



Archaetnos Culture & Cultural
Resource Consultants
BK 98 09854/23

**A REPORT ON AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL WALKDOWN IMPACT ASSESSMENT
FOR THE ESKOM MERENSKY-UCHOBA PROJECT, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

For:

DRA Global
Building 33 Woodlands Office Park
20 Woodlands
Sandton 2080

REPORT NO.: AE02224V

By:

Prof. A.C. van Vollenhoven (L.AKAD.SA.)
Accredited member of ASAPA (Accreditation number: 166)
Accredited member of SASCH (Accreditation number: CH001),
Johan Smit, BA (Hons)&
Daniël Viljoen (BA Hons)

8 September 2022

Archaetnos
P.O. Box 55
GROENKLOOF
0027
Tel: 083 291 6104
Fax: 086 520 4173
E-mail: antonv@archaetnos.co.za

Member: AC van Vollenhoven BA, BA (Hons), DTO, NDM, MA (Archaeology) [UP], MA (Culture History) [US], DPhil (Archaeology) [UP], Man Dip [TUT], D Phil (History) [US]

SUBMISSION OF REPORT

Please note that the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) or one of its subsidiary bodies needs to comment on this report.

It is the client's responsibility to do the submission via the SAHRIS System on the SAHRA website. Arrangements can however be made if necessary.

Clients are advised not to proceed with any action before receiving the necessary comments from SAHRA.

DISCLAIMER

Although all possible care is taken to identify all sites of cultural importance during the survey of study areas, the nature of archaeological and historical sites is as such that it always is possible that hidden or subterranean sites could be overlooked during the study. Access to certain areas is also sometimes limited. Archaetnos and its personnel will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result thereof. Any additional sites identified can be visited and assessed afterwards and the report amended, but only upon receiving an additional appointment.

**©Copyright
Archaetnos**

The information contained in this report is the sole intellectual property of Archaetnos CC. It may only be used for the purposes it was commissioned for by the client.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaetnos cc was requested by DRA Global to conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) for Eskom, related to the proposed Eskom Merensky-Uchoba Project. The project consists of approximately 18 km of a 132 KV power line from the existing Merensky substation to connect to the Merensky-Jane Furse-Uchoba 132kV Power line T-off point (this line has been approved for construction and construction will commence in due course). This is close to the town of Steelpoort in the Fetalgomo Tubatse Local Municipality, Sekhukhune District Municipality, Mpumalanga Province.

The study is done as a walk down, forming part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Each proposed pylon site was surveyed. A Phase 1 study has been done in the past.

A survey of literature was undertaken in order to obtain background information regarding the area. The field survey was conducted according to generally accepted HIA practices and was aimed at locating all possible objects, sites and features of cultural significance in the area of proposed development.

Three sites of cultural heritage importance were identified. They are believed to have a rating of low significance.

The following is recommended:

1. Site no 1, 2 and 3 is of low significance and may thus be demolished if necessary.
2. However, it is highly unlikely that this would be needed, and it can be left to deteriorate naturally.
3. Stone tools sites have been identified in a previous study with the closest about 30m from proposed pylon locations 30 and 31, and care should be taken during construction not to disturb these sites.
4. The proposed project may therefore continue, but only after receiving comments from SAHRA.
5. It should be noted that the subterranean presence of archaeological and/or historical sites, features or artefacts is always a distinct possibility. Care should therefore be taken when development commences that if any of these are discovered, work on site immediate cease and a qualified archaeologist be called in to investigate the occurrence.

CURRICULUM VITAE
Prof. Anton Carl van Vollenhoven

PERSONAL INFORMATION

- Born: 20 January 1966, Pretoria, RSA
- Address: Archaetnos, PO Box 55, Groenkloof, 0027
- Cell phone: 083 291 6104
- Nationality: RSA
- E-mail: antonv@archaetnos.co.za

TERTIARY EDUCATION

- BA 1986, University of Pretoria
- BA (HONS) Archaeology 1988 (cum laude), University of Pretoria
- MA Archaeology 1992, University of Pretoria
- Post-Graduate Diploma in Museology 1993 (cum laude), University of Pretoria
- Diploma Tertiary Education 1993, University of Pretoria
- DPhil Archaeology 2001, University of Pretoria.
- MA Cultural History 1998 (cum laude), University of Stellenbosch
- Management Diploma 2007 (cum laude), Tshwane University of Technology
- DPhil History 2010, University of Stellenbosch

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Current:

- *August 2007* – present – Managing Director for Archaetnos Archaeologists.
- *Since 2012*: Archaeologist and heritage official, Department of Environment and Agriculture, City of Tshwane
- *Since 2015*: Extraordinary Professor of History at the North-West University

Previous:

- *1988-1991*: Fort Klapperkop Military Museum - Researcher
- *1991-1999*: National Cultural History Museum. Work as Archaeologist, as well as Curator/Manager of Pioneer Museum (1994-1997)
- *1999-2002*: City Council of Pretoria. Work as Curator: Fort Klapperkop Heritage Site and Acting Deputy Manager Museums and Heritage.
- *2002-2007*: City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality. Work as Deputy Manager Museums and Heritage.
- *August 2007* – present – Managing Director for Archaetnos Archaeologists.
- *1988-2003*: Part-time lecturer in Archaeology at the University of Pretoria and a part-time lecturer on Cultural Resources Management in the Department of History at the University of Pretoria.
- *2014-2015*: Part-time lecturer for the Honours degree in Museum Sciences in the Department of History and Heritage Studies at the University of Pretoria
- *2020-2021*: Part-time lecturer in History at the North-West University

OTHER

- NRF C2 Research rating.
- Has published 40 peer-reviewed and 54 popular articles.
- Has written 13 books/book contributions/conference proceedings .
- Has been the author and co-author of over 1076 unpublished reports on cultural resources surveys and archaeological work.
- Has delivered more than 82 papers and lectures at national and international conferences.
- Member of SAHRA Council for 2003 – 2006.
- Member of the South African Academy for Science and Art.
- Member of Association for South African Professional Archaeologists.
- Member of the South African Society for Cultural History (Chairperson 2006-2008; 2012-2014; 2018-2021).
- Has been editor for the SA Journal of Cultural History 2002-2004.
- Editorial member of various scientific journals.
- Member of the Provincial Heritage Resources Agency, Gauteng’s Council.
- Member of Provincial Heritage Resources Agency, Gauteng’s HIA adjudication committee (Chairperson 2012-2024).

A list of reports can be viewed on www.archaetnos.co.za.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

I, Anton Carl van Vollenhoven from Archaetnos, hereby declare that I am an independent specialist within the field of heritage management.

Signed:



Date: 8 September 2022

LIST OF ACRONYMS:

AIA – Archaeological Impact Assessment
CMP – Cultural Management Plan
EAP – Environmental Assessment Practitioner
EIA – Environmental Impact Assessment
HIA – Heritage Impact Assessment
PIA – Palaeontological Impact Assessment
SAHRA –South African Heritage Resources Agency

CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
CIRRICULUM VITAE OF SPECIALISTS.....	4
DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.....	5
LIST OF ACRONYMS	5
CONTENTS.....	6
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE	9
3. CONDITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS	9
4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....	10
5. THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATIONS’ PERFORMANCE STANDARD FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE	14
6. METHODOLOGY	15
7. DESCRIPTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT.....	16
8. HISTORICAL CONTEXT	23
9. DISCUSSION OF SITES IDENTIFIED DURING THE SURVEY ..	29
10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	37
11. REFERENCES	39
APPENDIX A – DEFENITION OF TERMS.....	41
APPENDIX B – DEFINITION/ STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	42
APPENDIX C – SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATING	43
APPENDIX D – PROTECTION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	44
APPENDIX E – HERITAGE MANAGEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT PHASES.....	45

1. INTRODUCTION

Archaetnos cc was requested by DRA Global to conduct a walkdown for Eskom, related to the proposed Eskom Merensky-Uchoba Project. The project consists of approximately 18 km of a 132 KV power line from the existing Merensky substation to connect to the Merensky-Jane Furse-Uchoba 132kV Power line T-off point (this line has been approved for construction and construction will commence in due course). The power line runs roughly between the towns of Steelpoort and Kennedy's Vale in the jurisdiction of the Fetakgomo Tubatse Local Municipality in the Sekhukhune District Municipality, Limpopo Province (Figure 1-3).

The study is done as a line walk down, to survey the proposed pylon positions and indicated any areas of heritage significance along the line that might be impacted by the construction of the power line.




Figure 1: Location of Steelpoort in the Mpumalanga Province.



Figure 2: The proposed route (green) for the Merensky-Uchoba Project.




Figure 3: The 87 proposed pylon location for the Merensky-Uchoba Project.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference for the survey were to:

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

3. CONDITIONS & ASSUMPTIONS

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

1. Cultural Resources are all non-physical and physical man-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences associated with human activity (Appendix A). These include all sites, structure and artefacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development. Graves and cemeteries are included in this.
2. The significance of the sites, structures and artefacts is determined by means of their historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific value in relation to their uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. The various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these aspects.
3. Cultural significance is site-specific and relates to the content and context of the site. Sites regarded as having low cultural significance have already been recorded in full and require no further mitigation. Sites with medium cultural

significance may or may not require mitigation depending on other factors such as the significance of impact on the site. Sites with a high cultural significance require further mitigation (see Appendix C).

4. The latitude and longitude of any archaeological or historical site or feature, is to be treated as sensitive information by the developer and should not be disclosed to members of the public.
5. All recommendations are made with full cognizance of the relevant legislation.
6. It has to be mentioned that it is almost impossible to locate all the cultural resources in a given area, as it will be very time consuming. Developers should however note that this report should make it clear how to handle any other finds that might occur.
7. The vegetation cover at the pylon sites were reasonably low and open during the survey. Therefore, both the horizontal and the vertical archaeological visibility were good.
8. There were a few pylon positions that were not accessible, due to it being fenced off. Nevertheless, these areas are seen as low risk as they have mostly been disturbed due to industrial activities.

4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

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

4.1 The National Heritage Resources Act

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

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

- i. Objects, structures and sites of scientific or technological value.

The national estate (see Appendix D) includes the following:

- 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 features of cultural significance
- e. Geological sites of scientific or cultural importance
- f. Archaeological and paleontological importance
- g. Graves and burial grounds
- h. Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery
- i. Movable objects (e.g. archaeological, paleontological, meteorites, geological specimens, military, ethnographic, books etc.)

A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is the process to be followed in order to determine whether any heritage resources are located within the area to be developed as well as the possible impact of the proposed development thereon. An Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) only looks at archaeological resources. The different phases during the HIA process are described in Appendix E.

An HIA must be done under the following circumstances:

- a. The construction of a linear development (road, wall, power line canal etc.) exceeding 300m in length
- b. The construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length
- c. Any development or other activity that will change the character of a site and exceed 5 000m² or involve three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof
- d. Re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m²
- e. Any other category provided for in the regulations of SAHRA or a provincial heritage authority

Structures

Section 34 (1) of the mentioned act states that no person may demolish any structure or part thereof which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.

A structure means any building, works, device or other facility made by people and which is fixed to land, and includes any fixtures, fittings and equipment associated therewith.

Alter means any action affecting the structure, appearance or physical properties of a place or object, whether by way of structural or other works, by painting, plastering or the decoration or any other means.

Archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites

Section 35(4) of this act deals with archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites. The act states that no person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority (national or provincial):

- a. destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or paleontological site or any meteorite;
- b. destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or paleontological material or object or any meteorite;
- c. trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or paleontological material or object, or any meteorite;
- d. bring onto or use at an archaeological or paleontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment that assists in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and paleontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites, or
- e. alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years as protected.

The above mentioned may only be disturbed or moved by an archaeologist, after receiving a permit from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA). In order to demolish such a site or structure, a destruction permit from SAHRA will also be needed.

Human remains

Graves and burial grounds are divided into the following:

- a. ancestral graves
- b. royal graves and graves of traditional leaders
- c. graves of victims of conflict
- d. graves designated by the Minister
- e. historical graves and cemeteries
- f. human remains

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

- a. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;
- b. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority;
or
- c. bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.

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

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are subject to provisions of the **National Health Act (Act 61 of 2003)** and to local regulations. Exhumation of graves must conform to the standards set out in the **Ordinance on Exhumations (Ordinance no. 12 of 1980)** (replacing the old Transvaal Ordinance no. 7 of 1925).

Permission must also be gained from the descendants (where known), the National Department of Health, Provincial Department of Health, Premier of the Province and local police. Furthermore, permission must also be gained from the various landowners (i.e. where the graves are located and where they are to be relocated) before exhumation can take place. Human remains can only be handled by a registered undertaker or an institution declared under the **National Health Act (Act 61 of 2003)**.

4.2 The National Environmental Management Act

This act (Act 107 of 1998) states that a survey and evaluation of cultural resources must be done in areas where development projects, that will change the face of the environment, will be undertaken. The impact of the development on these resources should be determined and proposals for the mitigation thereof are made.

Environmental management should also take the cultural and social needs of people into account. Any disturbance of landscapes and sites that constitute the nation's cultural heritage should be avoided as far as possible and where this is not possible the disturbance should be minimized and remedied.

5. THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATIONS' PERFORMANCE STANDARD FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE

This standard recognizes the importance of cultural heritage for current and future generations. It aims to ensure that clients protect cultural heritage in the course of their project activities.

This is done by clients abiding to the law and having heritage surveys done in order to identify and protect cultural heritage resources via field studies and the documentation of such resources. These need to be done by competent professionals (e.g. archaeologists and cultural historians). Possible chance finds, encountered during the project development, also needs to be managed by not disturbing it and by having it assessed by professionals.

Impacts on the cultural heritage should be minimized. This include the possible maintenance of such sites in situ, or when impossible, the restoration of the functionality of the cultural heritage in a different location. When cultural historical and archaeological artefacts and structures need to be removed is should be done by professionals and by abiding to the applicable legislation.

The removal of cultural heritage resources may however only be considered if there are not technically or financially feasible alternatives. In considering the removal of cultural resources, it should be outweighed by the benefits of the overall project to the effected communities. Again professionals should carry out the work and adhere to the best available techniques.

Consultation with affected communities should be engaged in. This entails that access to such communities should be granted to their cultural heritage if this is applicable. Compensation for the loss of cultural heritage should only be given in extra-ordinary circumstances.

Critical cultural heritage may not be impacted on. Professionals should be used to advise on the assessment and protection thereof. Utilization of cultural heritage resources should always be done in consultation with the effected communities in order to be consistent with their customs and traditions and to come to agreements with relation to possible equitable sharing of benefits from commercialization.

6. METHODOLOGY

6.1 Survey of literature

A survey of literature was undertaken in order to obtain background information regarding the area. This includes reports identified on the SAHRIS Database. Sources consulted in this regard are indicated in the bibliography. One other study in the adjacent area was noted with various others having been done in the Steelpoort Valley (SAHRIS database; Archaetnos database).

6.2 Field survey

The survey was conducted according to generally accepted HIA practices and was aimed at locating possible objects, sites and features of cultural significance in the area of proposed development. This was a Phase 1 survey the aim was to investigate the areas the pylons were going to impact. Since one sometimes looks a bit wider than the demarcated area, as the surrounding context needs to be taken into consideration, it was determined that an additional field survey was not needed as the changes was covered by the initial field study .

Where required, the location/position of any site was determined by means of a Global Positioning System (GPS)¹, while photographs were also taken where needed. The survey was undertaken by doing a physical survey via off-road vehicle and on foot and covered as much as possible of the area to be studied (Figure 4). Certain factors, such as accessibility, density of vegetation, etc. may however influence the coverage. The length of the proposed linear development is approximately 18 km, and the survey took approximately 11 hours to complete.

6.3 Oral histories and social consultation

People from local communities are interviewed in order to obtain information relating to the surveyed area. It needs to be stated that this is not applicable under all circumstances. When applicable, the information is included in the text and referred to in the bibliography.

6.4 Documentation

All sites, objects, features, and structures identified were documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. Co-ordinates of individual localities were determined by means of the Global Positioning System

¹ A Garmin Oregon 550 with an accuracy factor of a few meters.

north and a provincial road to the south with a small section of just north of the Steelpoort River.

The environment along the length of the route within the surveyed area is much the same. It consists of sections with thick natural bush, mainly caused by over-grazing for example at pylons 37, 38, 56, 57, and 58 (Figure 6-7). In such areas both the vertical and horizontal archaeological visibility was difficult. However, the majority of the areas surveyed the vegetation cover was low and with open patches, indicating that the area had been disturbed for example at pylons 2, 6, 8, 10, 13, 24, 41, 43, and 85. Here archaeological visibility was relatively good (Figure 8-9).

Certain sections show signs of bush clearance which can be seen for example at pylons 20, and 22 (Figure 10). Other disturbance in and around the proposed pylon locations include roads crossing (Figure 11), power lines (Figure 12), and over-grazing (Figure 13). Pylon sites 25, 26, 27, 44, 45, 86 and 87 were not accessible, due to being fenced off and no access could be granted to these areas (Figure 14-16).

The topography of the area has a slight fall from southeast to northwest, towards the Steelpoort River. A few hills are also found within the surveyed areas.



Figure 5: The Merensky substation.



Figure 6: View of the environment showing thick bush at the proposed pylon site 37.



Figure 7: Another view of dense vegetation close to at the proposed pylon site 56.



Figure 8: A relatively open area at proposed pylon site 78. Note the exiting power line running parallel to the site.



Figure 9: Another open area at proposed pylon site 13.



Figure 10: View of vegetation clearing at proposed pylon site 20.



Figure 11: A dirt road running through proposed pylon site 54.



Figure 12: View proposed pylon site 74 next to construction of another powerline.



Figure 13: View of over-grazing at proposed pylon site 41.



Figure 14: View of fence, restricting access to pylon sites 25-27.



Figure 15: View of fence, restricting access to pylon sites 44-45.



Figure 16: View of fence, restricting access to pylon sites 86-87.

8. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Three sites of cultural heritage significance was located during the survey. Some background information is given in order to place the surveyed area in a broad historical and geographical context and to contextualize possible finds that could be unearthed during construction activities.

A large number of heritage reports were completed around the towns of Steelpoort and Burgersfort previously (SAHRA's SAHRIS database; Archaetnos database). These are included in the discussion below. One of these was a previous study on this line (Van Vollenhoven 2017).

8.1 Stone Age

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

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

No Stone Age sites are indicated in a historical atlas of this area. However one needs to take note that this may only indicate a lack of research in the area. The closest

Stone Age sites indicated in the atlas is Middle and Late Stone Age sites close to Ohrigstad (Bergh 1999: 5).

Stone Age material was however found during various surveys in and around Burgersfort and Steelpoort. This includes rock paintings at the Two Rivers Mine (Archaetnos database). Higgitt et.al. (2015: 21-22) did identify MSA tools on the farm De Grooteboom. These were however found in eroded areas, an indication that it likely were in a secondary context. It also was located towards the south of the current surveyed area.

The environment definitely would be supportive to Stone Age activities. The nearby mountains give natural shelter and material to make stone tools from. The streams would lure animals to the area and these people would therefore have hunted here. The natural rock mostly includes shale, which is a soft stone, meaning that that there are very limited resources from which to make stone tools. This would most likely be limited to the mountain tops. One should therefore be on the lookout for stone tools during construction work on the site.

In fact, some stone tools were found during the survey (Figure 17-18). These date to the Early, Middle and Late Stone Age, but were found out of context along the river or in the eroded area.




Figure 17: Stone tools found during the survey.



Figure 18: Stone tools found during the 2017 survey in the eroded area.

8.2 Iron Age

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

Early Iron Age (EIA) 200 – 1000 A.D.

Late Iron Age (LIA) 1000 – 1850 A.D.

Huffman (2007: xiii) however, indicates that a Middle Iron Age should be included. His dates, which now seem to be widely accepted in archaeological circles, are:

Early Iron Age (EIA) 250 – 900 A.D.

Middle Iron Age (MIA) 900 – 1300 A.D.

Late Iron Age (LIA) 1300 – 1840 A.D.

The nearest Early Iron Age site to the surveyed area is the sites at Lydenburg and Klingbeil to the south-east of the surveyed area. A large number of Late Iron Age sites have previously been identified in an area roughly stretching between Lydenburg, Nelspruit and Badplaas (Bergh 1999: 6-7).

Other sites have also been identified by Archaetnos during surveys in the area (Archaetnos database). Iron Age potshards and features have been located at the farm De Grooteboom by Higgitt et.al. (2015: 22-24). These were towards the south of the current area being investigated.

During the current survey a hammer stone (Figure 19) was picked up close to the river. Pottery, without decoration was also found in the eroded area, thus being out of context (Figure 20). It therefore serves as proof that these people did utilize the area.



Figure 19: Hammer stone found during the 2017 survey.



Figure 20: Pottery found during the 2017 survey in the eroded area.

The general broader environment around the surveyed area is suitable for Iron Age people. The mountains would give shelter and building material and the valleys good grazing and ample water sources. One would therefore expect that Iron Age people

may have utilized the area. The white settlers moved into this environment later on for the same reason.

8.3 Historical Age

The historical age started with the first recorded oral histories in the area. It includes the moving into the area of people that were able to read and write. This era is sometimes called the Colonial era or the recent past.

Due to factors such as population growth and a decrease in mortality rates, more people inhabited the country during the recent historical past. Therefore and because less time has passed, much more cultural heritage resources from this era have been left on the landscape. It is important to note that all cultural resources older than 60 years are potentially regarded as part of the heritage and that detailed studies are needed in order to determine whether these indeed have cultural significance. Factors to be considered include aesthetic, scientific, cultural and religious value of such resources.

It is known that one of the early trade routes passed along the Steelpoort River (Bergh 1999: 9). At the beginning of the 19th century the area was inhabited by the Koni, Tau, Pedi and Roka who are all of Sotho origin. During the Difaquane, in ca.1822, the Ndebele of Mzilikazi entered this area from the south. In 1825 a Zulu group under Zwibe attacked the Ndebele here. As a result these other groups fled to the north. They returned later on (Bergh 1999: 10-11).

None of the early travellers who visited the old Transvaal visited this area. In 1836 the Voortrekker groups of Tregardt and Van Rensburg passed to the west of the Steelpoort River (Bergh 1999: 13-14). The land around Lydenburg, including the Steelpoort River Valley was traded from the Swazi in 1846 and the first white settlers then started farming here (Bergh 1999: 16, 130-132).

Historical structures, such as farm houses and infrastructure may therefore be found in the area. Such buildings have been identified on neighboring farms during past surveys (Archaetnos database; Mathoho 2012: 31-33). Signs of the earliest historical mining activities were also identified on adjacent farms (Archaetnos database; Stegmann & Roodt 2012). Many graves from this period are also known from other nearby farms (Archaetnos database; Mathoho 2012: 34)).

One Provincial Heritage site is known from the area. About 10 km towards the south of the study area the Tšate Valley site is situated (Figure 21-22). It commemorates the rise of the Pedi Kingdom.



Figure 21: Commemorative stone for British soldiers who died in the war against the Pedi State.



Figure 22: Statue of Chief Sekhukhune.

9. DISCUSSION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IDENTIFIED DURING THE SURVEY

Three sites were identified during the current and 2017 survey. Database research showed various sites in the greater geographical area. The closest to the study area are those found by Fourie (2021), Mathoho (2012), and Pistorius (2019) discussed above. Fourie (2021) identified building remains, graves, Iron Age sites, and scattered stone tools (Figure 23). Some of the stone tool sites are about 30 m from a proposed pylon location and care should be taken during construction not to disturb these sites. Mathoho (2012) identified building remains, farmyards and graves, but the closest one to the study area is found on the northern side of the river, approximately 2 km from the corridor that was investigated (Figure 24). It will thus not be impacted on. Pistorius (2019) identified a line of upright stone, approximately 562 m from the nearest proposed pylon location (Figure 25). It will thus not be impacted on.



Figure 23: Location of the heritage sites identified before by Fourie (2021) in the vicinity of the line (Green: historical structures; Red: graves; Purple: Iron Age; Pink: stone tools).




Figure 24: Location of heritage sites identified by Mathoho (2012).




Figure 25: Location of the heritage site identified (Purple: Iron age) by Pistorius (2019).

9.1 Site 1 – Clay walled building remains

The remains of a building, probably a house, built from clay were identified (Figure 26). It is rectangular with sides of 10 x 12 m and two rooms. The height of the walls

varies between a few centimetres and about 2,5 m. It likely was a workers house on a farm. No artefacts were seen on site.

GPS: 24°43'12.86"S; 30°11'52.71"E

The site likely is older than 60 years, but without artefactual evidence this is difficult to tell. It is in a poor state and not very unique.



Figure 26: Remains of mud/ clay building.

Cultural significance Table:

A place is considered to be part of the national estate if it has cultural significance because of -	Applicable or not	Rating: 1=Negligible/ 2=Low/ 3=Low-Medium/ 4=Medium/ 5=Medium-High/ 6=High/ 7=Very High
Its importance in the community or pattern of South Africa's history	Y	Negligible
Its possession of uncommon, rare, or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural history	N	
Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South	N	

Africa's natural or cultural heritage		
Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects	N	
Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community cultural group	N	
Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period	Y	Negligible
Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons	N	
Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance in the history of South Africa	N	
Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa	N	
Reasoned assessment of significance using appropriate indicators outlined above:		Negligible

Integrity scale:

- 1 – Bad state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 2 – Bad state of preservation and includes contextual information
- 3 – Reasonable state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 4 – Reasonable state of preservation and includes contextual information
- 5 – Good state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 6 - Good state of preservation and includes contextual information
- 7 – Excellent state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 8 – Excellent state of preservation and includes contextual information

Field-rating = Cultural significance x Integrity

= 1 (Negligible) x 3

= 3

The field rating therefore is Local Grade IIIC. The description in the phase 1 heritage report is seen as sufficient recording (low significance) and it may be granted destruction at the discretion of the relevant heritage authority without a formal permit application, subjected to the granting of Environmental Authorisation.

9.2 Site 2 – Stone wall

The remains of a stone wall were identified (Figure 27). It is a single stone wall of approximately 6 m long. No artefacts were seen on site.

GPS: 24°47'5.09"S; 30°09'00.66"E

The site likely is older than 60 years, but without artefactual evidence this is difficult to tell. It is in a poor state and not very unique. It may be an old fence indicator.



Figure 27: Remains of a stone wall.

Cultural significance Table:

A place is considered to be part of the national estate if it has cultural significance because of -	Applicable or not	Rating: 1=Negligible/ 2=Low/ 3=Low-Medium/ 4=Medium/ 5=Medium-High/ 6=High/ 7=Very High
Its importance in the community or pattern of South Africa’s history	Y	Negligible

Its possession of uncommon, rare, or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural history	N	
Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage	N	
Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects	N	
Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community cultural group	N	
Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period	N	
Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons	N	
Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance in the history of South Africa	N	
Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa	N	
Reasoned assessment of significance using appropriate indicators outlined above:		Negligible

Integrity scale:

- 1 – Bad state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 2 – Bad state of preservation and includes contextual information
- 3 – Reasonable state of preservation, but no contextual information

- 4 – Reasonable state of preservation and includes contextual information
- 5 – Good state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 6 - Good state of preservation and includes contextual information
- 7 – Excellent state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 8 – Excellent state of preservation and includes contextual information

Field-rating = Cultural significance x Integrity

= 1 (Negligible) x 3

= 3

The field rating therefore is Local Grade IIIC. The description in the phase 1 heritage report is seen as sufficient recording (low significance) and it may be granted destruction at the discretion of the relevant heritage authority without a formal permit application, subjected to the granting of Environmental Authorisation.

9.3 Site 3 – Remains of stone structure

The remains of a stone structure were identified (Figure 28). It is rectangular with sides of 7 m x 6 m and is a single room and an enters to the north of the structure. And most likely served as part of animal husbandry. No artefacts were seen on site.

GPS: 24°46'38.67"S; 30°09'34.09"E

The site likely is older than 60 years, but without artefactual evidence this is difficult to tell. It is in a poor state and not very unique.



Figure 28: Remains of stone structure.

Cultural significance Table:

A place is considered to be part of the national estate if it has cultural significance because of -	Applicable or not	Rating: 1=Negligible/ 2=Low/ 3=Low-Medium/ 4=Medium/ 5=Medium-High/ 6=High/ 7=Very High
Its importance in the community or pattern of South Africa's history	Y	Negligible
Its possession of uncommon, rare, or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural history	N	
Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage	N	
Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects	Y	Negligible
Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community cultural group	N	
Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period	N	
Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons	N	
Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance in the history of South Africa	N	

Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa	N	
Reasoned assessment of significance using appropriate indicators outlined above:		Negligible

Integrity scale:

- 1 – Bad state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 2 – Bad state of preservation and includes contextual information
- 3 – Reasonable state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 4 – Reasonable state of preservation and includes contextual information
- 5 – Good state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 6 - Good state of preservation and includes contextual information
- 7 – Excellent state of preservation, but no contextual information
- 8 – Excellent state of preservation and includes contextual information

Field-rating = Cultural significance x Integrity

= 1 (Negligible) x 3

= 3

The field rating therefore is Local Grade IIIC. The description in the phase 1 heritage report is seen as sufficient recording (low significance) and it may be granted destruction at the discretion of the relevant heritage authority without a formal permit application, subjected to the granting of Environmental Authorisation.

10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The heritage survey in the indicated area was completed successfully. Three sites were identified (Figure 29). Site 1 is about 120m from the nearest pylon, site 2 is about 50 m from the nearest pylon and site 3 is about 30m from the nearest pylon site. All sites are considered of low heritage significance, but care should be taken not to damage these sites during the construction process.



Figure 29: Location of the sites identified during the current survey (red) and 2017 survey (yellow).

The following is recommended:

1. Site no 1, 2 and 3 is of low significance and may thus be demolished if necessary.
2. However, it is highly unlikely that this would be needed, and it can be left to deteriorate naturally.
3. Stone tools sites have been identified in a previous study with the closest about 30m from proposed pylon locations 30 and 31, and care should be taken during construction not to disturb these sites.
4. The proposed project may therefore continue, but only after receiving comments from SAHRA.
5. It should be noted that the subterranean presence of archaeological and/or historical sites, features or artefacts is always a distinct possibility. Care should therefore be taken when development commences that if any of these are discovered, work on site immediate cease and a qualified archaeologist be called in to investigate the occurrence.

11. REFERENCES

- Archaetnos database.
- Bergh, J.S. (red.). 1999. **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.** Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Coertze, P.J. & Coertze, R.D. 1996. **Verklarende vakwoordeboek vir Antropologie en Argeologie.** Pretoria: R.D. Coertze.
- Fourie, W. 2021. **Proposed 60MW PV Plant at the Samancor Chrome's Tubatse Ferrochrome Smelter, Steelpoort, Limpopo.** (Unpublished report, Pretoria, PGS Heritage).
- Higgitt, N., Du Piesanie, J. & Nel, J. 2015. **De Grooteboom Mining Permit Application and Associated Environmental Management Plan Heritage Impact Assessment.** (Unpublished report, Digby Wells Environmental, Randburg).
- Huffman, T.N. 2007. **Handbook to the Iron Age: The Archaeology of Pre-Colonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa.** Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- International Finance Corporation. 2012. **Overview of performance standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability. Performance Standard 8, Cultural Heritage.** World Bank Group.
- Knudson, S.J. 1978. **Culture in retrospect.** Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Korsman, S.A. & Meyer, A. 1999. Die Steentydperk en rotskuns. Bergh, J.S. (red.). **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.** Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Mathoho, E.M. 2012. **Phase 1 Archaeological impact assessment investigations for the proposed construction of ± 30 km, 132 kv power line from Merensky substation to the proposed new Kalkfontein and Kennedy's Vale substations within the jurisdiction of Greater Tubatse Local Municipality, Sekhukhune District, Limpopo Province.** (Unpublished report, Polokwane, Vhufahashu Heritage Consultants).
- Pistorius, J.C.C. 2019. **A Phase I heritage impact assessment study for Lion Smelter in the Steelpoort, Limpopo Province.** (Unpublished report, Rustenburg, Archaeologist & Heritage Consultant).
- Republic of South Africa. 1980. **Ordinance on Exhumations** (Ordinance no. 12 of 1980). The Government Printer: Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa. 2003. **National Health Act** (No 61 of 2003). The Government Printer: Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa. 1999. **National Heritage Resources Act** (No 25 of 1999). Pretoria: the Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1998. **National Environmental Management Act** (no 107 of 1998). Pretoria: The Government Printer.
- SAHRA database.
- Stegmann, L. & Roodt, F.E. 2012. **Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment report Two Rivers Platinum Mine, Limpopo.** (Unpublished report, SHASA Heritage Consultants, Polokwane).
- Van der Ryst, M.M. & Meyer, A. 1999. Die Ystertydperk. Bergh, J.S. (red.).

Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.
Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

APPENDIX A

DEFINITION OF TERMS:

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

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

Feature: A coincidental find of movable cultural objects.

Object: Artefact (cultural object).

(Also see Knudson 1978: 20).

APPENDIX B

DEFINITION/ STATEMENT OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE:

- Historic value: Important in the community or pattern of history or has an association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance in history.
- Aesthetic value: Important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group.
- Scientific value: Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of natural or cultural history or is important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement of a particular period
- Social value: Have a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons.
- Rarity: Does it possess uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage.
- Representivity: Important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of natural or cultural places or object or a range of landscapes or environments characteristic of its class or of human activities (including way of life, philosophy, custom, process, land-use, function, design or technique) in the environment of the nation, province region or locality.

APPENDIX C

SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATING:

Cultural significance:

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

Heritage significance:

- Grade I Heritage resources with exceptional qualities to the extent that they are of national significance
- Grade II Heritage resources with qualities giving it provincial or regional importance although it may form part of the national estate
- Grade III Other heritage resources of local importance and therefore worthy of conservation

Field ratings:

National Grade I significance	should be managed as part of the national estate
Provincial Grade II significance	should be managed as part of the provincial estate
Local Grade IIIA	should be included in the heritage register and not be mitigated (high significance)
General protection A (IV A)	site should be mitigated before destruction (high/medium significance)
General protection B (IV B)	site should be recorded before destruction (medium significance)
General protection C (IV C)	phase 1 is seen as sufficient recording and it may be demolished (low significance)

APPENDIX D

PROTECTION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES:

Formal protection:

National heritage sites and Provincial heritage sites – grade I and II

Protected areas - an area surrounding a heritage site

Provisional protection – for a maximum period of two years

Heritage registers – listing grades II and III

Heritage areas – areas with more than one heritage site included

Heritage objects – e.g. archaeological, palaeontological, meteorites, geological specimens, visual art, military, numismatic, books, etc.

General protection:

Objects protected by the laws of foreign states

Structures – older than 60 years

Archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites

Burial grounds and graves

Public monuments and memorials

APPENDIX E

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT PHASES

1. Pre-assessment or scoping phase – establishment of the scope of the project and terms of reference.
2. Baseline assessment – establishment of a broad framework of the potential heritage of an area.
3. Phase I impact assessment – identifying sites, assess their significance, make comments on the impact of the development and makes recommendations for mitigation or conservation.
4. Letter of recommendation for exemption – if there is no likelihood that any sites will be impacted.
5. Phase II mitigation or rescue – planning for the protection of significant sites or sampling through excavation or collection (after receiving a permit) of sites that may be lost.
6. Phase III management plan – for rare cases where sites are so important that development cannot be allowed.