

FOR ATTENTION: SAHRA Mpumalanga



**SOUTH AFRICAN HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY**  
111 HARRINGTON STREET, CAPE TOWN, 8001  
PO BOX 4837, CAPE TOWN, 8000  
TEL: 021 482 4502 FAX: 021 482 4509

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:**

File No.: **9/2/248/0001**  
Date received: 25 November 2005 (reminder) .....  
Date of comment: 25 November 2005.....  
Sent to peer review: .....  
Date to Peer Rev.: .....  
SAHRA Contact Person.: Dr S Wurz  
Plan2Survey Ref: K1995t-tim

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT**

**ASSESSMENT**

BY ARCHAEOLOGIST OF HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY

**REVIEW COMMENT ON**

*South Africa has a unique and non-renewable archaeological heritage. Archaeological sites are protected in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999) and may not be disturbed without a permit. Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIAs) identify and assess the significance of the sites, assess the potential impact of developments upon such sites, and make recommendations concerning mitigation and management of these sites. On the basis of satisfactory specialist reports SAHRA or the relevant heritage resources agency can assess whether or not it has objection to a development and indicate the conditions upon which such development might proceed and assess whether or not to issue permission to destroy such sites.*

*AIAs often form part of the heritage component of an Environmental Impact Assessment or Environmental Management Plan. They may also form part of a Heritage Impact Assessment called for in terms of section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act No. 25, 1999. They may have other origins. In any event they should comply with basic minimum standards of reporting as indicated in SAHRA Regulations and Guidelines.*

*This form provides review comment from the Archaeologist of the relevant heritage resources authority for use by Heritage Managers, for example, when informing authorities that have applied to SAHRA for comment and for inclusion in documentation sent to environmental authorities. It may be used in conjunction with Form B, which provides relevant peer review comment.*

- A. PROVINCE: *Mpumalanga*.....
- B. REGIONAL MANAGER : *Mr Neo January & Mr Godfrey Tshivhalavhala*.....
- C. AUTHOR(S) OF REPORT: *Dr J van Schalkwyk* .....
- .....
- D. DATE OF REPORT: *March 2005*.....
- E. TITLE OF REPORT: *Heritage Impact Assessment: Portion 5 of the farm Boschrand 283JT (Riverside)* .....
- .....
- F. Please circle as relevant: Archaeological component of EIA / EMP / HIA / CMP Other (Specify).....
- G. REPORT COMMISSIONED BY (CONSULTANT): *Plan-2-Survey Africa*.....
- H. CONTACT DETAILS: *Kevin Kritzinger, PO Box 3203, Nelspruit, 1200, Tel 013 741 1060, Fax 013 741 3752, Cell 082 7740 720, email: plan2survey@telkomsa.net*
- I. COMMENTS: (Please find comment on separate sheet(s) attached. ....

*Please see comment on next page*.....

**REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**


*J van Schalkwyk  
27 March 2005*

***Heritage Impact Assessment: Portion 5 of the farm Boschrand 283JT  
(Riverside)***

This report assesses the heritage of farm Boschrand, located immediately east of the R40, on the northern outskirts of Nelspruit on the way to Witrivier. The report notes that there are no obvious features, sites or artefacts of cultural significance that would be impacted on by the proposed development. However, as the vegetation is very dense in some of the areas surveyed, any archaeological sites or graves exposed during construction work should be reported immediately to an archaeologist.

The SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite supports these recommendations and has no objection to development in terms of section 35 of the NHRA.

NAME OF ARCHAEOLOGIST: *PP Mary Leslie* .....

SIGNATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGIST:  .....

EMAIL: *mleslie@sahra.org.za* .....

NAME OF HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY: *SAHRA* .....

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE COMMENT (ABOVE OR APPENDED) CONSTITUTES THE COMMENT OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGIST AND THAT ANY DEVELOPMENT THAT INVOLVES DESTRUCTION OF ANY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE IS STILL SUBJECT TO A PERMIT/PERMISSION FOR DESTRUCTION OF SUCH SITE GIVEN TO THE DEVELOPER BY THE RELEVANT HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERMIT COMMITTEE (THIS WILL BE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE PHASE 2 OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION AS NECESSARY). THIS REPORT MAY BE TAKEN ONLY AS APPROVAL, IN PRINCIPLE, IN TERMS OF SECTION 35 OF THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT. THE PROVINCIAL MANAGER OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY MUST ADVISE AS TO APPROVAL IN TERMS OF HERITAGE ISSUES ENCOMPASSED BY OTHER ASPECTS OF THE LEGISLATION, SUCH AS ISSUES OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (STRUCTURES (E.G. FARM HOUSES), OVER 60 YEARS), INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS OR OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES AS THIS IS NOT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGIST.

PLEASE NOTE THAT SAHRA IS NOW RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE I HERITAGE RESOURCES (AND EXPORT) AND THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE II AND GRADE III HERITAGE RESOURCES, EXCEPT WHERE THERE IS AN AGENCY ARRANGEMENT WITH THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY.