

Phase 1 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment:

**GENERAL WASTE DISPOSAL SITE AT THE ESKOM MAJUBA POWER STATION, GERT SIBANDE
DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

Prepared for:

BTW & Associates: Mr B Bouwer

- Postal Address: Old Farm Office Park Block B, 881 Old Farm Road, Faerie Glen, Pretoria; Tel: (012) 991 0161; E-mail: basieb@btw.co.za

Prepared by:

J A van Schalkwyk (D Litt et Phil),

- Heritage Consultant: ASAPA Registration No.: 164 - Principal Investigator: Iron Age, Colonial Period, Industrial Heritage.
- Postal Address: 62 Coetzer Avenue, Monument Park, 0181; Tel: 076 790 6777; E-mail: jvschalkwyk@mweb.co.za

Report No: 2018/JvS/017

- Status: Final
- Date: April 2018
- Revision No: -
- Date: -



Copy Right:

This report is provided solely for the purposes set out in it and may not, in whole or in part, be used for any other purpose or by a third party, without the author's prior written consent.


Specialist competency:

Johan A van Schalkwyk, D Litt et Phil, heritage consultant, has been working in the field of heritage management for more than 40 years. Originally based at the National Museum of Cultural History, Pretoria, he has actively done research in the fields of anthropology, archaeology, museology, tourism and impact assessment. This work was done in Limpopo Province, Gauteng, Mpumalanga, North West Province, Eastern Cape Province, Northern Cape Province, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Lesotho and Swaziland. Based on this work, he has curated various exhibitions at different museums and has published more than 70 papers, most in scientifically accredited journals. During this period, he has done more than 2000 Phase 1 and Phase 2 impact assessments (archaeological, anthropological, historical and social) for various government departments and developers. Projects include environmental management frameworks, roads, pipeline-, and power line developments, dams, mining, water purification works, historical landscapes, refuse dumps and urban developments. A complete *curriculum vitae* can be supplied on request.

Declaration:

I, J A van Schalkwyk, declare that:

- I am suitably qualified and accredited to act as independent specialist in this application.
- I do not have any financial or personal interest in the proposed development, nor its developers or any of their subsidiaries, apart from the provision of heritage assessment and management services, for which a fair numeration is charged.
- The work was conducted in an objective manner and any circumstances that might have compromised this have been reported.



J A van Schalkwyk
Heritage Consultant
April 2018



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**Phase 1 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment:
GENERAL WASTE DISPOSAL SITE AT THE ESKOM MAJUBA POWER STATION, GERT SIBANDE
DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

BTW & Associates (Pty) Ltd was contracted by *Eskom* as independent consultant to undertake the Scoping and EIA process for the development of a new general waste disposal site at the Majuba Power Station in Mpumalanga Province.

In accordance with Section 38 of the NHRA, an independent heritage consultant was appointed by *BTW & Associates (Pty) Ltd* to conduct a cultural heritage assessment to determine if the proposed activities would have an impact on any sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance.

The cultural landscape qualities of the region essentially consist of a rural area in which the human occupation is made up of a limited Stone Age occupation. This was followed much later by Nguni-speaking agro-pastoralists that settled in the larger region. They were soon followed by a colonial (farmer) component, which gave rise to the development of small villages and towns that dot the larger landscape. The final transformation was brought about by the development of infrastructure in the region, such as roads and railway lines and the development of large numbers of mines.

This report describes the methodology used, the limitations encountered, the heritage features that were identified and the recommendations and mitigation measures proposed relevant to this. It should be noted that the implementation of the mitigation measures is subject to SAHRA/PHRA's approval.

During the physical survey, no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified.

Impact assessment


- As no sites, features or objects of cultural historic significance were identified in the study area, there would be no impact resulting from the proposed development.

Reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity should be authorised:

- From a heritage point of view, it is recommended that the proposed development be allowed to continue, on acceptance of the proposed mitigation measures.

Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation:

- Should archaeological sites or graves be exposed in other areas during construction work, it must immediately be reported to a heritage practitioner so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made.



J A van Schalkwyk
Heritage Consultant
April 2018

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Project description	
Description	General Waste Disposal Site at Eskom Majuba Power Station
Project name	General Waste Disposal Site at the Eskom Majuba Power Station

Applicant
Eskom: Majuba Power Station

Environmental assessors
BTW & Associates (Pty) Ltd
Mr B Bouwer

Property details						
Province	Mpumalanga					
Magisterial district	Volksrust					
District municipality	Gert Sibande					
Topo-cadastral map	2729BB					
Farm name	Portions 1,2 and 6 of the Farm Witkoppies 81HS					
Closest town	Amersfoort					
Coordinates	Centre point (approximate)					
	No	Latitude	Longitude	No	Latitude	Longitude
	1	-27,11859	29,77431			

Development criteria in terms of Section 38(1) of the NHR Act	Yes/No
Construction of road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other linear form of development or barrier exceeding 300m in length	No
Construction of bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length	No
Development exceeding 5000 sq m	Yes
Development involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions	No
Development involving three or more erven or divisions that have been consolidated within past five years	No
Rezoning of site exceeding 10 000 sq m	No
Any other development category, public open space, squares, parks, recreation grounds	No

Land use	
Previous land use	Farming (grazing)
Current land use	Farming (grazing)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	II
TECHNICAL SUMMARY	II
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	V
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK.....	1
3. HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	1
4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	1
5. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT.....	2
7. SURVEY RESULTS	1
8. RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATINGS	1
9. MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES.....	1
10. CONSLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	1
11. REFERENCES	1
12. ADDENDUM.....	2
1. Indemnity and terms of use of this report.....	2
2. Assessing the significance of heritage resources and potential impacts	1
3. Mitigation measures	5
4. Relocation of graves.....	7
5. Inventory of identified cultural heritage sites.....	8

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. Heritage screening: known heritage sites and features within a 4km radius.	2
Figure 2. Map indicating the track log of the field survey.....	3
Figure 3. Vegetation cover encountered during the field survey.....	3
Figure 4. Location of the study area in regional context.....	1
Figure 5. Layout of the proposed development (to the left of the existing dump site).....	2
Figure 6. Views of the natural landscape in the study area.	3
Figure 7. Aerial view of the study area.....	3
Figure 8. Location of heritage sites in the study area.	1

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**TERMS**

Bioturbation: The burrowing by small mammals, insects and termites that disturb archaeological deposits.

Cumulative impacts: “Cumulative Impact”, in relation to an activity, means the past, current and reasonably foreseeable future impact of an activity, considered together with the impact of activities associated with that activity, that in itself may not be significant, but may become significant when added to existing and reasonably foreseeable impacts eventuating from similar or diverse activities.

Debitage: Stone chips discarded during the manufacture of stone tools.

Factory site: A specialised archaeological site where a specific set of technological activities has taken place – usually used to describe a place where stone tools were made.

Historic Period: Since the arrival of the white settlers - c. AD 1830 - in this part of the country.

Holocene: The most recent time period, which commenced c. 10 000 years ago.

Iron Age (also referred to as **Early Farming Communities**): Period covering the last 1800 years, when new people brought a new way of life to southern Africa. They established settled villages, cultivated domestic crops such as sorghum, millet and beans, and they herded cattle as well as sheep and goats. As they produced their own iron tools, archaeologists call this the Iron Age.

Early Iron Age	AD 200 - AD 900
Middle Iron Age	AD 900 - AD 1300
Later Iron Age	AD 1300 - AD 1830

Midden: The accumulated debris resulting from human occupation of a site.

Mitigation, means to anticipate and prevent negative impacts and risks, then to minimise them, rehabilitate or repair impacts to the extent feasible.

National Estate: The collective heritage assets of the Nation.

Pleistocene: Geological time period of 3 000 000 to 20 000 years ago.

Stone Age: The first and longest part of human history is the Stone Age, which began with the appearance of early humans between 3-2 million years ago. Stone Age people were hunters, gatherers and scavengers who did not live in permanently settled communities. Their stone tools preserve well and are found in most places in South Africa and elsewhere.

Early Stone Age	2 500 000 - 150 000 Before Present
Middle Stone Age	150 000 - 30 000 BP
Later Stone Age	30 000 - until c. AD 200

Tradition: As used in archaeology, it is a seriated sequence of artefact assemblages, particularly ceramics.

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

ASAPA	Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists
BCE	Before the Common Era (the year 0)
BP	Before Present (calculated from 1950 when radio-carbon dating was established)
CE	Common Era (the year 0)
ESA	Early Stone Age
EIA	Early Iron Age
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
I & AP's	Interested and Affected Parties
LIA	Late Iron Age
LSA	Later Stone Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NASA	National Archives of South Africa
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Agency
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency
SAHRIS	South African Heritage Resources Information System

**Phase 1 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment:
GENERAL WASTE DISPOSAL SITE AT THE ESKOM MAJUBA POWER STATION, GERT SIBANDE
DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

BTW & Associates (Pty) Ltd was contracted by *Eskom* as independent consultant to undertake the Scoping and EIA process for the development of a new general waste disposal site at the Majuba Power Station in Mpumalanga Province.

South Africa's heritage resources, also described as the 'national estate', comprise a wide range of sites, features, objects and beliefs. However, according to Section 27(18) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), No. 25 of 1999, 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 site.

In accordance with Section 38 of the NHRA, an independent heritage consultant was appointed by *BTW & Associates (Pty) Ltd* to conduct a cultural heritage assessment to determine if the proposed activities would have an impact on any sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance.

This report forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as required by the EIA Regulations in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) as amended and is intended for submission to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).

1.2 Terms and references

The aim of a full HIA investigation is to provide an informed heritage-related opinion about the proposed development by an appropriate heritage specialist. The objectives are to identify heritage resources (involving site inspections, existing heritage data and additional heritage specialists if necessary); assess their significances; assess alternatives in order to promote heritage conservation issues; and to assess the acceptability of the proposed development from a heritage perspective.

The result of this investigation is a heritage impact assessment report indicating the presence/absence of heritage resources and how to manage them in the context of the proposed development.

Depending on SAHRA's acceptance of this report, the developer will receive permission to proceed with the proposed development, on condition of successful implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

1.2.1 Scope of work

The aim of this study is to determine if any sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance occur within the boundaries of the area where the establishment of the landfill site is to take place. This includes:

- Conducting a desk-top investigation of the area;
- A visit to the proposed development site.

The objectives were to:

- Identify possible archaeological, cultural and historic sites within the proposed development areas;
- Evaluate the potential impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed development on archaeological, cultural and historical resources;
- Recommend mitigation measures to ameliorate any negative impacts on areas of archaeological, cultural or historical importance.

1.2.2 Assumptions and Limitations

The investigation has been influenced by the following factors:

- It is assumed that the description of the proposed project, provided by the client, is accurate.
- No subsurface investigation (i.e. excavations or sampling) were undertaken, since a permit from SAHRA is required for such activities.
- It is assumed that the public consultation process undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is sufficient and that it does not have to be repeated as part of the heritage impact assessment.
- The unpredictability of buried archaeological remains.
- This report does not consider the palaeontological potential of the site.

2. LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

2.1 Background

Heritage Impact Assessments are governed by national legislation and standards and International Best Practise. These include:

- South African Legislation
 - National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA);
 - Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, 2002 (Act No. 22 of 2002) (MPRDA);
 - National Environmental Management Act 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA); and
 - National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) (NWA).
- Standards and Regulations
 - South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) Minimum Standards;
 - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) Constitution and Code of Ethics;
 - Anthropological Association of Southern Africa Constitution and Code of Ethics.
- International Best Practise and Guidelines
 - ICOMOS Standards (Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties); and
 - The UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972).

2.2 Heritage Impact Assessment Studies

South Africa's unique and non-renewable archaeological and palaeontological heritage sites are 'generally' protected in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999, Section 35) and may not be disturbed at all without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority. The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999, Section 38) provides guidelines for Cultural Resources Management and prospective developments:

"38 (1) Subject to the provisions of subsections (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development categorised as:

- (a) the construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;*
- (b) the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length;*
- (c) any development or other activity which will change the character of a site:*
 - (i) exceeding 5 000 m² in extent; or*
 - (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or*
 - (iii) involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or*
 - (iv) the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;*
- (d) the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m² in extent; or*
- (e) any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority, must at the very earliest stages of initiating such a development, notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development."*

And:

"38 (3) The responsible heritage resources authority must specify the information to be provided in a report required in terms of subsection (2)(a): Provided that the following must be included:

- (a) The identification and mapping of all heritage resources in the area affected;*
- (b) an assessment of the significance of such resources in terms of the heritage assessment*

criteria set out in section 6(2) or prescribed under section 7;
(c) an assessment of the impact of the development on such heritage resources;
(d) an evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the sustainable social and economic benefits to be derived from the development;
(e) the results of consultation with communities affected by the proposed development and other interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources;
(f) if heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the consideration of alternatives; and
(g) plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after the completion of the proposed development.”

3. HERITAGE RESOURCES

3.1 The National Estate

The National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999) defines the heritage resources of South Africa which are of cultural significance or other special value for the present community and for future generations that must be considered part of the national estate to include:

- places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance;
- places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
- historical settlements and townscapes;
- landscapes and natural features of cultural significance;
- geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;
- archaeological and palaeontological sites;
- graves and burial grounds, including-
 - ancestral graves;
 - royal graves and graves of traditional leaders;
 - graves of victims of conflict;
 - graves of individuals designated by the Minister by notice in the Gazette;
 - historical graves and cemeteries; and
 - other human remains which are not covered in terms of the Human Tissue Act, 1983 (Act No. 65 of 1983);
- sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa;
- movable objects, including-
 - objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens;
 - objects to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
 - ethnographic art and objects;
 - military objects;
 - objects of decorative or fine art;
 - objects of scientific or technological interest; and
 - books, records, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic, film or video material or sound recordings, excluding those that are public records as defined in section 1(xiv) of the National Archives of South Africa Act, 1996 (Act No. 43 of 1996).

3.2 Cultural significance

In the NHRA, Section 2 (vi), it is stated that “cultural significance” means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance. This is determined in relation to a site or feature’s uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential.

According to Section 3(3) of the NHRA, a place or object is to be considered part of the national estate if it has cultural significance or other special value because of

- its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South 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;

- its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa; and
- sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

A matrix was developed whereby the above criteria were applied for the determination of the significance of each identified site. This allowed some form of control over the application of similar values for similar identified sites – see Section 2 of the Addendum below.

4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Extent of the Study

This survey and impact assessment covers all facets of cultural heritage located in the study area as presented in Section 5 below and illustrated in Figure 5.

4.2 Methodology

4.2.1 Desktop review

4.2.1.1 Survey of the literature

A survey of the relevant literature was conducted with the aim of reviewing the previous research done and determining the potential of the area. In this regard, various anthropological, archaeological and historical sources were consulted – see list of references in Section 11.

- Information on events, sites and features in the larger region were obtained from these sources.

4.2.1.2 Data bases

The *Heritage Atlas Database*, various SAHRA databases, the *Environmental Potential Atlas*, the *Chief Surveyor General* and the *National Archives of South Africa* were consulted.

- Database surveys produced a number of sites located in the larger region of the proposed development.

4.2.1.3 Other sources

Aerial photographs and topocadastral and other maps were also studied - see the list of references below.

- Features such as areas with a lack of vegetation, possible buildings, hills and pans, were identified and marked for investigation during the field survey.

4.2.1.4 Interpretation

The results of the above investigation are summarised in Table 1 below – see list of references in Section 11 – and can be summarised as follows:

- No known Stone Age sites occur in the larger region;
- Late Iron Age sites occur some distance (30km) to the southeast on the study area;
- Historic structures, inclusive of buildings, monuments and bridges, occur mostly in an urban environment (Bethal, Amersfoort), although they also occur sporadically on farms;
- Formal burial sites occur in an urban setting, with a number of informal ones occurring sporadically throughout the country side.

*Based on the above assessment, the probability of cultural heritage sites, features and objects occurring in the study area is deemed to be **Improbable (i.e., (some possibility, but low likelihood).***

Table 1: Pre-Feasibility Assessment

Category	Period	Presence	Reference
Early hominin	Pliocene – Lower Pleistocene		
	Early hominin	None	
Stone Age	Lower Pleistocene – Holocene		
	Early Stone Age	None	
	Middle Stone Age	None	

	Later Stone Age	Low	Heritage Database
	Rock Art	Low	Heritage Database
Iron Age	Holocene		
	Early Iron Age	None	
	Middle Iron Age	None	
	Late Iron Age	Low	Mason (1968)
Colonial period	Holocene		
	Contact period	Low	
	Recent history	Medium	Cloete (2000); Van Schalkwyk (2006, 2007, 2011, 2012, 2013)
	Industrial heritage	Low	Heritage Database




Figure 1. Heritage screening: known heritage sites and features within a 4km radius. (Circles spaced at 2km apart)

4.2.2 Field survey

The field survey was done according to generally accepted archaeological practices, and was aimed at locating all possible sites, objects and structures. The area that had to be investigated was identified by the *BTW & Associates (Pty) Ltd* by means of maps. This was loaded onto an ASUS digital device and used in Google Earth during the field survey to access the areas.

- The survey was conducted on 3 April 2018. The site was surveyed by an intensive pedestrian investigation – see Fig. 2 below.




Figure 2. Map indicating the track log of the field survey.
(Study area = red; tracklog = green)

4.2.4 Factors influencing the field survey

During the site visit, the vegetation encountered over most of the development area was very high and dense, consisting of tall grass. This impacted negatively on the archaeological visibility (Fig. 3).



Figure 3. Vegetation cover encountered during the field survey.

4.2.5 Documentation

All sites, objects and structures that are identified are documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. Coordinates of individual localities are determined by means of the *Global Positioning System* (GPS) and plotted on a map. This information is added to the description in order to facilitate the identification of each locality.

The track log and identified sites were recorded by means of a Garmin Oregon 550 handheld GPS device. Photographic recording was done by means of a Canon EOS 550D digital camera.

Map datum used: Hartebeeshoek 94 (WGS84).

5. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

5.1 Site location

The site proposed for the development of the general waste disposal site is located within the boundary of the Eskom Majuba Power Station, approximately 16 km southwest (SW) of Amersfoort and approximately 40km north-northwest (NNW) of Volksrust in the Mpumalanga Province. The site falls within the Pixley Ka Seme Local Municipality which falls within the Gert Sibande District Municipality. For more information, see the Technical Summary on p. iii above.




Figure 4. Location of the study area in regional context.

5.2 Development proposal

Eskom (Majuba Power Station) has applied for and received a permit to close the existing general landfill site, for which a draft permit issued in July 1990 expired, and replace it with a new site adjacent to it, for which the relevant permits and licences are to be obtained. The proposed new site would be used for the remaining life-span (45 years) of the power station. It is estimated that 980 tons of waste will be dumped per annum (see Fig. 5 below).



Figure 5. Layout of the proposed development (to the left of the existing dump site).
(Map supplied by BTW & Associates)

6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

6.1 Natural Landscape

The geology of the study area is made up of shale. The topography of the region can be described strongly undulating plains. The original vegetation is classified as Amersfoort Highveld Clay Grassland, which is part of the of the Mesic Highveld Grassland Bioregion (Muncina & Rutherford 2006). No streams or rivers occur in the study area.

It seems as if the study area was previously used for agricultural fields, as some contouring took place. Recently, however, the area was subjected only to grazing of cattle.





Existing landfill site	Looking north towards the power station
	
General vegetation cover	Alternative vegetation growth

Figure 6. Views of the natural landscape in the study area.



Figure 7. Aerial view of the study area.
(Image: Google Earth)

6.2 Cultural Landscape

The aim of this section is to present an overview of the history of the larger region in order to eventually determine the significance of heritage sites identified in the study area, within the context of their historic, aesthetic, scientific and social value, rarity and representivity.

The cultural landscape qualities of the region essentially consist of a rural area in which the human occupation is made up of a limited Stone Age occupation. This was followed much later by Nguni-speaking agro-pastoralist that settled in the larger region. They were soon followed by a colonial (farmer) component, which gave rise to the development of small villages and towns that dot the larger landscape. The final transformation was brought about by the development of infrastructure in the region, such as roads and railway lines and the development of large numbers of mines.

6.2.1 Stone Age

No information about Stone Age habitation of the area is available. There might be two reasons for this. Firstly, it is unlikely that Stone Age people would have occupied the area specific, as it would have been too cold, and no shelters or caves exists locally that could be used to shelter in. Secondly, no systematic survey of the area has been done and, as a result, no sites have been reported.

6.2.2 Iron Age

Iron Age people started to settle in southern Africa c. AD 300, with one of the oldest known sites at Silver Leaves, south east of Tzaneen dating to AD 270. However, Iron Age occupation of the eastern highveld area (including the study area) did not start much before the 1500s. Some sites dating to the Late Iron Age is known to exist to the north, south and west of the study area.

The occupation of the larger geographical area (including the study area) did not start much before the 1500s. By the 16th century things changed, with the climate becoming warmer and wetter, creating condition that allowed Late Iron Age (LIA) farmers to occupy areas previously unsuitable, for example the treeless plains of the Free State and North West Province.

6.2.3 Historic period

By the early 19th century white settlers took up farms. An investigation of the Title Deeds of most of the farms in the region indicates that they were surveyed as early as the 1860s, implying that they would have been occupied by colonists since then.

Many farmsteads in the region were destroyed during the Anglo Boer War. As a result, most structures date to the period after that. The architecture of these farmsteads can be described as eclectic as they were built and added to as required over a period of time. In some cases, outbuildings would be in the same style as the main house, if they date to the same period. However, they tend to vary considerably in style and materials used.

7. SURVEY RESULTS

During the physical survey, the following sites, features and objects of cultural significance were identified in the study area – see **Section 5** of the **Addendum** for a more detailed discussion of each of the identified sites, features or objects:

7.1 Stone Age

- No sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the Stone Age were identified in the study area.

7.2 Iron Age

- No sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the Iron Age were identified in the study area.

7.3 Historic period

- No sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the historic were identified in the study area.




Figure 8. Location of heritage sites in the study area.
(Please note that as no heritage sites were identified, nothing is indicated on the map.)

8. RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATINGS

8.1 Impact assessment

Heritage impacts are categorised as:

- Direct or physical impacts, implying alteration or destruction of heritage features within the project boundaries;
- Indirect impacts, e.g. restriction of access or visual intrusion concerning the broader environment;
- Cumulative impacts that are combinations of the above.

Impact analysis of cultural heritage resources under threat of the proposed development, is based on the present understanding of the development and its significance is calculated and presented below:

- As no sites, features or objects of cultural historic significance were identified in the study area, there would be no impact resulting from the proposed development.

Table 2: Calculation of the impact on the identified heritage features

Nature: No heritage features are located inside the proposed development area.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Site	Site
Duration	Permanent	Permanent
Magnitude	Minor	Minor
Probability	Low	Low
Significance	Low (6)	Low (6)
Status (positive or negative)	Neutral	Neutral
Reversibility	Non-reversible	Non-reversible
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be mitigated	Yes	
Mitigation: Avoidance of site		
Cumulative impact: Loss of one of a limited number of similar features in the larger landscape.		

9. MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Heritage sites are fixed features in the environment, occurring within specific spatial confines. Any impact upon them is permanent and non-reversible. Those resources that cannot be avoided and that are directly impacted by the proposed development can be excavated/recorded and a management plan can be developed for future action. Those sites that are not impacted on can be written into the management plan, whence they can be avoided or cared for in the future.

Sources of risk were considered with regards to development activities defined in Section 2(viii) of the NHRA that may be triggered and are summarised in Table 3A and 3B below. These issues formed the basis of the impact assessment described. The potential risks are discussed according to the various phases of the project below.

9.1 Objectives

- Protection of archaeological, historical and any other site or land considered being of cultural value within the project boundary against vandalism, destruction and theft.
- The preservation and appropriate management of new discoveries in accordance with the NHRA, should these be discovered during construction activities.

The following shall apply:

- Known sites should be clearly marked in order that they can be avoided during construction activities.
- The contractors and workers should be notified that archaeological sites might be exposed during the construction activities.
- Should any heritage artefacts be exposed during excavation, work on the area where the artefacts were discovered, shall cease immediately and the Environmental Control Officer shall be notified as soon as possible;
- All discoveries shall be reported immediately to a heritage practitioner so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made. Acting upon advice from these specialists, the Environmental Control Officer will advise the necessary actions to be taken;
- Under no circumstances shall any artefacts be removed, destroyed or interfered with by anyone on the site; and
- Contractors and workers shall be advised of the penalties associated with the unlawful removal of cultural, historical, archaeological or palaeontological artefacts, as set out in the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 51. (1).

9.2 Control

In order to achieve this, the following should be in place:

- A person or entity, e.g. Eskom or the or the principal construction contractor, should be tasked to take responsibility for the heritage sites and should be held accountable for any damage.
- Known sites should be located and isolated, e.g. by fencing them off. All construction workers should be informed that these are no-go areas, unless accompanied by the individual or persons representing the Environmental Control Officer as identified above.
- In areas where the vegetation is threatening the heritage sites, e.g. growing trees pushing walls over, it should be removed, but only after permission for the methods proposed has been granted by SAHRA. A heritage official should be part of the team executing these measures.

Table 3A: Construction Phase: Environmental Management Programme for the project

Action required	Protection of heritage sites, features and objects		
Potential Impact	The identified risk is damage or changes to resources that are generally protected in terms of Sections 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36 and 37 of the NHRA that may occur in the proposed project area.		
Risk if impact is not mitigated	Loss or damage to sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance		
Activity / issue	Mitigation: Action/control	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. Removal of Vegetation 2. Construction of required infrastructure, e.g. access roads, water pipelines	See discussion in Section 9.1 above	Construction Contractor	During construction only
Monitoring	See discussion in Section 9.2 above		

Table 3B: Operation Phase: Environmental Management Programme for the project

Action required	Protection of heritage sites, features and objects		
Potential Impact	It is unlikely that the negative impacts identified for pre-mitigation will occur if the recommendations are followed.		
Risk if impact is not mitigated	Loss or damage to sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance		
Activity / issue	Mitigation: Action/control	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. Removal of Vegetation 2. Construction of required infrastructure, e.g. access roads, water pipelines	See discussion in Section 9.1 above	Principal Contractor	During operation only
Monitoring	See discussion in Section 9.2 above		

9.3 Mitigation measures

Mitigation: means to anticipate and prevent negative impacts and risks, then to minimise them, rehabilitate or repair impacts to the extent feasible.

- For the current study, as no sites, features or objects of cultural historic significance have been identified in the study area, no mitigation measures are proposed.

10. CONSLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BTW & Associates (Pty) Ltd was contracted by *Eskom* as independent consultant to undertake the Scoping and EIA process for the development of a new general waste disposal site at the Majuba Power Station in Mpumalanga Province.

The cultural landscape qualities of the region essentially consist of a rural area in which the human occupation is made up of a limited Stone Age occupation. This was followed much later by Nguni-speaking agro-pastoralist that settled in the larger region. They were soon followed by a colonial (farmer) component, which gave rise to the development of small villages and towns that dot the larger landscape. The final transformation was brought about by the development of infrastructure in the region, such as roads and railway lines and the development of large numbers of mines.

This report describes the methodology used, the limitations encountered, the heritage features that were identified and the recommendations and mitigation measures proposed relevant to this. It should be noted that the implementation of the mitigation measures is subject to SAHRA/PHRA's approval.

During the physical survey, no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified.

Impact assessment

- As no sites, features or objects of cultural historic significance were identified in the study area, there would be no impact resulting from the proposed development.

Reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity should be authorised:

- From a heritage point of view, it is recommended that the proposed development be allowed to continue on acceptance of the proposed mitigation measures.

Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation:

- Should archaeological sites or graves be exposed in other areas during construction work, it must immediately be reported to a heritage practitioner so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made.

11. REFERENCES

11.1 Data bases

Chief Surveyor General.
Environmental Potential Atlas, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism.
Heritage Atlas Database, Pretoria.
SAHRA Archaeology and Palaeontology Report Mapping Project (2009).
SAHRIS Database.

11.2 Literature

- Bergh, J.S. (red.). 1998. *Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika: die vier noordelike provinsies*. Pretoria: J.L. Schaik.
- Cloete, P.G. 2000. *The Anglo-Boer War: a chronology*. Pretoria: JP van der Walt.
- Delius, P (ed.) 2007. *Mpumalanga: History and Heritage*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Huffman, T.N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Mason, R.J. 1968. Transvaal and Natal Iron Age settlement revealed by aerial photography and excavation. *African Studies* 27.
- Mason, R.J. 1969. *Prehistory of the Transvaal*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Muncina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. *The Vegetation Map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland*. Pretoria: SANBI.
- Raper, P.E. 2004. *South African place names*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball Publishers.
- Praagh, L.V. (ed.) 1906. *The Transvaal and its mines*. London: Praagh & Lloyd.
- Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2006. *Heritage impact scoping report for the underground coal gasification plant, Roodekopjes 67HS, Amersfoort district, Mpumalanga*. Unpublished report 2006KH055. Pretoria: National Cultural History Museum.
- Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2007. *Heritage scoping report for the proposed Majuba CCGT power plant, Amersfoort magisterial district, Mpumalanga*. Unpublished report 2007/JvS/081.
- Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2011. *Heritage impact assessment for the proposed expansion of the Majuba ash dam, Mpumalanga Province*. Unpublished report 2011/JvS/100.
- Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2012. *Cultural heritage impact scoping assessment report for the Underground Coal Gasification project and associated infrastructure in support of co-firing of gas at the Majuba Power Station, Amersfoort, Mpumalanga*. Unpublished report 2012/JvS/051.
- Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2013. *Proposed continuous disposal of ash at Majuba Power Station – cultural heritage impact assessment study*. Unpublished report 2012/JvS/051.

11.3 Maps and aerial photographs

1: 50 000 Topocadastral maps

Google Earth

12. ADDENDUM

1. Indemnity and terms of use of this report

The findings, results, conclusions and recommendations given in this report are based on the author's best scientific and professional knowledge as well as available information. The report is based on survey and assessment techniques which are limited by time and budgetary constraints relevant to the type and level of investigation undertaken and the author reserve the right to modify aspects of the report including the recommendations if and when new information may become available from ongoing research or further work in this field or pertaining to this investigation.

Although all possible care is taken to identify all sites of cultural importance during the investigation of study areas, it is always possible that hidden or sub-surface sites could be overlooked during the study. The author of this report will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result of such oversights.

Although the author exercises due care and diligence in rendering services and preparing documents, he accepts no liability and the client, by receiving this document, indemnifies the author against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, directly or indirectly by the author and by the use of the information contained in this document.

This report must not be altered or added to without the prior written consent of the author. This also refers to electronic copies of this report which are supplied for the purposes of inclusion as part of other reports, including main reports. Similarly, any recommendations, statements or conclusions drawn from or based on this report must make reference to this report. If these form part of a main report relating to this investigation or report, this report must be included in its entirety as an appendix or separate section to the main report.

2. Assessing the significance of heritage resources and potential impacts

A system for site grading was established by the NHRA and further developed by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA 2007) and has been approved by ASAPA for use in southern Africa and was utilised during this assessment.

2.1 Significance of the identified heritage resources

According to the NHRA, Section 2(vi) the **significance** of a heritage sites and artefacts is determined by its aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technical value in relation to the uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. It must be kept in mind that the various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and that the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these.

Matrix used for assessing the significance of each identified site/feature

1. SITE EVALUATION			
1.1 Historic value			
Is it important in the community, or pattern of history			
Does it have strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in history			
Does it have significance relating to the history of slavery			
1.2 Aesthetic value			
Is it important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group			
1.3 Scientific value			
Does it have potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of natural or cultural heritage			
Is it important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period			
1.4 Social value			
Does it have strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons			
1.5 Rarity			
Does it possess uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage			
1.6 Representivity			
Is it important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of natural or cultural places or objects			
Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a range of landscapes or environments, the attributes of which identify it as being characteristic of its class			
Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics 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.			
2. Sphere of Significance		High	Medium
International			
National			
Provincial			
Regional			
Local			
Specific community			
3. Field Register Rating			
1.	National/Grade 1: High significance - No alteration whatsoever without permit from SAHRA		
2.	Provincial/Grade 2: High significance - No alteration whatsoever without permit from provincial heritage authority.		
3.	Local/Grade 3A: High significance - Mitigation as part of development process not		

	advised.	
4.	Local/Grade 3B: High significance - Could be mitigated and (part) retained as heritage register site	
5.	Generally protected Grade 4A: High/medium significance - Should be mitigated before destruction	
6.	Generally protected Grade 4B: Medium significance - Should be recorded before destruction	
7.	Generally protected Grade 4C: Low significance - Requires no further recording before destruction	

2.2 Significance of the anticipated impact on heritage resources

All impacts identified during the HIA stage of the study will be classified in terms of their significance. Issues would be assessed in terms of the following criteria:

Nature of the impact

A description of what causes the effect, what will be affected and how it will be affected.

Extent

The physical **extent**, wherein it is indicated whether:

- 1 - The impact will be limited to the site;
- 2 - The impact will be limited to the local area;
- 3 - The impact will be limited to the region;
- 4 - The impact will be national; or
- 5 - The impact will be international.

Duration

Here it should be indicated whether the lifespan of the impact will be:

- 1 - Of a very short duration (0–1 years);
- 2 - Of a short duration (2-5 years);
- 3 - Medium-term (5–15 years);
- 4 - Long term (where the impact will persist possibly beyond the operational life of the activity);
or
- 5 - Permanent (where the impact will persist indefinitely).

Magnitude (Intensity)

The magnitude of impact, quantified on a scale from 0-10, where a score is assigned:

- 0 - Small and will have no effect;
- 2 - Minor and will not result in an impact;
- 4 - Low and will cause a slight impact;
- 6 - Moderate and will result in processes continuing but in a modified way;
- 8 - High, (processes are altered to the extent that they temporarily cease); or
- 10 - Very high and results in complete destruction of patterns and permanent cessation of processes.

Probability

This describes the likelihood of the impact actually occurring and is estimated on a scale where:

- 1 - Very improbable (probably will not happen);
- 2 - Improbable (some possibility, but low likelihood);
- 3 - Probable (distinct possibility);
- 4 - Highly probable (most likely); or
- 5 - Definite (impact will occur regardless of any prevention measures).

Significance

The significance is determined through a synthesis of the characteristics described above (refer to the formula below) and can be assessed as low, medium or high:

S = (E+D+M) x P; where
S = Significance weighting
E = Extent
D = Duration
M = Magnitude
P = Probability

Significance of impact		
Points	Significant Weighting	Discussion
< 30 points	Low	Where this impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area.
31-60 points	Medium	Where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area unless it is effectively mitigated.
> 60 points	High	Where the impact must have an influence on the decision process to develop in the area.

Confidence

This should relate to the level of confidence that the specialist has in establishing the nature and degree of impacts. It relates to the level and reliability of information, the nature and degree of consultation with I&AP's and the dynamic of the broader socio-political context.

- High, where the information is comprehensive and accurate, where there has been a high degree of consultation and the socio-political context is relatively stable.
- Medium, where the information is sufficient but is based mainly on secondary sources, where there has been a limited targeted consultation and socio-political context is fluid.
- Low, where the information is poor, a high degree of contestation is evident and there is a state of socio-political flux.

Status

- The status, which is described as either positive, negative or neutral.

Reversibility

- The degree to which the impact can be reversed.

Mitigation

- The degree to which the impact can be mitigated.

Nature:		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Construction Phase		
Probability		
Duration		
Extent		
Magnitude		
Significance		
Status (positive or negative)		
Operational Phase		
Probability		
Duration		
Extent		
Magnitude		
Significance		
Status (positive or negative)		

Reversibility		
Irreplaceable loss of resources?		
Can impacts be mitigated		

3. Mitigation measures

- *Mitigation: means to anticipate and prevent negative impacts and risks, then to minimise them, rehabilitate or repair impacts to the extent feasible.*

Impacts can be managed through one or a combination of the following mitigation measures:

- Avoidance
- Investigation (archaeological)
- Rehabilitation
- Interpretation
- Memorialisation
- Enhancement (positive impacts)

For the current study, the following mitigation measures are proposed, to be implemented only if any of the identified sites or features are to be impacted on by the proposed development activities:

- (1) Avoidance/Preserve: This is viewed to be the primary form of mitigation and applies where any type of development occurs within a formally protected or significant or sensitive heritage context and is likely to have a high negative impact. This measure often includes the change / alteration of development planning and therefore impact zones in order not to impact on resources. The site should be retained *in situ* and a buffer zone should be created around it, either temporary (by means of danger tape) or permanently (wire fence or built wall). Depending on the type of site, the buffer zone can vary from
 - 10 metres for a single grave, or a built structure, to
 - 50 metres where the boundaries are less obvious, e.g. a Late Iron Age site.
- (2) Archaeological investigation: This option can be implemented with additional design and construction inputs. This is appropriate where development occurs in a context of heritage significance and where the impact is such that it can be mitigated. Mitigation is to excavate the site by archaeological techniques, document the site (map and photograph) and analyse the recovered material to acceptable standards. This can only be done by a suitably qualified archaeologist.
 - This option should be implemented when it is impossible to avoid impacting on an identified site or feature.
 - This also applies for graves older than 60 years that are to be relocated. For graves younger than 60 years a permit from SAHRA is not required. However, all other legal requirements must be adhered to.
 - Impacts can be beneficial – e.g. mitigation contribute to knowledge
- (3) Rehabilitation: When features, e.g. buildings or other structures are to be re-used. Rehabilitation is considered in heritage management terms as an intervention typically involving the adding of a new heritage layer to enable a new sustainable use.
 - The heritage resource is degraded or in the process of degradation and would benefit from rehabilitation.
 - Where rehabilitation implies appropriate conservation interventions, i.e. adaptive reuse, repair and maintenance, consolidation and minimal loss of historical fabric.
 - Conservation measures would be to record the buildings/structures as they are (at a particular point in time). The records and recordings would then become the 'artefacts' to be preserved and managed as heritage features or (movable) objects.
 - This approach automatically also leads to the enhancement of the sites or features that are re-used.

- (4) Mitigation is also possible with additional design and construction inputs. Although linked to the previous measure (rehabilitation) a secondary though 'indirect' conservation measure would be to use the existing architectural 'vocabulary' of the structure as guideline for any new designs.
 - The following principle should be considered: **heritage informs design**.
 - This approach automatically also leads to the enhancement of the sites or features that are re-used.

- (5) No further action required: This is applicable only where sites or features have been rated to be of such low significance that it does not warrant further documentation, as it is viewed to be fully documented after inclusion in this report.
 - Site monitoring during development, by an ECO or the heritage specialist are often added to this recommendation in order to ensure that no undetected heritage/remains are destroyed.

4. Relocation of graves

If the graves are younger than 60 years, an undertaker can be contracted to deal with the exhumation and reburial. This will include public participation, organising cemeteries, coffins, etc. They need permits and have their own requirements that must be adhered to.

If the graves are older than 60 years old or of undetermined age, an archaeologist must be in attendance to assist with the exhumation and documentation of the graves. This is a requirement by law.

Once it has been decided to relocate particular graves, the following steps should be taken:

- Notices of the intention to relocate the graves need to be put up at the burial site for a period of 60 days. This should contain information where communities and family members can contact the developer/archaeologist/public-relations officer/undertaker. All information pertaining to the identification of the graves needs to be documented for the application of a SAHRA permit. The notices need to be in at least 3 languages, English, and two other languages. This is a requirement by law.
- Notices of the intention needs to be placed in at least two local newspapers and have the same information as the above point. This is a requirement by law.
- Local radio stations can also be used to try contact family members. This is not required by law, but is helpful in trying to contact family members.
- During this time (60 days) a suitable cemetery need to be identified close to the development area or otherwise one specified by the family of the deceased.
- An open day for family members should be arranged after the period of 60 days so that they can gather to discuss the way forward, and to sort out any problems. The developer needs to take the families requirements into account. This is a requirement by law.
- Once the 60 days has passed and all the information from the family members have been received, a permit can be requested from SAHRA. This is a requirement by law.
- Once the permit has been received, the graves may be exhumed and relocated.
- All headstones must be relocated with the graves as well as any items found in the grave.

Information needed for the SAHRA permit application

- The permit application needs to be done by an archaeologist.
- A map of the area where the graves have been located.
- A survey report of the area prepared by an archaeologist.
- All the information on the families that have identified graves.
- If graves have not been identified and there are no headstones to indicate the grave, these are then unknown graves and should be handled as if they are older than 60 years. This information also needs to be given to SAHRA.
- A letter from the landowner giving permission to the developer to exhume and relocate the graves.
- A letter from the new cemetery confirming that the graves will be reburied there.
- Details of the farm name and number, magisterial district and GPS coordinates of the gravesite.

5. Inventory of identified cultural heritage sites

Nil