



Final Comment

In terms of section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)

Attention: AGES Environmental Unit

Postnet Suite 74
Private Bag X07
Arcadia
0007

Proposal for open cast mining Rooderand Portion 2 in the Bojanala Municipal District, Northwest Province

Kruger, N. May 2012. *Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) of Demarcated Surface Areas on the Farm Rooderand Portion 2, Bojanala Municipal District Northwest Province*

Atla Mining Resources (Pty) Ltd has proposed further development of open cast mining on Portion 2 of Rooderand Farm, Bonjala Municipal District, North West Province. The proposed mining area is north of and adjacent to the Pilanesberg Nature Reserve and the site is located within an area already disturbed by nearby formal and informal settlements and by mining and agricultural activity. This disturbance is most pronounced in the north of site, with the least impacted area that adjacent to the Nature Reserve fence. The vegetation of the site is Clay Thorn Bushveld and Mixed Bushveld and a river with two dams runs north-south in the eastern part of the property. The proposed activities will entail open pits, stockpiles, waste rock dumps, return water and tailings dams as well as plant and office facilities.

The archaeological survey consisted of a desktop study and a field survey. The desktop study revealed that the study area is known to be rich in early Moloko remains, where sites were often located at the foots of hills and contained little or no stone walling. Late Moloko culture is typified by stone walled settlements found, predominantly, on hilltops. The area also holds significant indicators of the Kgatla Kgafela sequences, with such sites as Mabele-a-Podi bearing testament to their presence in the area. Traces of iron smelting, and the associated ritual activities are likely to be found in this area.

The site survey identified several sites of varying significance. The study area was found to contain several isolated, low density surface occurrences of stone artefacts, predominantly of Middle Stone Age origins. These were determined to be of little significance.

The site survey also identified several Iron Age sites. Site IA01 was a large occupation site (100m x 1200m) located in the southern part of the property, aligned east-west. A large quantity of potsherds, upper and lower grindstones, granary stands and hut floors were identified. The absence of stone walling at an evidently occupied site indicates that this site was probably early Moloko (pre-1600 AD). Site IA02 was identified in the east of the study area and consisted of a single section of collapsed stone walling. Although no artefactual material was associated with the wall, it is likely to date to the last 300 years. Two heaped stone cairns were





identified in association with Site IA02, and these were identified as possible graves (BP01). Site IS01, in the south west of the study area, comprised the remains of an iron smelting site, measuring 50m², but disturbed along its eastern margin by a service road. This site contained a large number of artefacts related to iron working, including tuyere fragments, ceramics, iron objects, ore residue and iron slag. A single historical period site was identified (HP01), consisting of the brick and concrete foundations of a rectangular house, a concrete dam and a recent midden, containing glass, wood, plastic and metal objects; it was determined that the site was likely to be younger than 60 years old. All of these sites are within the footprint of the various activities proposed for this area.

Although no palaeontological assessment was conducted of the area, it is of low palaeontological significance as it is underlain by igneous rock which is largely unfossiliferous, and mantled by recent Quaternary deposits.

Decision:

SAHRA supports the recommendations of the author and requires that:

- The southern area of the site, consisting of Sites IA01 and IS01, as indicated by the author in the HIA, requires Phase 2 mitigation, in terms of Section 35 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999). This mitigation should take the form of systematic recording, excavation and sampling to be undertaken before trenching and any other earth-moving activity takes place. The visible material boundaries of the sites to be mitigated must be surveyed with the aid of a surveying instrument, and a photographic record must be established immediately before, during and after mitigation. The specialist will require a mitigation permit from the relevant Heritage Resources Authority. On receipt of a satisfactory mitigation (Phase 2) permit report from the archaeologist, the heritage authority will make further recommendations in terms of the site. Very often permission is given for the destruction of the remainder of the archaeological or palaeontological sites. Very rarely, if a site has high heritage significance the authority may request that it be conserved, that mini-site management plans, interpretive material and possibly protective infrastructure be established.
- Site IA02 should be recorded by means of drawings and photographs and the site should be subjected to shovel testing to establish context. A Shovel Testing Permit will be required for this work, and the results of this testing will need to form part of the Phase 2 mitigation report to be submitted to SAHRA for comment.
- The possible graves (BP01) should be investigated by means of shovel testing to determine whether they are indeed graves; a Shovel Testing Permit will be required for this work. If the features are graves, provisional protection under Section 36 of the NHRA (Act 25 of 1999) applies. As such, protection and conservation is always the preferred course of action, but if the area where the burials are located falls within the development footprint and cannot be excluded from the development area, then the provisions stipulated in Section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999) are applicable, and relocation of these might proceed provided that a public consultation process is followed (see Attachment and SAHRA Regulations).

Decisions on Built Environment (e.g. structures over 60 years) and associated Living Heritage (e.g. sacred





Enquiries: Kathryn Smuts
Tel: 021 462 4502
Email: ksmuts@sahra.org.za
CaseID: 357

Date: Thursday September 20, 2012

Page No: 3

sites) must be made by the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority of the North West Province (**Mr. Mothlabane Mosiane**, email: mosianem@nwpg.gov.za) to whom this Archaeological Review Comment will be copied.

Should you have any further queries, please contact the designated official using the case number quoted above in the case header.

Yours faithfully

Kathryn Smuts
Heritage Officer: Archaeology
South African Heritage Resources Agency

Colette Scheermeyer
SAHRA Head Archaeologist
South African Heritage Resources Agency

ADMIN:

Terms & Conditions:

1. This approval does not exonerate the applicant from obtaining local authority approval or any other necessary approval for proposed work.
2. If any heritage resources, including graves or human remains, are encountered they must be reported to SAHRA immediately.
3. SAHRA reserves the right to request additional information as required.



The South African Heritage Resources Agency

Street Address: 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town 8000 * Postal Address: PO Box 4637, Cape Town 8000
* Tel: +27 21 462 4502 * Fax: +27 21 462 4509 * Web: <http://www.sahra.org.za>