



Final Comment

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

Attention: Plan-2-Survey Africa Inc.

Pelser, A. & Van der Walt, J. November 2010. A Report on A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed Sedaven Development of Portions 8 & 25 of the Farm Boschoek 385 IR, Heidelberg, Gauteng.

The assessment was initiated in expectation of future developments within the study area. The development area is located approximately 8km west of Heidelberg and is bordered by the Suikerbosrand Nature Reserve to the west and north. The authors note parts of the study area have already been developed and that large areas are covered with ploughed fields.

The following heritage sites were identified:

Site 1 – The Sedaven Cemetery. The authors state that the oldest grave in the cemetery dates to 1963 and therefore falls outside SAHRA's jurisdiction. The authors recommend that the site and graves be left intact and that no development should take place within a 15m perimeter from the fence surrounding the site.

Site 2 - A Late Iron Age find-spot, located near Site 1 and characterised by scattered, undecorated potsherds and some low stone walling sections. The authors state that this site is not significant. The authors give no recommendations regarding this site.

Site 3 – A Large Late Iron Age stone walled settlement of at least 3 occupational units along with features such as cattle enclosures and walling, as well as pottery, ash and bone. The authors recommend the following mitigation measures:

- Mapping and drawing the settlement in order to determine its layout and organization and full extent.
- Fencing-in the site to ensure that no further damage to the walling occurs.
- Drafting a Management Plan for the site.

The authors state that if the development is going to impact on the site, mitigation measures should be implemented, including archaeological excavations after which a destruction permit can be obtained.

Site 4 – Late Iron Age stone walling. The authors state that this site is similar to Site 3 and possibly formed part of the same Settlement Complex. The authors give no recommendations regarding this site.

Site 5 – An old silo and dairy/farmstead. The authors state that the age of the silo and related structures are





not known but could be older than 60 years. The authors recommend that if the development is going to impact on the site, an architectural historian should assess the site and recommend suitable mitigation measures.

Site 6 – An informal cemetery of approximately 42 graves, with the oldest known date of death being 2003. The authors state that the graves most likely belong to local farm workers and informal settlers as well as staff workers at Sedaven. The authors recommend that the area be fenced and that no development should take place within 15m from the fence around it and that a Management Plan for the grave yard, to be incorporated in the development plans, should be drafted.

Historical buildings in the School/Village area. The authors identified a number of possible historically significant structures, although no date for these structures is given. The authors state that if there will be any impact on these structures, an Architectural Historian be employed to assess their age and significance.

Decision:

For Sites 2 - 4, the SAHRA APM Unit recommends that these sites be treated as one settlement complex and that the recommendations of the authors be followed of mapping and drawing the settlement in order to determine its layout, organisation and full extent, that fencing take place to ensure that no further damage to the walling occurs, and that a Management Plan for the sites be drafted and submitted to APM Unit. The SAHRA APM Unit supports the recommendations of the authors that if the development is going to impact on these sites, mitigation measures should be implemented, including archaeological excavations after which a destruction permit can be obtained. The specialist will also require a mitigation permit in terms of section 35 of the NHRA (Act no. 25 of 1999).

Regarding the two cemeteries: considering the age of Site 1 as reported by the authors, any mitigation necessitated by development will have to be negotiated with the Local Municipality. For Site 6, the graves should be restored where these are dilapidated, protected and conserved in perpetuity. For this purpose, a proper fence must be build around them including entry gates to allow visits from relatives and family friends. The fence must be placed 2 meters away from the perimeter of the graves. No development is allowed within 15 meters from the fence line surrounding the graves. Alternatively, if the area where the burials are located fall within the development footprint, then 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.

Please note that where the development involves disturbance of an archaeological or palaeontological site of some significance and Phase 2 mitigation has been asked for, SAHRA will require that, in terms of





s.38(4)(b&c) of the National Heritage Resources Act, the provisions of section 35 apply. 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.

For the Historical Buildings, please note that decisions on Built Environment must be referred to the Gauteng Provincial Heritage Resources Agency (Ms Maphata Ramphele: Maphata.Ramphele@gauteng.gov.za, Mr Grant Botha: grantb@gpg.gov.za).

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

Yours faithfully

Andrew Salomon
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.

