites. Surface material included rusted fish tins and other remains are associated with recent settlement. Some
	Elev: 713m S24° 39' 59.5"	LB/3: Late Iron Age stone wall: The site is poorly defined and level with the surface. No surface material was observed. Very indistinct and disturbed.
AREA 1b	Elev: 694m S24° 39' 43.9" E30° 18' 03.8"	LB/4: Water furrow from the Steelpoort river: This section of the furrow has been completely destroyed by modern infrastructure (pre-concrete mix industry and extensive dumping of building rubble). It had its origin in the Steelpoort river, following through recently cultivated lands and the tarred road (R37). Sections of the water furrow are still visible on areas 2 & 3, which show that it was not lined, but a ground water furrow.

24J.C.C. Pistorius, Phase 1 HIA for the proposed New Burgersfort Development, p. 23.

25J.C.C. Pistorius, Phase 1 HIA for the proposed New Burgersfort Development, p. 23.

AREAS INDICATED IN APPENDIX 3	CO-ORDINATES	COMMENTS ON FIELD SURVEY: ARCHAEOLOGICAL / CULTURAL HERITAGE FEATURES
	Elev: 690m S24° 39' 51.4" E30° 17' 59.5"	LB:GY04 Burial site 14 graves and 1 illegally exhumed grave. According to Mr. Van der Wal, this action happened during Dec. 2004. ²⁶ Since then, a re-burial in the same grave took place (June 2009). Most of the graves are of stone packed grave dressing. Three graves have concrete casing with casted tombstones. The dates are not original and are scratched on the tombstones. 1) Oruti Mohlala (16-8-1958). 2) The tombstone of this grave seems not original as it was recently buried, and deeply planted in the grave. Mr van der Wal is of the opinion that it was taken from somewhere else: Inscription: Sara Molo... (16 Jul 1918).
	Elev: 636m S24° 39' 51.0" E30° 17' 58.0"	LB/5: Part of a retaining wall built with stone, associated with minor diggings / prospecting on the side of the hill.
AREA 2	Elev: 644m S24° 39' 42.9" E30° 18' 44.3"	LB/4: Water Furrow (continuation of the above): The furrow is clearly visible in this section, parallel to the R37. It had no lining, just soil. It continued through section 3 where it crossed the road to section 1b, through to its origin in the Steelpoort (Tubatse) River.
AREA 3	Elev: 672m S24° 39' 08.3" E30° 18' 15.8"	LB:GY05 Burial site of Voortrekkers: The monument at this site commemorates the Great Trek, 1838-1938. There are imprints of ox wagon tracks in concrete. The name of "Gertruida Joubert" is also in the concrete.

²⁶Personal information: B. van der Wal, Anglorand, 2009-03-28.

AREAS INDICATED IN APPENDIX 3	CO-ORDINATES	COMMENTS ON FIELD SURVEY: ARCHAEOLOGICAL / CULTURAL HERITAGE FEATURES
	Elev: 672m S24° 39' 10.6" E30° 18' 12.3"	LB/6: Site of Fort Burgers. The location of this site is still known to some of the inhabitants (Hansie Meyer & F. Labuschagne) of the area. The fort was hexagonal.
	Elev: 699m S24° 39' 10.0" E30° 18' 32.7"	LB/7: A second water furrow is indicated on topographical map 1:50 000, 2430CB Burgersfort. This furrow originated in the Spekboomriver to feed the farm dams. There is however no visible indication of the furrow left due to recent agricultural activities, and the GPS co-ordinate is only a possible indication (as seen on the 1:50 000 map) where it ended into the dam.
AREA 4	Elev: 718m S24° 40' 11.2" E30° 17' 40.9"	LB/8: Old diggings (possibly for lime), next to border fence.
IRON BRIDGE	Elev: 632m S24° 39' 52.9" E30° 17' 48.6"	LB/9: Iron bridge over Steelpoort (Tubatse) River: Mr. Van der Wal (who is currently 50 years old) used to remember the bridge as a child. 27 The bridge has no welding in its construction, and only rivets were used to keep the pieces attached. The bridge has already been vandalized and pieces have been cut with a cutting torch, to sell as scrap metal.

Discussion on the footprint of the proposed residential development

A total of 14 (fourteen) sites / heritage features were documented. The characteristics of each of these sites vary greatly. Sites LB/GY01 – 05 are informal burial sites. Sites LB/1 – LB/2 are recent rectangular stone and dagga foundations. LB/3 was identified as a LIA stone wall although it is poorly defined. LB/4 & LB/7 are water furrows associated with recent agricultural activities. A straight stone wall is possibly associated with recent prospecting activities (LB/5). The site of Fort Burgers (LB/6) is located in section 3 although there is nothing to be seen above ground, today. Prospecting and digging activities took place in the area and site LB/8, is the site of old diggings. Feature LB/9 is the old iron bridge over the Steelpoort River.

27Personal information: B. van der Wal, Anglorand, 2009-03-28.

AREA 1a: Three of the burial sites are situated in this section, together with recent settlements. The LIA stone wall is also situated in the eastern section.

AREA 1b: One burial site is situated in section 1b. Modern infrastructure and light industries form part of this area, as well as recent agricultural activities. The following examples have been noted: Crane Hire, pre-concrete mix industry, vehicle repair shop, restaurant and filling station. There are two residential houses with outbuildings, squatter dwellings, large corrugated iron structures, a loading ramp and other concrete and brick structures. The central part of this section was used for agricultural purposes. Extensive dumping of building rubble and general domestic waste, currently takes place on this site.

AREA 2 & 3: Most of areas 2 & 3 had been extensively disturbed by agricultural practices and citrus plantations for many years. The extent of the disturbance may be seen in the 2004 Google Earth image of this area (Appendix 3). Two sites of significance are situated in this section, the site of Fort Burgers and a Voortrekker burial site.

AREA 4: No features of significance were identified in this area.

Sites LB/GY01, LB/GY02, LB/GY03, LB/GY04 & LB/GY05, Burial sites:

LB/GY01 Burial site (site GY01 in Pistorius's report)²⁸, approximately 40 graves, the majority of which consist of stone dressing. According to Mr. J. Matladi who lives near the graveyard, several members of his family were buried here. One grave has a tombstone with an inscription: "Magdalena Lorozimba Nkosi, U Bube 1958". (See Fig. 1).

LB/GY02 Burial site (site GY02 in Pistorius's report)²⁹ consists of three graves covered with stone dressing, no headstones. According to Mr. John Moloto who lives in a shack next to the graveyard one of the deceased was known by the surname "Mkhondo" (See Fig. 2).

LB/GY03 Burial site (site GY03 in Pistorius's report),³⁰ approximately 18-20 graves, associated with the Mnisi family. The majority of graves are covered with stone piles, two of which are fitted with granite slabs and edged with concrete. The two granite tomb stones have the following inscriptions:

28 J.C.C. Pistorius, Phase 1 HIA for the proposed New Burgersfort Development, pp. 20-23.

29 J.C.C. Pistorius, Phase 1 HIA for the proposed New Burgersfort Development, pp. 20-23.

30 J.C.C. Pistorius, Phase 1 HIA for the proposed New Burgersfort Development, pp. 20-23.

“Johannes Mnisi, Waz 14-02-1895, Was 24-05-1984, Ps 23, Etle Hirhula Nkosa.”

“David Mnisi, Obel 01-09-1963, Ohlo 26-12-1990, Ps 23.” (See Fig. 3).

LB/GY04 Burial site: Fourteen (14) graves and 1 illegally exhumed grave were counted in this informal cemetery. A reburial took place recently (June 2009).³¹ According to Mr. Van der Wal, the exhumation happened during Dec. 2004.³² Most of the graves are of stone packed grave dressing. Three graves have concrete casing with casted tombstones. The dates are doubtful as they were recently scratched on the tombstones.

1) Oruti Mohlala (16-8-1958).

2) The tombstone of this grave seems not original as it was recently buried, and deeply planted, in the grave. Mr Van der Wal is of the opinion that it was taken from somewhere else: Inscription: Sara Molo... (16 Jul 1918). (See Fig. 4).

LB/GY05 Burial site: Informal Voortrekker graves. Poorly defined stones mark the outline of the grave dressings. A monument commemorates this site and the Great Trek, 1838-1938. There are imprints of ox wagon tracks in concrete, with the name of “Gertruida Joubert” also in concrete. (See Fig. 5).

Locations: See Appendix 3.

Impact by proposed development: All the burial sites will be negatively impacted upon by the proposed development (see Appendix 2: Compilation layout plan of proposed development).

Mitigation: The following options exist as mitigation measures for the burial sites: After consultation with the family members, the developer may apply for a permit from SAHRA to relocate the graves by a professional grave relocater, to a site as agreed upon by the family;

Alternatively, the developer should demarcate these areas as public open spaces, and not develop in these sections, and management guidelines should be established for the burial sites. Visitors and family members of the deceased should be allowed to visit the graves.

Site LB/3:

Late Iron Age stone wall. The site is poorly defined and level with the surface. It was built with small stones, although it has collapsed, and further disturbed by the nearby settlements. No surface material was observed. Very indistinct. (See Fig. 6).

Location: See Appendix 3.

³¹ Personal information: B. van der Wal, Anglorand, 2009-06-30.

³² Personal information: B. van der Wal, Anglorand, 2009-03-28.

Impact by proposed development: The site will negatively be impacted upon by the proposed development.

Mitigation: A phase two assessment is recommended. Late Iron Age stone walls must be further researched, excavated and documented to establish the scientific value thereof. Application for a destruction permit from SAHRA, is essential.



Site LB/3: Poorly defined LIA stone wall

Sites LB/1, LB/2:

Square stone, mud and lime foundations, associated with recent settlement. These foundations are constructed with limestone and mud. They are rectangular with two or more rooms around a central verandah and is dated to the recent past.

Location: See Appendix 3.

Impact by proposed development: The area will be impacted upon by the proposed development, but does not have historical or cultural significance.

Mitigation: None

Sites LB/4, LB/7:

Water furrows for irrigation purposes. Sections of these furrows have already been completely destroyed by agricultural activities as well as modern infrastructure. (See Fig. 9).

Location: See Appendix 3.

Impact by proposed development: None

Mitigation: None

Site LB/5:

Part of a retaining wall, associated with minor diggings / prospecting on the side of the hill. This wall has no cultural significance. (See Fig. 7).

Location: See Appendix 3.

Impact by proposed development: None

Mitigation: None

Site LB/6:

Site of Fort Burgers. The site was pointed out by the farm manager Mr. D. Viljoen, as there is currently nothing above surface to indicate the site. (See Fig. 8).

Location: See Appendix 3.

Impact by proposed development: This area will be negatively impacted upon by the proposed development.

Mitigation: A second phase scientific investigation is recommended, which include, locating the exact site, excavation and further research in an effort to understand the extent of the fort, and various activity areas within the fort complex. A management plan should be drafted for the fort, in order to secure its future existence

Site LB/8:

Old diggings, (possibly for lime), next to border fence. This area has no historic or cultural significance. (See Fig. 10).

Location: See Appendix 3.

Impact by proposed development: None

Mitigation: None

Site LB/9:

Iron Bridge over Steelpoort (Tubatse) River. Mr. Van der Wal (who is currently 50 years old) used to remember the bridge as a child. ³³ The bridge has no welding in its construction, and only rivets were used to keep the pieces attached. The bridge has already been vandalized and pieces have illegally been cut, with a cutting torch, to sell as scrap metal. The bridge is at least 60 years old and protected under the NHRA. Mr. van der Wal indicated that there is a possibility to utilize this bridge as a commercial feature, in which case mitigation measures will be necessary.³⁴ (See Fig. 11).

Location: See Appendix 3.

Impact by proposed development: If the bridge will be used for commercial purposes, then it will be impacted upon.

Mitigation: If the bridge will be used for commercial purposes, mitigation measures are needed. A full documentation report on the bridge, will be needed. The client should submit a business proposal for the future plans for the construction, and then apply for a permit from SAHRA to utilize this feature. A stability report from a registered engineering company will be recommended.

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA

Section 38 of the National Heritage resources act (25 of 1999), rates all heritage resources into National, Provincial or Local significance, and proposals in terms of the above is made for all identified heritage features.

Evaluation methods

Site significance is important to establish the measure of mitigation and / or management of the resources. Sites are evaluated as HIGH (National importance), MEDIUM (Provincial importance or LOW, (local importance), as specified in the NHRA. It is explained as follows:

National Heritage Resources Act

The National Heritage Resources Act no. 25, 1999 (NHRA) aims to promote good management of the national estate, and to enable and encourage communities to conserve their legacy so that it may be bequeathed to future generations. Heritage is unique and it cannot be renewed, and contributes to redressing past inequities.³⁵ It promotes previously neglected research areas of which the study area is in crucial need of.

³³Personal information: B. van der Wal, Anglorand, 2009-03-28.

³⁴ Personal information: B. van der Wal, Anglorand, 2009-03-28.

³⁵National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. p. 2.

All archaeological and other cultural heritage resources are evaluated according to the NHRA, section 3(3). A place or object is considered to be part of the national estate if it has cultural significance or other special value in terms of:

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

its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;

(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;³⁶

Graves

SAHRA Policy on burial grounds

The policy is that graves and cemeteries should be left undisturbed, no matter how inaccessible and difficult they are to maintain. It is our obligation to empower civil society to nurture and conserve our heritage. It is only when essential developments threaten a place of burial, that human remains should be disinterred to another cemetery or burial ground.

From a historical point of view and for research purposes, it is vital that burial sites are not disturbed. The location and marking of an individual's grave tells a life story, where he / she died defending (or attacking) a particular place or situation and makes it easier to understand the circumstances of his / her death.³⁷

The significance and evaluation of the archaeological and cultural heritage features can be summarised as follows:

Site no	Cultural Heritage features	Significance	Measures of mitigation
---------	----------------------------	--------------	------------------------

³⁶National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. pp. 12-14

³⁷SAHRA, Burial sites, [Http://www.sahra.org.za/burial.htm](http://www.sahra.org.za/burial.htm), Access, 2008-10-16.

LB/GY01, LB/GY02, LB/GY03, LB/GY04 & LB/GY05, burial sites	Graves	High	Mitigation needed – permit for relocation; OR no development in these areas, leave as public open spaces
LB/3	LIA stone wall	Low	Mitigation needed to establish scientific value
LB/1, LB/2	Foundations of dwellings from the recent past	None	None
LB/4, LB/7	Ground water furrows for irrigation purposes	None	None
LB/5	Retaining wall	None	None
LB/6	Fort Burgers – historically significant	Medium	Second phase mitigation needed with management plan
LB/8	Old lime diggings	None	None
LB/9	Iron bridge over Steelpoort river	Low	If bridge is planned to utilize as a commercial feature, mitigation measures are recommended

Field rating:

The graves are rated as High and are of outstanding significance as specified by the NHRA. Mitigation measures are therefore necessary to contact the relevant communities and come to an agreement regarding relocation or visitation rights.

The LIA cultural heritage feature, as discussed in the section above, is rated as Low and therefore of local significance. Dr. J. Pistorius indicated that this feature has been extensively disturbed, and does

not qualify as a significant site.³⁸ Mitigation measures include further research, recording and excavation to establish its scientific value. The client may then apply for a destruction permit from SAHRA.

The site of Fort Burgers is rated as Medium and of provincial value, which forms part the historic conflict between Sekukune (Pedi) and their European neighbors in the 1870's. A phase two investigation is recommended to establish the exact location, to excavate and to further research the fort in an effort to understand the extent, and various activity areas within the fort complex. A management plan is also recommended to ensure its future protection.

The iron bridge over the Steelpoort (Tubatse) River is rated as a historic feature of local significance and protected under the NHRA. If any commercial activities are planned for this bridge (as indicated by Mr. Van Der Wal), then a full documentation report is recommended.

None of the other features which were observed, have any historic or cultural significance.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following mitigation measures are recommended:

The burial sites, LB/GY01, LB/GY02, LB/GY03, LB/GY04 & LB/GY05, are rated as High and are of outstanding significance as specified by the NHRA. After consultation with the family members, the developer may apply for a permit from SAHRA to relocate the graves by a professional grave relocater, to a site as agreed upon by the family; or alternatively, the developer should demarcate these areas as public open spaces, and not develop in these sections. Management guidelines should be established for the burial sites. Visitors and family members of the deceased should be allowed to visit the burial sites.

Site LB/3, the LIA stone wall is rated as Low and therefore of local significance. Mitigation measures include the further research, recording and excavation to establish its scientific value. The client may then apply for a destruction permit from SAHRA.

Site LB/6: The site of Fort Burgers is rated as Medium and of provincial value. A phase two investigation is recommended to establish the exact location, to excavate and further research the fort in an effort to understand the extent, and various activity areas within the fort complex. A management plan is also recommended to ensure its future protection.

³⁸ J.C.C. Pistorius, Phase 1 HIA for the proposed New Burgersfort Development, p. 25.

Site LB/9: The iron bridge over the Steelpoort (Tubatse) River, is rated as a historic feature of local significance and protected under the NHRA. If any commercial activities are planned for this bridge (as indicated by Mr. Van Der Wal), then a full documentation report is recommended. If the bridge will be used for commercial purposes, mitigation measures are needed. The client should also submit a business proposal for the future plans for the construction, and then apply for a permit from SAHRA to utilize this feature. A stability report from a registered engineering company is recommended.

It is recommended that if the mitigation measures as specified above, are adhered to, the developer may continue with the development of the five portions on Leeuwvallei 297KT.

G. CONCLUSION

Archaeological material or graves are not always visible during a field survey and therefore some significant material may only be revealed during construction activities. It is therefore recommended that the developers be made aware of this possibility, and when human remains, clay or ceramic pottery etc. are observed, a qualified archaeologist must be notified and an assessment be done. Further research might be necessary in this regard for which the developer is responsible.

Adansonia Heritage Consultants cannot be held responsible for any archaeological material or graves which were not located during the survey.

SOURCES

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

PRMA: Information file 9/2. Prehistory & Archaeology.

PRMA: Information file 10/1. Ethnology & Anthropology.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS:

National Legislation

Republic of South Africa, National Heritage Resources Act, (Act No. 25 of 1999).

LITERATURE

BERGH, J.S. (red.), *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*. J.L. van Schaik, 1999.

DE JONGH, M. (red.), *Swatini*, UNISA, 1987.

MAKHURA, T., *Early Inhabitants*, in Delius, P. (ed.), *Mpumalanga: History and Heritage*. Natal University Press, 2007.

THEAL, G.M., *History of South Africa from 1873 – 1884*, Cape Town, unknown.

VAN WARMELO, N.J., *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, Pretoria, 1935.

VAN WARMELO, N.J., *A genealogy of the house of Sekhukhune*, Pretoria, 1944.

ZIERVOGEL, D. *The Eastern Sotho: A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey with Ethnographical notes on the Pai, Kutswe and Pulana Bantu Tribes*. Pretoria, 1953.

LITERARY SOURCES

Pistorius, J.C.C., *A Phase 1 HIA study for the proposed New Burgersfort ext 30 residential and the Burgersfort ext 31 industrial development projects near Burgersfort*, February 2005.

ELECTRONIC INFORMATION

SAHRA, Burial sites, [Http://www.sahra.org.za/burial.htm](http://www.sahra.org.za/burial.htm), Access, 2008-10-16.

The Sekukuni Wars, <http://samilitaryhistory.org/vol1025hk.html>, 2009-06-25.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Personal information: Mr. B. Van der Wal, Cell 0822590204, 2009-03-28.

Personal information: J.P. Celliers, 'HIA, Lydenburg Townlands, reply', jcelliers@thabachweu.org.za
2009-06-18.