



**MAGOGUDI CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS: PROPOSED
MAGOGUDI TYRE STORAGE FACILITIES SLYPKLIP PROJECT ON
A PORTION OF THE FARM SLYPKLIP 36, FRANCES BAARD
DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE**

Archaeological Impact Assessment



Prepared for: Magogudi Construction Projects

Prepared by: Exigo Sustainability

ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (AIA) ON A PORTION OF THE FARM SLYPKLIP 36 FOR THE PROPOSED MAGOGUDI TYRE STORAGE FACILITIES SLYPKLIP PROJECT, FRANCES BAARD DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

Conducted for:

Magogudi Construction Projects

Compiled by:

Nelius Kruger (BA, BA Hons. Archaeology Pret.)

Reviewed by:

Solly Lamola (Magogudi Construction Projects)

DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST

Name	Institution
Solly Lamola	Magogudi Construction Projects

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Date	Version	Status
21 May 2019	1.0	Draft
6 January 2020	2.0	Final

DECLARATION

I, Nelius Le Roux Kruger, declare that –

- I act as the independent specialist;
- I am conducting any work and activity relating to the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the client;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have the required expertise in conducting the specialist report and I will comply with legislation, including the relevant Heritage Legislation (National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999, Human Tissue Act 65 of 1983 as amended, Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance no. 7 of 1925, Excavations Ordinance no. 12 of 1980), the Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment (SAHRA, AMAFA and the CRM section of ASAPA), regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I have not, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- All the particulars furnished by me in this declaration are true and correct.



Signature of specialist
Company: Exigo Sustainability
Date: 6 January 2020

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

This document contains confidential and proprietary information equally shared between Exigo Sustainability and Magogudi Construction Projects, and is protected by copyright in favour of these companies and may not be reproduced, or used without the written consent of these companies, which has been obtained beforehand. This document is prepared exclusively for Magogudi Construction Projects and is subject to all confidentiality, copyright and trade secrets, rules, intellectual property law and practices of South Africa. Exigo Sustainability promotes the conservation of sensitive archaeological and heritage resources and therefore uncompromisingly adheres to relevant Heritage Legislation (National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999, Human Tissue Act 65 of 1983 as amended, Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance no. 7 of 1925, Excavations Ordinance no. 12 of 1980). In order to ensure best practices and ethics in the examination, conservation and mitigation of archaeological and heritage resources, Exigo Sustainability follows the Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment as set out by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and the CRM section of the Association for South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the results of an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study subject to an Environmental Basic Assessment (BA) process for the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project on a portion of the farm Slypklip 36 in the Frances Baard District Municipality of the Northern Cape Province. The proposed project entails the establishment of a tyre storage facility over a surface area of approximately 4ha. The report includes background information on the area’s archaeology, its representation in Southern Africa, and the history of the larger area under investigation, survey methodology and results as well as heritage legislation and conservation policies. A copy of the report will be supplied to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and recommendations contained in this document will be reviewed.

Project Title	Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project
Project Location	S28.420206° E24.728932°
1:50 000 Map Sheet	2824BC
Farm Portion / Parcel	A portion of the farm Slypklip 36
Magisterial District / Municipal Area	Frances Baard District Municipality
Province	Northern Cape Province

The Northern Cape holds traces of various types of archaeological sites inclusive of fossil, prehistoric and historical sites. Of palaeontological and Stone Age significance is a major fossil-bearing and archaeological complex of karstic deposits in the escarpment of the Ghaap Plateau, around 100 km southwest of Taung. In addition, the ancient bedrock of the well-known Nooitgedacht Glacial Pavements, comprising a 300 million year old geological feature between Kimberley and Barkly West, were utilized during the Later Stone Age period in the late Holocene as panels for rock engravings. Sites dating to the Iron Age occur in the north eastern part of the Northwest Province but environmental factors delegated that the spread of Iron Age farming westwards from the 17th century was constrained mainly to the area east of the Langeberg Mountains. However, evidence of an Iron Age presence as far as the Upington area in the eighteenth century occurs in the larger landscape area. Moving into recent times, the archaeological record reflects the development of a rich colonial frontier, characterised by, amongst others, a complex industrial archaeological landscape such as diamond mining developments along the Vaal River and at Kimberley, which herald the modern era in South African history. Finally, the Northwest Province saw a number of war conflicts, particularly the Anglo Boer War (or the South African War) left behind the remnants of battlefields, skirmishes and concentration camps.

A careful analysis of historical aerial imagery and archive maps indicate that portions of Slypklip – and particularly areas subject to this assessment have been altered extensively by recent and historical farming activities along the Vaal River. This inference was confirmed during an archaeological site assessment during which no *in situ* archaeological or heritage remains were encountered. The following recommendations are made based on general observations in the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project in terms of heritage resources management.

- A Palaeontological Impact Assessment is recommended where bedrock is to be impacted and, should fossil remains such as fossil fish, reptiles or petrified wood be exposed during construction,

these objects should be carefully safeguarded and the relevant heritage resources authority (SAHRA) should be notified immediately so that the appropriate action can be taken by a professional palaeontologist.

- A number of MSA lithics, including formal tools such as broken points, scrapers and a blade were noted in the project area along previously cultivated surfaces. The transformed nature of the local landscape has resulted in a loss of primary context and as such, the scientific value of the artefacts. However, it is recommended that any development activities be monitored in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected Stone Age occurrences.
- Considering the localised nature of heritage remains, the general monitoring of the development progress by an ECO or by the heritage specialist is recommended for all stages of the project. Should any subsurface palaeontological, archaeological or historical material, or burials be exposed during construction activities, all activities should be suspended and the archaeological specialist should be notified immediately.
- It is essential that cognisance be taken of the larger archaeological landscape of the area in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage sites. It should be stated that it is likely that further undetected archaeological remains might occur elsewhere in the landscape along water sources and drainage lines, fountains and pans would often have attracted human activity in the past. Also, since Stone Age material seems to originate from below present soil surfaces in eroded areas, the larger landscape should be regarded as potentially sensitive in terms of possible subsurface deposits. Burials and historically significant structures dating to the Colonial Period occur on farms in the area and these resources should be avoided during all phases of construction and development, including the operational phases of the development.

Cognisant of known site distribution patterns in this section of the Northern Cape Province along the Vaal River, and based on general on-site observations and off-site assessments and, notably the fact that the project site and its immediate surrounds have previously been transformed by intensive historical agriculture and farming, the author of this report is of the opinion that the construction of the Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project, will have a minimal (if any) impact on archaeological artefacts, features or structures surviving in primary context, subject to the fact that no previously undetected heritage remains (for example, those in sub-surface deposits) are exposed at any stage of the development.

It is essential that cognisance be taken of the larger archaeological landscape of the Northern Cape region in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage sites. Should any previously undetected heritage resources be exposed or uncovered during construction phases of the proposed project, these should immediately be reported to the heritage consultant or SAHRA. Since the intrinsic heritage and social value of graves and cemeteries are highly significant, these resources require special management measures. This report details the methodology, limitations and recommendations relevant to these heritage areas, as well as areas of proposed development. It should be noted that recommendations and possible mitigation measures are valid for the duration of the development process, and mitigation measures might have to be implemented on additional features of heritage importance not detected during this Phase 1 assessment (e.g. uncovered during the construction process).

NOTATIONS AND TERMS/TERMINOLOGY

Absolute dating: Absolute dating provides specific dates or range of dates expressed in years.

Archaeological record: The archaeological record minimally includes all the material remains documented by archaeologists. More comprehensive definitions also include the record of culture history and everything written about the past by archaeologists.

Artefact: Entities whose characteristics result or partially result from human activity. The shape and other characteristics of the artefact are not altered by removal of the surroundings in which they are discovered. In the Southern African context examples of artefacts include potsherds, iron objects, stone tools, beads and hut remains.

Assemblage: A group of artefacts recurring together at a particular time and place, and representing the sum of human activities.

Context: An artefact's context usually consists of its immediate *matrix*, its *provenience* and its *association* with other artefacts. When found in *primary context*, the original artefact or structure was undisturbed by natural or human factors until excavation and if in *secondary context*, disturbance or displacement by later ecological action or human activities occurred.

Cultural Heritage Resource: The broad generic term *Cultural Heritage Resources* refers to any physical and spiritual property associated with past and present human use or occupation of the environment, cultural activities and history. The term includes sites, structures, places, natural features and material of palaeontological, archaeological, historical, aesthetic, scientific, architectural, religious, symbolic or traditional importance to specific individuals or groups, traditional systems of cultural practice, belief or social interaction.

Cultural landscape: A cultural landscape refers to a distinctive geographic area with cultural significance.

Cultural Resource Management (CRM): A system of measures for safeguarding the archaeological heritage of a given area, generally applied within the framework of legislation designed to safeguard the past.

Feature: Non-portable artefacts, in other words artefacts that cannot be removed from their surroundings without destroying or altering their original form. Hearths, roads, and storage pits are examples of archaeological features

Impact: A description of the effect of an aspect of the development on a specified component of the biophysical, social or economic environment within a defined time and space.

Lithic: Stone tools or waste from stone tool manufacturing found on archaeological sites.

Matrix: The material in which an artefact is situated (sediments such as sand, ashy soil, mud, water, etcetera). The matrix may be of natural origin or human-made.

Midden: Refuse that accumulates in a concentrated heap.

Microlith: A small stone tool, typically knapped of flint or chert, usually about three centimetres long or less.

Monolith: A geological feature such as a large rock, consisting of a single massive stone or rock, or a single piece of rock placed as, or within, a monument or site.

Phase 1 CRM Assessment: An Impact Assessment which identifies archaeological and heritage sites, assesses their significance and comments on the impact of a given development on the sites. Recommendations for site mitigation or conservation are also made during this phase.

Phase 2 CRM Study: In-depth studies which could include major archaeological excavations, detailed site surveys and mapping / plans of sites, including historical / architectural structures and features. Alternatively, the sampling of sites by collecting material, small test pit excavations or auger sampling is required. Mitigation / Rescue involves planning the protection of significant sites or sampling through excavation or collection (in terms of a permit) at sites that may be lost as a result of a given development.

Phase 3 CRM Measure: A Heritage Site Management Plan (for heritage conservation), is required in rare cases where the site is so important that development will not be allowed and sometimes developers are encouraged to enhance the value of the sites retained on their properties with appropriate interpretive material or displays.

Provenience: Provenience is the three-dimensional (horizontal and vertical) position in which artefacts are found. Fundamental to ascertaining the provenience of an artefact is *association*, the co-occurrence of an artefact with other archaeological remains; and *superposition*, the principle whereby artefacts in lower levels of a matrix were deposited before the artefacts found in the layers above them, and are therefore older.

Random Sampling: A probabilistic sampling strategy whereby randomly selected sample blocks in an area are surveyed. These are fixed by drawing coordinates of the sample blocks from a table of random numbers.

Scoping Assessment: The process of determining the spatial and temporal boundaries (i.e. extent) and key issues to be addressed in an impact assessment. The main purpose is to focus the impact assessment on a manageable number of important questions on which decision making is expected to focus and to ensure that only key issues and reasonable alternatives are examined. The outcome of the scoping process is a Scoping Report that includes issues raised during the scoping process, appropriate responses and, where required, terms of reference for specialist involvement.

Site (Archaeological): A distinct spatial clustering of artefacts, features, structures, and organic and environmental remains, as the residue of human activity. These include surface sites, caves and rock shelters, larger open-air sites, sealed sites (deposits) and river deposits. Common functions of archaeological sites include living or habitation sites, kill sites, ceremonial sites, burial sites, trading, quarry, and art sites,

Stratigraphy: This principle examines and describes the observable layers of sediments and the arrangement of strata in deposits

Systematic Sampling: A probabilistic sampling strategy whereby a grid of sample blocks is set up over the survey area and each of these blocks is equally spaced and searched.

Trigger: A particular characteristic of either the receiving environment or the proposed project which indicates that there is likely to be an *issue* and/or potentially significant *impact* associated with that proposed development that may require specialist input. Legal requirements of existing and future legislation may also trigger the need for specialist involvement.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
ASAPA	Association for South African Professional Archaeologists
AIA	Archaeological Impact Assessment
BP	Before Present
BCE	Before Common Era
BGG	Burial Grounds and Graves
CRM	Culture Resources Management
EIA	Early Iron Age (also Early Farmer Period)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EFP	Early Farmer Period (also Early Iron Age)
ESA	Earlier Stone Age
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
K2/Map	K2/Mapungubwe Period
LFP	Later Farmer Period (also Later Iron Age)
LIA	Later Iron Age (also Later Farmer Period)
LSA	Later Stone Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age (also Early later Farmer Period)
MRA	Mining Right Area
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act No.25 of 1999, Section 35
PFS	Pre-Feasibility Study
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Authorities
SAFA	Society for Africanist Archaeologists
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Association
YCE	Years before Common Era (Present)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
1 BACKGROUND	11
1.1 SCOPE AND MOTIVATION	11
1.2 PROJECT DIRECTION	11
1.3 PROJECT BRIEF	11
1.4 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	13
1.5 CRM: LEGISLATION, CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE MANAGEMENT	13
1.5.1 <i>Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites</i>	13
1.5.2 <i>Background to HIA and AIA Studies</i>	15
2 REGIONAL CONTEXT.....	16
2.1 AREA LOCATION	16
2.2 AREA DESCRIPTION: RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	16
2.3 SITE DESCRIPTION	16
3 METHOD OF ENQUIRY.....	19
3.1 SOURCES OF INFORMATION	19
3.1.1 <i>Desktop Study</i>	19
3.1.2 <i>Aerial Survey</i>	21
3.1.3 <i>Mapping of sites</i>	21
3.1.4 <i>Field Survey</i>	22
3.2 LIMITATIONS.....	23
3.2.1 <i>Access</i>	23
3.2.2 <i>Visibility</i>	23
3.2.3 <i>Summary: Limitations and Constraints</i>	26
3.3 IMPACT ASSESSMENT.....	26
4 ARCHAEO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT.....	27
4.1 THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF SOUTHERN AFRICA	27
4.2 DISCUSSION: AN ARCHAEO-HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE RIVERTON AREA	27
4.2.1 <i>Early History and the Stone Ages</i>	28
4.2.2 <i>A Later Stone Age landscape of Rock Markings</i>	30
4.2.3 <i>Iron Age / Farmer Period</i>	31
4.2.4 <i>Pastoralism and the last 2000 years</i>	31
4.2.5 <i>Later History: Colonial Period and the Anglo Boer War</i>	32
5 RESULTS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY	34
5.1 THE OFF-SITE DESKTOP SURVEY.....	34
5.2 THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY.....	36
6 RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING	38
6.1 POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE RATINGS.....	38
6.1.1 <i>General assessment of impacts on resources</i>	38
6.1.2 <i>Direct impact rating</i>	38
6.2 MANAGEMENT ACTIONS.....	38
7 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	39
8 GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS	40
9 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	41
10 ADDENDUM 1: HERITAGE LEGISLATION BACKGROUND.....	44
10.1 CRM: LEGISLATION, CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE MANAGEMENT	44
10.1.1 <i>Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites</i>	44

10.1.2 Background to HIA and AIA Studies..... 45

10.2 ASSESSING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE RESOURCES 47

- CATEGORIES OF SIGNIFICANCE 47

11 ADDENDUM 2: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE 49

11.1 SITE SIGNIFICANCE MATRIX..... 49

11.2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA 50

11.3 DIRECT IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA 51

11.4 MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION ACTIONS..... 52

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Aerial map indicating the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip project area..... 12

Figure 2-1: 1:50 00 Map representation of the location of the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip project (sheet 2824BC).17

Figure 2-2: Aerial map providing a regional context for the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip project area. 18

Figure 3-1: Map indicating the GPS track log for site surveys for the Project. The project area is indicated in yellow and survey focus area is indicated in green..... 22

Figure 3-2: Topographic map indicating the GPS track log (red line) for site surveys for the Project. The project area is indicated in yellow and survey focus area is indicated in green..... 22

Figure 3-3: View of a powerline bisecting the project area to the north. 23

Figure 3-4: View of the project area, looking south. 24

Figure 3-5: View of old agricultural fields denoting the project area. 24

Figure 3-6: Ploughed and ripped surfaces as part of old agricultural fields the project area. 24

Figure 3-7: View of denser surface grass cover along the eastern boundary of the project area..... 25

Figure 3-8: View of the project area, looking north..... 25

Figure 3-9: View of old agricultural fields in the project area..... 25

Figure 3-10: The western boundary of the project footprint along a regional access road to the area. 26

Figure 4-1: Typical ESA handaxe (left) and cleaver (center). To the right is a MSA scraper (right, top), point (right, middle) and blade (right, bottom). 28

Figure 4-2: Intrusive breccia containing a Late Stone Age industry. Note the high density of lithics. 29

Figure 4-3: Rock engravings at the Wildebeest Kuil Rock Art Site. 30

Figure 4-4: Original title deed for the farm Slypklip, dating to 1884 33

Figure 5-1: An aerial image of Slypklip dating to 1944 indicating the locations of the project area (yellow outlines) during the early 20th century. Note the apparent absence of man-made structures in the footprint area. 34

Figure 5-2: Historical topographic maps of Slypklip dating to 1968 (left) and 1986 (right), indicating the location of the project area (green outline) during the mid to later 20th century. 35

Figure 5-3: View of eroded and previously cultivated surfaces where MSA tools were noted..... 36

Figure 5-4: An MSA scarper (left),debitage (centre) and a core (right) noted in the project area in disturbed areas. 37

Figure 5-5: A core (left) and two side scrapers (centre and right) from the MSA located in the project area. 37

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Scope and Motivation

Exigo Sustainability (Pty) Ltd (Exigo) was commissioned by Magogudi Construction Projects to conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study subject to an Environmental Basic Assessment (BA) process for the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project in the Northern Cape Province. The rationale of this AIA is to determine the presence of heritage resources such as archaeological and historical sites and features, graves and places of religious and cultural significance in previously unstudied areas; to consider the impact of the proposed project on such heritage resources, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the cultural resources management measures that may be required at affected sites / features.

1.2 Project Direction

Exigo's expertise ensures that all projects be conducted to the highest international ethical and professional standards. As archaeological specialist for Exigo Sustainability, Mr Neels Kruger acted as field director for the project; responsible for the assimilation of all information, the compilation of the final consolidated AIA report and recommendations in terms of heritage resources on the demarcated project areas. Mr Kruger is an accredited archaeologist and Culture Resources Management (CRM) practitioner with the Association of South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA), a member of the Society for Africanist Archaeologists (SAFA) and the Pan African Archaeological Association (PAA) as well as a Master's Degree candidate in archaeology at the University of Pretoria.

1.3 Project Brief

Magogudi Construction Projects proposes the establishment of a tyre storage facility over a surface area of approximately **4ha** on a portion of the farm Slypklip. The proposed facility will consist out of the following components:

- **A concrete surface of 4ha for tyre storage,**
- **Water and electricity supply infrastructure,**
- **A site office**
- **An access road to the site.**

The proposed facility, trucks will deliver scrap tyres for temporary storage. The scrap tyres will be shred and baled whereafter the bales will be transported to a recycling facility.




Figure 1-1: Aerial map indicating the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip project area.

1.4 Terms of Reference

Heritage specialist input into the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is essential to ensure that, through the management of change, developments still conserve our heritage resources. It is also a legal requirement for certain development categories which may have an impact on heritage resources. Thus, EIAs should always include an assessment of heritage resources. The heritage component of the EIA is provided for in the **National Environmental Management Act, (Act 107 of 1998)** and endorsed by section 38 of the **National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA - Act 25 of 1999)**. In addition, the NHRA protects all structures and features older than 60 years, archaeological sites and material and graves as well as burial sites. The objective of this legislation is to ensure that developers implement measures to limit the potentially negative effects that the development could have on heritage resources. Based hereon, this project functioned according to the following **terms of reference** for heritage specialist input:

- *Provide a detailed description of all archaeological artefacts, structures (including graves) and settlements which may be affected, if any.*
- *Assess the nature and degree of significance of such resources within the area.*
- *Establish heritage informants/constraints to guide the development process through establishing thresholds of impact significance;*
- *Assess and rate any possible impact on the archaeological and historical remains within the area emanating from the proposed development activities.*
- *Propose possible heritage management measures provided that such action is necessitated by the development.*
- *Liaise and consult with the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA). A Notification of Intent to Develop (NID) will be submitted to SAHRA at the soonest opportunity.*

1.5 CRM: Legislation, Conservation and Heritage Management

The broad generic term *Cultural Heritage Resources* refers to any physical and spiritual property associated with past and present human use or occupation of the environment, cultural activities and history. The term includes sites, structures, places, natural features and material of palaeontological, archaeological, historical, aesthetic, scientific, architectural, religious, symbolic or traditional importance to specific individuals or groups, traditional systems of cultural practice, belief or social interaction.

1.5.1 Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and its provincial offices aim to conserve and control the management, research, alteration and destruction of cultural resources of South Africa. It is therefore vitally important to adhere to heritage resource legislation at all times.

a. National Heritage Resources Act No 25 of 1999, section 35

According to the National Heritage Resources Act No 25 of 1999 (section 35) the following features are 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.

In addition, the national estate 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 sites
- 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.)

With regards to activities and work on archaeological and heritage sites this Act states that:

“No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years without a permit by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.” (34. [1] 1999:58)

and

“No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority-

- (a) *destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;*
- (b) *destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological 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 palaeontological material or object, or any meteorite; or*
- (d) *bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites. (35. [4] 1999:58).”*

and

“No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources agency-

- (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, 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;*
- (c) *bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) and excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals (36. [3] 1999:60)."*

b. Human Tissue Act of 1983 and Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies of 1925

Graves and burial grounds are commonly divided into the following subsets:

- 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

Graves 60 years or older are heritage resources and fall under the jurisdiction of both the National Heritage Resources Act and the Human Tissues Act of 1983. However, graves younger than 60 years are specifically protected by the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and Ordinance on Excavations (Ordinance no. 12 of 1980) as well as any local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws. Such burial places also fall under the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the Provincial Health Departments.

c. National Heritage Resources Act No 25 of 1999, section 35

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.

1.5.2 Background to HIA and AIA 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. Heritage sites are frequently threatened by development projects and both the environmental and heritage legislation require impact assessments (HIAs & AIAs) that identify all heritage resources in areas to be developed. Particularly, these assessments are required to make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact of the sites. HIAs and AIAs should be done by qualified professionals with adequate knowledge to (a) identify all heritage resources including archaeological and palaeontological sites that might occur in areas of developed and (b) make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact on the sites.

A detailed guideline of statutory terms and requirements is supplied in Addendum 1.

2 REGIONAL CONTEXT

2.1 Area Location

The proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip project occurs on a portion of the Farm Slypklip 36 in the Frances Baard District Municipality of the Northern Cape Province. The farm is located on the eastern banks of the Vaal River north of the small settlement of Riverton, comprising mainly of agricultural lands. The R375 route passes west of the project area and smaller regional roads connecting to the N12 passes south of the farm. The project area is situated 40km north of the town of Kimberley and Barkly West occurs 25km southwest of Slypklip.

The study areas appear on 1:50000 map sheet 2824BC (see Figure 2-1) and coordinates for the proposed project are as follows:

- **S28.420206° E24.728932°**

2.2 Area Description: Receiving Environment

Riverton and its surrounds lay within the Savanna biome which is the largest biome in Southern Africa. It is characterized by a grassy ground layer and a distinct upper layer of woody plants (trees and shrubs). The environmental factors delimiting the biome are complex and include altitude, rainfall, geology and soil types, with rainfall being the major delimiting factor. Fire and grazing also keep the grassy layer dominant. The most recent classification of the area by Mucina & Rutherford shows that the site is classified as Ghaap Plateau Vaalbosveld. The landscape features of the Ghaap Plateau Vaalbosveld vegetation type are a flat plateau with well-developed shrub layer dominated by *Tarchonanthus camphoratus* underlied by surface limestone and dolomite. The conservation status of the Ghaap Plateau Vaalbosveld is Least Threatened with none conserved in statutory reserves and only 1% transformed (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006). This vegetation type covers most of the Ghaap Plateau, and is found on different types of soils, such as calcareous tufa, dark brown to red sands and acid gravels, all underlain by dolomite. In addition, the District consists of two very distinct, morphological regions divided by the Vaal / Harts river valley, the Kalahari and Ghaap Plateau to the west and the Kimberley Plains to the east. The Kimberley plains tend to be wetter, more fertile, have greater mineral resources and contain most of the district's settlement system. The Kimberley plains tended to be wetter, more fertile, have greater mineral resources and contained most of the municipality's settlements. The Vaal River occurs directly west of the project area.

2.3 Site Description

The Farm Slypklip 36 subject to this assessment is situated along flat plains along the eastern banks of the Vaal River. Generally, the terrains consist of flatter parcels of developable in a landscape that has, in places, been transformed by historical and more recent crop and livestock farming. The demarcated development footprint consists of old fields with occasional trees scattered across the site. No man-made structures such as farmstead buildings were noted at the site and cultivated fields borders the site to the west and south. The site is bisected by a regional access road and a power line and the Skanskop farmstead and associated buildings occur along the southern periphery of the project footprint area.




Figure 2-1: 1:50 00 Map representation of the location of the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip project (sheet 2824BC).




Figure 2-2: Aerial map providing a regional context for the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip project area.

3 METHOD OF ENQUIRY

3.1 Sources of Information

Data from detailed desktop, aerial and field studies were employed in order to sample surface areas systematically and to ensure a high probability of heritage site recording.

3.1.1 Desktop Study

The larger landscape around Kimberley has been well documented in terms of its archaeology and history. Numerous academic papers and research articles supplied a historical context for the proposed project and archival sources, aerial photographs, historical maps and local histories were used to create a baseline of the landscape's heritage. In addition, the study drew on available unpublished Heritage Assessment reports to give a comprehensive representation of known sites in the study area. These included:

- Beaumont, P.B. 2002. Archaeological Report: Construction of a Temporary Bridge across the Vaal River at Windsorton, Erf 1, for Floodplain (Island) Diamond Reclamation.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2005a. Archaeological Impact Assessment of a Portion of the Remnant of Farm 225, near Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2005b. Archaeological Impact Assessment of a Portion of the Delportshoop Commonage, Northern Cape.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2006. Phase 1 Heritage Assessment Report on Portion 4 of the Farm Slypklip North 32, Frances Baard District Municipality, Northern Cape Province.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2007a. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report on Parts of Portion 2 and the Remainder of the Farm Holsdam 229 near Barkly West, Frances Baard District Municipality, Northern Cape Province.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2007b. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report on the Farm Eureka 200 near Kimberley, Francis Baard District Municipality, Northern Cape Province.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2008. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report on the Proposed Northgate Housing development on Portions of the Original Farm Roode Pan 70, near Kimberley in the Sol Plaatjie Municipality of the Northern Cape Province.
- Dreyer, C. 2003. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Pipeline Installed at Hanover, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2005a. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Diamond Mining Activities at the Farm Riverside 208, Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2005b. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Diamond Mining Activities at the Farms Melkvei 221 and Longlands 231, Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2005c. First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Residential Development on Erven 687 and 711, Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2006a. First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Developments at the Big Hole, Kimberley, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2006b. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Diamond Mining Activities at the Farm Winter's Rush (Longlands 350), Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2006c. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Diamond Mining Activities at the Farm Holpan 161, Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2008. Archaeological and Culture Historical Assessment of the proposed Residential Developments at Kimberley, Northern Cape.
- Henderson, Z.L. 2003. Archaeological Survey of Van Aswegenshoek 134.
- Morris, D. 2001. Report on Historical Rubbish Midden at Kamfersdam.

- Morris, D. 2002. Report on an Inspection of Cemeteries at Sydney-on-Vaal.
- Morris, D. 2003a. Archaeological Survey of the Farm Koodoosberg No 141.
- Morris, D. 2003b. Archaeological Impact Assessment Rietputs 15, Windsorton.
- Morris, D. 2005a. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of the so-called 'Kemo Dump' (National Site Number 2824DB039) on Remainder of Erf 5024, Erf 6376 and Erf 5058, Vooruitzicht 81, Kimberley, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2005b. Site Visit to Inspect Cultural Material on the Mine Debris Dumps adjacent to the Kimberley Mine at the Site of the Proposed Hotel.
- Morris, D. 2005c. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment for De Beers Consolidated Mines Ltd (Contract 0616-AC-244-05) to evaluate Heritage Resources on properties as Indicated.
- Morris, D. 2005d. Archaeological Impact Assessment of Abrahamoos Fontein near Plooyburg, Northern Cape
- Morris, D. 2005e. Archaeological Impact Assessment at Taaibosch Fontein near Plooyburg, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2005f. Archaeological Impact Assessment on the Claim of Mr. Medwyn Jacobs, Erf 86, near Barkley West.
- Morris, D. 2005g. Archaeological Impact Assessment on Windsorton, Erf 1, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2006a. Report on a Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of a Proposed Clay Quarry at Roodepan 70, Kimberley, Northern Cape, NC30/5/1/3/3/2/1/358EM.
- Morris, D. 2006b. Site Visit to Inspect an Area of Proposed Debris Washing along Kenilworth Road, on Erven 14741, in the Magisterial District of Kimberley.
- Morris, D. 2006c. Report on a Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of Proposed Prospecting on Uityk 106, Locks Verdriet 105 and Brakpan 107, West of Kimberley, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2006d. Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment on Portion 20 Mosesberg, near Schmidtsdrift, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2006e. Archaeological Impact Assessment on the Claim of Mr. Setlhabi at Waldeck's Plant, Pniel, near Barkley West, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2007. Archaeological Impact Assessment at Longlands 350 near Barkly West, Northern Cape: Collective Application List of E. Nyanyiwa.
- Morris, D. 2009. Report on a Phase 1 Archaeological Assessment of a proposed mining site at the Eddie Williams Oval, Kimberley, Northern Cape.
- Nel, J. (Archaic Heritage Project Management). 2008. Final Report: Heritage Resources Scoping and Preliminary Assessment. Transnet Freight Line EIA, Eastern Cape and Northern Cape.
- Nelson, C. 2007. Upgrading of the TR502 Road, Barkly West Magisterial District, Northern Cape Province.
- Rossouw, L. 2006. A Preliminary Evaluation of Archaeological and Palaeontological Impact with regard to the Application for Prospecting Rights on the Farms Doornfontein 12, Grasbult 5, Schoolplaats 3, Schoolplaats Annex 4 and Pontdrift 2 in the Warrenton District, Northern Cape.
- Rossouw, L. (National Museum, Bloemfontein). 2008. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of Farm Fourteen Streams, Warrenton District, Northern Cape Province.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005a. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: Portion 1 of Roode Pan 146, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005b. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: Portions of Paardeberg 154, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.

- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005c. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: (Portions of) Leeuwoort 161, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005d. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: (Portions of) Paardeberg 12, Paardeberg-East, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005e. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: Rooipoort – (Portions of) Klipfontein 99, Berg Plaats 100, Vogelstruispan 98, Vogelstruispan 101 and Zand Plaas 102, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005f. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment: (Southern Portion of) Camp 3, Erf 1, Windsorton, Barkly West District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2006a. Stamper Claim on a Portion of the Farm Longlands, Barkly West, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2006c. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: A 400ha Portion of Van Zoelen's Laagte 158, Windsorton District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2007b. Proposed Phase 2 Archaeological Mitigation and Management for the Residential Development, Remainder of Portion 1 of the Farm van Zoelen's Laagte 158, Windsorton, Barkly-West District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. . 2007c. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment – Sewer Purification Plant, Ikutseng Township, Warrenton, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. . 2007d. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment: Portion of the farm Platfontein 68, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2008. Heritage Impact Survey Report for the Development of Visitor Facilities in the Makala National Park, Northern Cape Province.

3.1.2 Aerial Survey

Aerial photography is often employed to locate and study archaeological sites, particularly where larger scale area surveys are performed. This method was applied to assist the foot and automotive site surveys where depressions, variation in vegetation, soil marks and landmarks were examined. Specific attention was given to shadow sites (shadows of walls or earthworks which are visible early or late in the day), crop mark sites (crop mark sites are visible because disturbances beneath crops cause variations in their height, vigour and type) and soil marks (e.g. differently coloured or textured soil (soil marks) might indicate ploughed-out burial mounds). Attention was also given to moisture differences, as prolonged dampening of soil as a result of precipitation frequently occurs over walls or embankments. In addition, historical aerial photos obtained during the archival search were scrutinized and features that were regarded as important in terms of heritage value were identified and if they were located within the boundaries of the project area they were physically visited in an effort to determine whether they still exist and in order to assess their current condition and significance. By superimposing high frequency aerial photographs with images generated with Google Earth as well as historical aerial imagery, potential sensitive areas were subsequently identified, geo-referenced and transferred to a handheld GPS device. These areas served as reference points from where further vehicular and pedestrian surveys were carried out.

3.1.3 Mapping of sites

Historical and current maps of the project area were examined. By merging data obtained from the desktop study and the aerial survey, sites and areas of possible heritage potential were plotted on these maps of the larger Riverton area using GIS software. These maps were then superimposed on high definition aerial representations in order to graphically demonstrate the geographical locations and distribution of potentially sensitive landscapes.




Figure 3-1: Map indicating the GPS track log for site surveys for the Project. The project area is indicated in yellow and survey focus area is indicated in green.




Figure 3-2: Topographic map indicating the GPS track log (red line) for site surveys for the Project. The project area is indicated in yellow and survey focus area is indicated in green.

3.1.4 Field Survey

Archaeological survey implies the systematic procedure of the identification of archaeological sites. An archaeological survey of the Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project area was conducted in May 2019. The process encompassed a systematic field survey in accordance with standard archaeological practice by which heritage resources are observed and documented. In order to sample surface areas systematically and to ensure a high probability of site recording, the proposed project area was surveyed on foot. As the larger Slypklip property west of the regional road to the site is enclosed in a game fence with

locked gates, this area could not be accessed for the site survey and the investigation focused on the proposed footprint area **east** of the access road (see Figure 1-1). Particular focus was placed on proposed infrastructure footprint areas provided to the specialist. GPS reference points identified during the aerial survey were also visited and random spot checks were made (see detail in previous section). Using a Garmin GPS, the survey was tracked and general surroundings were photographed with a Samsung Digital camera. Real time aerial orientation, by means of a mobile Google Earth application was also employed to investigate possible disturbed areas during the survey.

3.2 Limitations

3.2.1 Access

The study area is accessed directly via a regional road connecting to the N12. As noted above, the larger Slypklip property **west** of this regional road is enclosed in a game fence with locked gates and this area could not be accessed for the site survey. The survey therefore focused on the proposed footprint area **east** of the access road which was accessible at the time of the site investigation.

3.2.2 Visibility

The surrounding vegetation in the larger landscape around Riverton is mostly comprised out of grassland, riparian vegetation and scattered trees and bushes. The general visibility at the time of the AIA survey (May 2019) ranged from high in transformed areas, to moderate in more pristine and overgrown zones. In single cases during the survey sub-surface inspection was possible. Where applied, this revealed no archaeological deposits.



Figure 3-3: View of a powerline bisecting the project area to the north.



Figure 3-4: View of the project area, looking south.



Figure 3-5: View of old agricultural fields denoting the project area.



Figure 3-6: Ploughed and ripped surfaces as part of old agricultural fields the project area.



Figure 3-7: View of denser surface grass cover along the eastern boundary of the project area.



Figure 3-8: View of the project area, looking north.



Figure 3-9: View of old agricultural fields in the project area.



Figure 3-10: The western boundary of the project footprint along a regional access road to the area.

3.2.3 Summary: Limitations and Constraints

The site survey for the Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project AIA primarily focused around areas tentatively identified as sensitive and of high heritage probability (i.e. those noted during the aerial survey) as well as areas of high human settlement catchment. In summary, the following constraints were encountered during the site survey:

- The larger Slypklip property **west** of this regional road is enclosed in a game fence with locked gates and this area could not be accessed for the site survey. The survey therefore focused on the proposed footprint area **east** of the access road which was accessible at the time of the site investigation.

It should be noted that, even though it might be assumed that survey findings are representative of the heritage landscape of the project area for the Transnet Boshhoek Railway Loop Project, it should be stated that the possibility exists that individual sites could be missed due to the localised nature of some heritage remains as well as the possible presence of sub-surface archaeology. Therefore, maintaining due cognisance of the integrity and accuracy of the archaeological survey, it should be stated that the heritage resources identified during the study do not necessarily represent all the heritage resources present in the project area. The subterranean nature of some archaeological sites, dense vegetation cover and visibility constraints sometimes distort heritage representations and any additional heritage resources located during consequent development phases must be reported to the Heritage Resources Authority or an archaeological specialist.

3.3 Impact Assessment

For consistency among specialists, impact assessment ratings by Exigo Specialist are generally done using the Plomp¹ impact assessment matrix scale supplied by Exigo. According to this matrix scale, each heritage receptor in the study area is given an impact assessment. The significances of the impacts were determined through a synthesis of the criteria below:

¹ Plomp, H., 2004

4 ARCHAEO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT

4.1 The archaeology of Southern Africa

Archaeology in Southern Africa is typically divided into two main fields of study, the **Stone Age** and the **Iron Age** or **Farmer Period**. The following table provides a concise outline of the chronological sequence of periods, events, cultural groups and material expressions in Southern African pre-history and history.

Table 1 Chronological Periods across Southern Africa

Period	Epoch	Associated cultural groups	Typical Material Expressions
Early Stone Age 2.5m – 250 000 YCE	Pleistocene	Early Hominins: <i>Australopithecines</i> <i>Homo habilis</i> <i>Homo erectus</i>	Typically large stone tools such as hand axes, choppers and cleavers.
Middle Stone Age 250 000 – 25 000 YCE	Pleistocene	First <i>Homo sapiens</i> species	Typically smaller stone tools such as scrapers, blades and points.
Late Stone Age 20 000 BC – present	Pleistocene / Holocene	<i>Homo sapiens sapiens</i> including San people	Typically small to minute stone tools such as arrow heads, points and bladelets.
Early Iron Age / Early Farmer Period 300 – 900 AD (commonly restricted to the interior and north-east coastal areas of Southern Africa)	Holocene	First Bantu-speaking groups	Typically distinct ceramics, bead ware, iron objects, grinding stones.
Middle Iron Age (Mapungubwe / K2) / early Later Farmer Period 900 – 1350 AD (commonly restricted to the interior and north-east coastal areas of Southern Africa)	Holocene	Bantu-speaking groups, ancestors of present-day groups	Typically distinct ceramics, bead ware and iron / gold / copper objects, trade goods and grinding stones.
Late Iron Age / Later Farmer Period 1400 AD -1850 AD (commonly restricted to the interior and north-east coastal areas of Southern Africa)	Holocene	Various Bantu-speaking groups including Venda, Thonga, Sotho-Tswana and Zulu	Distinct ceramics, grinding stones, iron objects, trade objects, remains of iron smelting activities including iron smelting furnace, iron slag and residue as well as iron ore.
Historical / Colonial Period ±1850 AD – present	Holocene	Various Bantu-speaking groups as well as European farmers, settlers and explorers	Remains of historical structures e.g. homesteads, missionary schools etc. as well as, glass, porcelain, metal and ceramics.

4.2 Discussion: An archaeo-historical background of the Riverton Area

The history of this section of the Northern Cape Province is reflected in a rich archaeological landscape, mostly dominated by Stone Age and Colonial Period occurrences. Numerous sites, documenting Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age habitation occur across the landscape, mostly in open air locales or in sediments alongside rivers or pans. In addition, a wealth of Later Stone Age rock art sites, most of which are in the form of rock engravings are to be found in the larger landscape. These sites occur on hilltops, slopes, rock outcrops

and occasionally in river beds. Sites dating to the Iron Age occur in the north eastern part of the Northwest Province but environmental factors delegated that the spread of Iron Age farming westwards from the 17th century was constrained mainly to the area east of the Langeberg Mountains. However, evidence of an Iron Age presence as far as the Upington area in the eighteenth century occurs in the larger landscape area. Moving into recent times, the archaeological record reflects the development of a rich colonial frontier, characterised by, amongst others, a complex industrial archaeological landscape such as mining developments at Kimberley, which herald the modern era in South African history. Finally, the Northwest Province saw a number of war conflicts, particularly the Anglo Boer War (or the South African War) left behind the remnants of battlefields, skirmishes and concentration camps.

4.2.1 Early History and the Stone Ages

According to archaeological research, the earliest ancestors of modern humans emerged some two to three million years ago. The remains of Australopithecine and *Homo habilis* have been found in dolomite caves and underground dwellings in the Riverton Area at places such as Sterkfontein and Swartkrans near Krugersdorp. *Homo habilis*, one of the Early Stone Age hominids, is associated with Oldowan artefacts, which include crude implements manufactured from large pebbles. The Acheulian industrial complex replaced the Oldowan industrial complex during the Early Stone Age. This phase of human existence was widely distributed across South Africa and is associated with *Homo erectus*, who manufactured hand axes and cleavers from as early as one and a half million years ago. Middle Stone Age sites dating from as early as two hundred thousand years ago have been found all over South Africa. Middle Stone Age hunter-gatherer bands also lived and hunted in the Orange and Vaal River valleys. These people, who probably looked like modern humans, occupied campsites near water but also used caves as dwellings. They manufactured a wide range of stone tools, including blades and points that may have had long wooden sticks as hafts and were used as spears.




Figure 4-1: Typical ESA handaxe (left) and cleaver (center). To the right is a MSA scraper (right, top), point (right, middle) and blade (right, bottom).

The Northern Cape has traces of various types of archaeological sites inclusive of fossil, prehistoric and historical sites. Of palaeontological and Stone Age significance is a major fossil-bearing and archaeological complex of karstic deposits at Groot Kloof in the escarpment of the Ghaap Plateau, around 100 km southwest of Taung. The region is known for open fluvial and lacustrine sites sampling Lower and Middle Pleistocene tool types and the long, but discontinuous sequence of Wonderwerk Cave. Small pockets of Later Stone Age artefact-bearing breccia and rock art also occur. The significance of Groot Kloof is underscored by current

debate about the emergence of modern humans in which the appearance of modern behaviour is posited to have occurred in this and other regions (Curnoe et al. 2005). In addition, the glacially scoured (smoothed and striated) ancient bedrock of the well-known Nooitgedacht Glacial Pavements, comprising a 300 million year old geological feature between Kimberley and Barkly West, were utilized during the Later Stone Age period in the late Holocene as panels for rock engravings.




Figure 4-2: Intrusive breccia containing a Late Stone Age industry. Note the high density of lithics.

The Stone Age archaeological wealth of the Northern Cape is unequalled by any of the other provinces in South Africa. Stone Age sites are not randomly scattered within the landscape and they occur either near water sources or close to local sources of two highly-prized raw materials, specularite and jaspilite. As such, tools dating to all phases of the Stone Age are mostly found in the vicinity of larger watercourses. Surveys around Kimberley have documented Acheullian industries and continuity between Earlier Stone Age (ESA) and Middle Stone Age (MSA) lithic technologies in the same area. Excavations at other well-known sites in the wider region attest to further ESA and MSA occupation, some of which have yielded significant Stone Age assemblages that all inform on our general understanding of the technological sequences of the Stone Age in the Northern Cape and the Northwest (e.g. see Beaumont 2008, 2009; Morris 2006; Morris 2007; Dreyer 2007). Within the greater Kimberley region ESA and MSA sites with long research histories include Doornlaagte, Pniel, Canteen Koppie and Rooidam (Beaumont & Morris 1990). Open air ESA and MSA sites are often associated with raw material outcrops, dolines, playas (palaeo-lakes) and palaeo-river channels. In addition low density ESA, MSA and Later Stone Age (LSA) occurrences remain regular phenomena characterizing the cultural landscape of the region. LSA use of the more immediate region is most prominently evidenced by the Wildebeest Kuil Rock Art Center and adjoining Rock Art site (see later reference). Here, a number of lithic artefacts with spatial distribution indicative of separate residential and knapping areas occur around the hill. Of note around Barkly West and Delportshoop is the Canteen Kopje Earlier Stone Age situated outside Barkly West. The rich Stone Age site is a Provincial Heritage Site which has yielded an as yet unpublished basal date of some 2.3 million years, making the site one of the oldest in South Africa. In 2016 the site became threatened by mining after the Department of Minerals and Energy issued a permit for part of the site to be mined.

4.2.2 A Later Stone Age landscape of Rock Markings

The Late Stone Age commenced twenty thousand years ago or somewhat earlier. The various types of Later Stone Age industries scattered across the country are associated with the historical San and Khoi-Khoi people. The San were renowned as formidable hunter-gatherers, while the Khoi-Khoi herded cattle and small stock during the last two thousand years. Late Stone Age people manufactured tools that were small but highly effective, such as arrow heads and knives. Later Stone Age (LSA) sites occur both at the coast and inland as caves deposits, rock shelters, open sites and shell deposits. Rock engravings are mostly found in the interior plateau of South Africa for example in Kimberley and the Karoo. Evidence exists of rock art paintings occurring in caves and shelters at the Wonderwerk Caves, Kuruman Hills, Ghaap Escarpment and scattered sites in the Karoo. Rock engravings have also been identified at Driekopseiland that is positioned in the close vicinity of Kimberley Town. Driekopseiland is evident of more than ninety percent of geometric engraving sites (Morris 1988). Geometrics have been identified at the Kuruman valley and the middle Orange area (Morris 1988). Engravings tend to be found at rock walls, low outcrops, or clusters of surface stone.



Figure 4-3: Rock engravings at the Wildebeest Kuil Rock Art Site.

The Wildebeest Kuil 1 Rock Art site, a declared Provincial Heritage Site (2008), is characterized by a fairly prominent hill surrounded by a number of 'kuils' or non-perennial water holes and wetlands. The hill itself is host to more than 400 petroglyphs, including both naturalistic and abstract engravings, in fine-line and pecked technique. LSA deposits are scattered about the immediate terrain with deposits closer to the hill indicative of residential outlines and activity or knapping areas. Extensive LSA use of the landscape is evidenced by even more engravings on the glacial pavements of the farm Nooitgedacht, just north of Platfontein. Further afield the Driekopseiland site, one of the most prolific engraving sites in the country is host to more than 3,600 images, engraved into the glaciated andesite of the Riet River's banks (Morris 1990a). Closer to the Vaal River, at the Bushmans' Fountain site, Klipfontein, more than 4,500 engravings have been recorded across the approximate 9ha site (Morris 1990b). The many petroglyph sites across the Northern Cape signal an aesthetic and spiritual expression of a modern LSA cognition. The LSA archaeological record is directly associated with San history, dating conservatively back to around 40-27kya, whilst the Khoe is reported to have entered the country around 2kya (Mitchell 2002). Both groups are known to have traded with Later Iron Age communities and Colonial settlers. Rock engravings are mostly situated in the semi-arid plateau with most of these engravings situated at the Orange – Vaal basin, Karoo and Namibia. The upper Vaal, Limpopo basin and eastern Free State regions have a small

quantity of rock engravings as well. Generally, rock paintings exist at cave areas and rock engravings at open surface areas. The Cape interior consists of a technical, formal and thematic variation between and within sites (Morris 1988). Two major techniques existed namely the incised and pecked engravings. Morris (1988) indicated technical and formal characteristics through space and a sharp contrast exists between engravings positioned north of the Orange River that are mostly pecked and those in the Karoo where scraping was mostly used. According to Morris (1988) hairline engravings occur at the North and the South, but they are rare at the Vryburg region. Finger painting techniques mostly occur at the Kuruman Hills, Asbestos Mountains, Ghaap Escarpment, Langeberg, Koranaberg ranges, scattered sites at the Karoo and the Kareeberge (Morris 1988). The development petroglyphs (i.e. carving or line drawing on rock) were associated with three different types of techniques, namely incised fine lines, pecked engravings and scraped engravings. According to Peter Beaumont the pecked and scraped engravings at the Upper Karoo are coeval (i.e. having the same age or date of origin) (Beaumont P B et al. 1989). Dating of rock art includes the use of carbonate fraction dating of ostrich eggshell pieces, dating of charcoal and ostrich eggshell at various rock art shelters. Unifacial points, double segments and thin – walled sherds may indicate the presence of the Khoikhoi at the Northern Cape during 2500 BP (years Before the Present) (Beaumont 1989).

4.2.3 Iron Age / Farmer Period

The beginnings of the Iron Age (Farmer Period) in Southern Africa are associated with the arrival of a new Bantu speaking population group at around the third century AD. These newcomers introduced a new way of life into areas that were occupied by Later Stone Age hunter-gatherers and Khoekhoe herders. Distinctive features of the Iron Age are a settled village life, food production (agriculture and animal husbandry), metallurgy (the mining, smelting and working of iron, copper and gold) and the manufacture of pottery. Iron Age people moved into Southern Africa by c. AD 200, entering the area either by moving down the coastal plains, or by using a more central route. From the coast they followed the various rivers inland. Being cultivators, they preferred rich alluvial soils. The Iron Age can be divided into three phases. The Early Iron Age includes the majority of the first millennium A.D. and is characterised by traditions such as Happy Rest and Silver Leaves. The Middle Iron Age spans the 10th to the 13th Centuries A.D. and includes such well known cultures as those at K2 and Mapungubwe. The Late Iron Age is taken to stretch from the 14th Century up to the colonial period and includes traditions such as Icon and Letaba. Stone ruins indicate the occurrence of Iron Age settlements in the Northern Cape specifically at sites such as Dithakong where evidence exists that the Thlaping used to be settled in the Kuruman – Dithakong areas prior to 1800 (Breutz 1959, Humphreys 1976). Here, the assessment of the contact between the Stone Age, Iron Age and Colonial societies are significant in order to understand situations of contact and assimilation between societies. As an example, Trade occurred between local Thlaping Tswana people and the Khoikhoi communities. It means that the Tswana traded as far south as the Orange River at least the same time as the Europeans at the Cape (Humphreys 1976).

4.2.4 Pastoralism and the last 2000 years

Until 2000 years ago, hunter-gatherer communities traded, exchanged goods, encountered and interacted with other hunter-gatherer communities. From about 2000 years ago the social dynamics of the Southern African landscape started changing with the immigration of two 'other' groups of people, different in physique, political, economic and social systems, beliefs and rituals. One of these groups, the Khoekhoen pastoralists or herders entered Southern Africa with domestic animals, namely fat-tailed sheep and goats, travelling through the south towards the coast. They also introduced thin-walled pottery common in the interior and along the coastal regions of Southern Africa. Their economic systems were directed by the accumulation of wealth in domestic stock numbers and their political make-up was more hierarchical than that of the hunter-gatherers.

4.2.5 Later History: Colonial Period and the Anglo Boer War

The 18th century was defined as a period of conflict when the Griqua, Korana and white settlers were competing for the availability of land. This period is also known for the occurrence of the Mfecane or the so called Difaqane that resulted in a time period of instability that started in the middle 1820's. The conflict time period related to the Mfecane or Difaqane was the result of the influx of the then displaced people. The continuous conflict resulted in tribal groups migrating to hilltop areas in the need of finding safe environments. From early Colonial times interest in the Northern Cape was firmly vested in its mineral wealth; early settlers speculated about mountains rich in copper towards the north-west. The landscape around the study area was scarcely populated in Historical times and it was only towards the early 19th century that missionaries, hunters and traders access the region. These pioneers were followed by Colonial farmers who negotiated with local chiefs for land, or occupied areas that were perceived to be vacant. In some areas short-lived Boer Republics were established.

Since 1869, the various gravels along the Vaal River have been worked intensively for their content of high-grade alluvial diamonds. The standard size of a digger's claim was 15 x 15 metres. The diamond-bearing gravels, covered by a layer of sterile red sand, were washed by hand in simple rotary pans. The left-over concentrate of heavy material was then carefully sorted for diamonds. The search for diamonds continues along the Vaal River in the Windsorton, Barkly West and Delportshoop areas and further downstream. Most of the European-owned farms in this region were proclaimed during the 19th century but various claims and counter claims to ownership of the territory were made following the discovery of diamonds in 1869-70. For example, the Presidents of the Free State and Transvaal Republics met in the area with the Griqua Chief Nicolaas Waterboer and his agent David Arnot, Griqua lawyer and diplomat on 18 August 1870 to discuss land ownership and rights. The Griqua representatives walked out in a huff and the Free State proclaimed the territory theirs. But this was not the end of the story, the dispute being settled eventually by the Keate Award (in favour of Waterboer, who placed himself under British protection), and the proclamation of the Crown Colony of Griqualand West on 27 October 1871.

The Anglo-Boer War saw the Kimberley area besieged by the *Boers* on the 14th of October 1899, with British forces suffering heavy losses. The Boers moved quickly to try to capture the British enclave when war broke out between the British and the two Boer republics in October 1899. The town was ill-prepared but the defenders organised an energetic and effective improvised defense that was able to prevent it from being taken. Cecil John Rhodes, who had made his fortune in the town, and who controlled all the mining activities, moved into the town at the onset of the siege. His presence was controversial, as his involvement in the Jameson Raid made him one of the primary protagonists behind war breaking out. Rhodes was constantly at loggerheads with the military, but he was nonetheless instrumental in organising the defense of the town. The Boers shelled the town with their superior artillery in an attempt to force the garrison to capitulate. Engineers of the De Beers company manufactured a one-off gun named Long Cecil, however the Boers soon countered with a much larger siege gun that terrified the residents, forcing many to take shelter in the Kimberley Mine. The British military had to change its strategy for the war as public opinion demanded that the sieges of Kimberley, Ladysmith and Mafeking be relieved before the Boer capitals were assaulted. The first attempt at relief of Kimberley under Lord Methuen was stopped at the battles of Modder River and Magersfontein. The 124-day siege was finally relieved on 15 February 1900 by a cavalry division under Lieutenant-General John French, part of a larger force under Lord Roberts. The battle against the Boer general Piet Cronjé continued at Paardeberg immediately after the town itself was relieved.




Figure 4-4: Original title deed for the farm Slypklip, dating to 1884

5 RESULTS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

5.1 The Off-Site Desktop Survey

In terms of heritage resources, the general landscape around the project area is primarily well known for its Stone Age and Colonial / Historical Period archaeology primarily related to farming and the Diamond Mining industry of the past century and resulting urbanization and industrialization. No particular reference to archaeological sites or features of heritage potential were recorded during an examination of literature thematically or geographically related to the project area.

A careful analysis of historical aerial imagery and archive maps indicate that portions of Slypklip – and particularly areas subject to this assessment have been altered extensively by recent and historical farming activities along the Vaal River. Man-made structures, notably the “Skanskop” farmstead, were noted to be present south of the project areas during the first part of the 20th century, outside the development area (see Figure 5-1 and Figure 5-2).



Figure 5-1: An aerial image of Slypklip dating to 1944 indicating the locations of the project area (yellow outlines) during the early 20th century. Note the apparent absence of man-made structures in the footprint area.




Figure 5-2: Historical topographic maps of Slyphklip dating to 1968 (left) and 1986 (right), indicating the location of the project area (green outline) during the mid to later 20th century.

5.2 The Archaeological Site Survey

An analysis of historical aerial imagery and archive maps of areas subject to this assessment suggests a landscape which has been subjected to historical farming activities possibly sterilising the area of heritage remains. This inference was confirmed during an archaeological site assessment during which no *in situ* archaeological or heritage remains were encountered. The following observations were made:

- **Stone Age** remains associated with geo-morphological exposures along the Vaal River, as well as rock outcrops are known to exist in the larger Kimberley area. Similarly, a number of Middle Stone Age tools were found scattered across the project landscape on surfaces previously transformed by crop farming. Artefacts observed include both residue and debris, and formal MSA tools such as scrapers, points, blades, prepared cores and residue flakes. The artefacts were manufactured from banded ironstone and fine-grained dolerite and other Cryptocrystalline Silica (CCS) material. As these lithics were found in areas previously cultivated, their primary context has in all probability been lost compromising their scientific value.



Figure 5-3: View of eroded and previously cultivated surfaces where MSA tools were noted.



Figure 5-4: An MSA scarpers (left), debitage (centre) and a core (right) noted in the project area in disturbed areas.



Figure 5-5: A core (left) and two side scrapers (centre and right) from the MSA located in the project area.

- A frontier zone between the east and the west, the Northwest and Northern Cape landscape contains traces of precolonial **Iron Age Farmer Period** remnants. However, the site inspection produced no Iron Age farmer sites or remains.
- Kimberley and its surroundings have a long and extensive **Colonial Period** settlement history. From around the first half of the 19th century, the area was frequented by explorers, missionaries and farmers who all contributed to a recent history of contact and conflict. Even though structures dating to Historical Period farming occurs north of the project footprint in features relating to the built environment of the early Historical Period were observed in the project footprint.
- No **graves** or signs of **human burials** were observed in the project. In the rural areas of the Northern Cape Province graves and cemeteries often occur within settlements or around homesteads but this seem not to be the case in Riverton owing to the centralization of burials at the dedicated municipal cemetery. However, the probability of additional and informal human burials encountered during development should not be excluded. If any human bones are found during the course of construction work then they should be reported to an archaeologist and work in the immediate vicinity should cease until the appropriate actions have been carried out by the archaeologist

As noted in previous sections, the absence of heritage sites can be attributed to the fact that general landscape has been transformed as a result of historical and more recent crop and livestock farming

6 RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING

6.1 Potential Impacts and Significance Ratings²

The following section provides a background to the identification and assessment of possible impacts and alternatives, as well as a range of risk situations and scenarios commonly associated with heritage resources management. A guideline for the rating of impacts and recommendation of management actions for areas of heritage potential within the study area is supplied in Section 10.2 of Addendum 3.

6.1.1 General assessment of impacts on resources

Generally, the value and significance of archaeological and other heritage sites might be impacted on by any activity that would result immediately or in the future in the destruction, damage, excavation, alteration, removal or collection from its original position, of any archaeological material or object (as indicated in the National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999)). Thus, the destructive impacts that are possible in terms of heritage resources would tend to be direct, once-off events occurring during the initial construction period. However, in the long run, the proximity of operations in any given area could result in secondary indirect impacts. The EIA process therefore specifies impact assessment criteria which can be utilised from the perspective of a heritage specialist study which elucidates the overall extent of impacts.

6.1.2 Direct impact rating

Direct or primary effects on heritage resources occur at the same time and in the same space as the activity, e.g. loss of historical fabric through demolition work. **Indirect effects or secondary effects** on heritage resources occur later in time or at a different place from the causal activity, or as a result of a complex pathway, e.g. restriction of access to a heritage resource resulting in the gradual erosion of its significance, which is dependent on ritual patterns of access (refer to Section 10.3 in the Addendum for an outline of the relationship between the significance of a heritage context, the intensity of development and the significance of heritage impacts to be expected).

Cognisant of known site distribution patterns in this section of the Northern Cape Province along the Vaal River, and based on general on-site observations and off-site assessments and, notably the fact that the project site and its immediate surrounds have previously been transformed by intensive historical agriculture and farming, the author of this report is of the opinion that the Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project, will have a minimal (if any) impact on archaeological artefacts, features or structures surviving in primary context, subject to the fact that no previously undetected heritage remains (for example, those in sub-surface deposits) are exposed at any stage of the development.

6.2 Management actions

Recommendations for relevant heritage resource management actions are vital to the conservation of heritage resources. A general guideline for recommended management actions is included in Section 10.4 of Addendum 3.

OBJECTIVE: ensure conservation of heritage resources of significance, prevent unnecessary disturbance and/or destruction of previously undetected heritage receptors.

No specific action in terms of mitigation is required for the footprint areas of the Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project. However, the following general procedure is required for the site:

² Based on: Winter, S. & Baumann, N. 2005. *Guideline for involving heritage specialists in EIA processes: Edition 1.*

PROJECT COMPONENT/S	All phases of construction and operation.		
POTENTIAL IMPACT	Damage/destruction of sites.		
ACTIVITY RISK/SOURCE	Digging foundations and trenches into sensitive deposits that are not visible at the surface.		
MITIGATION: TARGET/OBJECTIVE	To locate previously undetected heritage remains / graves as soon as possible after disturbance so as to maximize the chances of successful rescue/mitigation work.		
MITIGATION: ACTION/CONTROL	RESPONSIBILITY	TIMEFRAME	
Fixed Mitigation Procedure (required)			
Site Monitoring: Regular examination of trenches and excavations.	ECO	Monitor as frequently as practically possible.	
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	Archaeological sites are discovered and mitigated with the minimum amount of unnecessary disturbance.		
MONITORING	Successful location of sites by person/s monitoring.		

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

The larger landscape around the project area indicate a rich heritage horizon encompassing Stone Age and Colonial / Historical Period archaeology primarily related to the Diamond Mining industry of the past century and resulting urbanization and industrialization. Locally, the project area has been largely transformed by historical and recent agriculture activities largely sterilising surface and subsurface of heritage remains, especially those dating to pre-colonial and prehistorical times. Cognisance should nonetheless be taken of archaeological material that might be present in surface and sub-surface deposits along drainage lines and in pristine areas. The following recommendations are made based on general observations in the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project area:

- A Palaeontological Impact Assessment is recommended where bedrock is to be impacted and, should fossil remains such as fossil fish, reptiles or petrified wood be exposed during construction, these objects should carefully safeguarded and the relevant heritage resources authority (SAHRA) should be notified immediately so that the appropriate action can be taken by a professional palaeontologist.
- A number of MSA lithics, including formal tools such as broken points, scrapers and a blade were noted in the project area along previously cultivated surfaces. The transformed nature of the local landscape has resulted in a loss of primary context and as such, the scientific value of the artefacts. However, it is recommended that any development activities be monitored in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected Stone Age occurrences.
- Considering the localised nature of heritage remains, the general monitoring of the development progress by an ECO or by the heritage specialist is recommended for all stages of the project. Should any subsurface palaeontological, archaeological or historical material, or burials be exposed during construction activities, all activities should be suspended and the archaeological specialist should be notified immediately.
- It is essential that cognisance be taken of the larger archaeological landscape of the area in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage sites. It should be stated that it is likely that further undetected archaeological remains might occur elsewhere in the Study Area along water sources and drainage lines, fountains and pans would often have attracted

human activity in the past. Also, since Stone Age material seems to originate from below present soil surfaces in eroded areas, the larger landscape should be regarded as potentially sensitive in terms of possible subsurface deposits. Burials and historically significant structures dating to the Colonial Period occur on farms in the area and these resources should be avoided during all phases of construction and development, including the operational phases of the development.

In addition to these site-specific recommendations, careful cognizance should be taken of the following:

- As Palaeontological remains occur where bedrock has been exposed, all geological features should be regarded as sensitive.
- Water sources such as drainage lines, fountains and pans would often have attracted human activity in the past. As Stone Age material occur in the larger landscape, such resources should be regarded as potentially sensitive in terms of possible subsurface deposits.

8 GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS

This AIA report serves to confirm the extent and significance of the heritage landscape of the proposed Magogudi Tyre Storage Facilities Slypklip Project area. The larger heritage horizon encompasses rich and diverse archaeological landscapes and cognizance should be taken of heritage resources and archaeological material that might be present in surface and sub-surface deposits. If, during construction, any possible archaeological material culture discoveries are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist be contacted for an assessment of the find. Such material culture might include:

- Formal Earlier Stone Age stone tools.
- Formal MSA stone tools.
- Formal LSA stone tools.
- Potsherds
- Iron objects.
- Beads made from ostrich eggshell and glass.
- Ash middens and cattle dung deposits and accumulations.
- Faunal remains.
- Human remains/graves.
- Stone walling or any sub-surface structures.
- Historical glass, tin or ceramics.
- Fossils.

If such sites were to be encountered or impacted by any proposed developments, recommendations contained in this report, as well as endorsement of mitigation measures as set out by AMAFA, SAHRA, the National Resources Act and the CRM section of ASAPA will be required. It must be emphasised that the conclusions and recommendations expressed in this archaeological heritage sensitivity investigation are based on the visibility of archaeological sites/features and may not therefore, represent the area's complete archaeological legacy. Many sites/features may be covered by soil and vegetation and might only be located during sub-surface investigations. If subsurface archaeological deposits, artefacts or skeletal material were to be recovered in the area during construction activities, all activities should be suspended and the archaeological specialist should be notified immediately (*cf.* NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 36 (6)). It must also be clear that Archaeological Specialist Reports will be assessed by the relevant heritage resources authority (SAHRA).

9 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bergh, J.S. 1999. Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika: die vier noordelike provinsies. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik
- Beaumont, P & Morris, D. 1990. Guide to archaeological sites in the Northern Cape. McGregor Museum, Kimberley
- Beaumont, P.B., 2004. Kathu Pan and Kathu Townlands/Uitkoms. In: Morris, D. & Beaumont, P.B. (Eds.), Archaeology in the Northern Cape: Some Key Sites. Southern African Association for Archaeologists Postconference Excursion, Kimberley, McGregor Museum: pp. 50–53;
- Bergh, J.S. 1999. Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika: die vier noordelike provinsies. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik
- Birkholtz, P. 2011. Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed Pering Mining Project, Located on the Farm Pering Mine 1023 HN, Reivilo, North West Province. Pretoria: PGS
- Breutz, P. L. 1959. The tribes of Vryburg district. Ethnological Publications No. 46. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Curnoe, D et al. 2005. Beyond Taung: Palaeoanthropological research at Groot Kloof, Ghaap Escarpment, Northern Cape Province, South Africa. Nyame Akuma Bulletin of the Society of Africanist Archaeologists, December 2005:64
- Curnoe, D et al. 2006. Discovery of Middle Pleistocene fossil and stone tool-bearing deposits at Groot Kloof, Ghaap escarpment, Northern Cape province. South African Journal of Science **102**, May/June 2006
- Deacon, J. 1996. Archaeology for Planners, Developers and Local Authorities. National Monuments Council. Publication no. P021E.
- Deacon, J. 1997. Report: Workshop on Standards for the Assessment of Significance and Research Priorities for Contract Archaeology. In: Newsletter No 49, Sept 1998. Association for Southern African Archaeologists.
- Denbow, J.R. 1979. *Cenchrus ciliaris*: an ecological indicator of Iron Age middens using aerial photography in eastern Botswana. South African Journal of Science 75:405—408
- Evers, T.M. 1988. The recognition of Groups in the Iron Age of Southern Africa. PhD thesis. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.
- Hall, M. 1987. The Changing Past :Farmers, Kings & Traders in Southern Africa 200 – 1860 Cape Town, Johannesburg: David Philip
- Hall, M. 1996. Archaeology Africa. Cape Town, Johannesburg: David Philip
- Henning, B. 2013. An Environmental Report on the Ecology (flora and fauna) for the for the proposed

Renewable Energy Generation Project on Portion 1 of the Farm Kangkatjes 919 HN. Pretoria: AGES Gauteng (Pty)Ltd.

Huffman, T.N. 2002. Regionality in the Iron Age: the case of the Sotho-Tswana. Southern African Humanities. Vol 14. Pietermaritzburg.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. Handbook to the Iron Age. Pietermaritzburg: University of Kwazulu-Natal Press
Kruger, N. 2012. Sishen Western Waste Rock Dumps: Sishen Iron Ore Mine, Kgalagadi District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment Report. Pretoria: AGES Gauteng (Pty)Ltd.

Humphreys, A.J. (2009 reproduced). A Prehistoric Frontier in the Northern Cape and the Western Orange Free State Archaeological Evidence in Interaction and Ideological Change

Kruger, N. 2013. Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study of Portion 1 of the farm Kangkatjes 919 HN, for the proposed Vidigenix 2 Solar Park in the Greater Taung Local Municipality, Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompoti District Municipality, North West Province. Pretoria: AGES

Morris, D. 1990a. Driekopseiland. In Beaumont, P.B. & Morris, D. (eds.) Guide to Archaeological Sites in the Northern Cape. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.

Morris, D. 1990b. Klipfontein: Bushman's Fountain Rock Engraving Site. In Beaumont, P.B. & Morris, D. (eds.) Guide to Archaeological Sites in the Northern Cape. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.

Morris, D. 2004. Tsantsabane: the Blinkklipkop specularite mine, and Doornfontein. In: Morris, D and Beaumont, P. Archaeology in the Northern Cape: some key sites. Kimberley: McGregor Museum, 54 – 60.

Morris, D. 2005. Report on a Phase 1 Archaeological Assessment of proposed mining areas on the farms Ploegfontein, Klipbankfontein, Welgevonden, Leeuwfontein, Wolhaarkop and Kapstevel, west of Postmasburg, Northern Cape. Unpublished Report.

Morris, D. 2006. Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment at the claim of Mr M.M. Nyaba, Erf 687 near Barkly West, Northern Cape. Unpublished Report.

Phillipson, D.W. 1985. African Archaeology (second edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Renfrew, C & Bahn, P. 1991. Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice USA: Thames & Hudson

Swanepoel, N. et al (Eds.) 2008. Five hundred years rediscovered. Johannesburg: Wits University Press

Soriano, S, Villa, P & Wadley, L. 2007. Blade technology and tool forms in the Middle Stone Age of South Africa: the Howiesons Poort and post-Howiesons Poort at Rose Cottage Cave. Journal of Archaeological Science 34:681-703.

Van der Ryst, M.M & Küsel, S. 2012. Phase 2 Report on Middle Stone Age localities on the farm Zandkopsdrift 357, Garies District, Northern Cape Province. Pretoria: Habitat Landscape Architects.

Van Schalkwyk, J. 2011. Heritage impact assessment for the proposed development of photovoltaic power plants on five different locations in Northwest and Northern Cape Provinces. Pretoria: NCHM

Van Warmelo, N.J. 1935. A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Wilke, D. 1993. Van delwerskamp tot dorp : Delportshoop, 1871-1931. Tesis (M.A.) University van Port Elizabeth, 1993.

Winter, S. & Baumann, N. 2005. Guideline for involving heritage specialists in EIA processes: Edition 1. CSIR Report No ENV-S-C 2005 053 E. Republic of South Africa, Provincial Government of the Western Cape, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning, Cape Town.

Wilkins, J. & Chazan, M. 2012. Blade production ~500 thousand years ago at Kathu Pan 1, South Africa: support for a multiple origins hypothesis for early Middle Pleistocene blade technology. Journal of Archaeological Science

Human Tissue Act and Ordinance 7 of 1925, Government Gazette, Cape Town

National Resource Act No.25 of 1999, Government Gazette, Cape Town

SAHRA, 2005. Minimum Standards for the Archaeological and the Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment Reports, Draft version 1.4.

<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn22508-first-stonetipped-spear-thrown-earlier-than-thought.html>

Accessed 2019-05-20

<http://southafricanpalaeocaves.files.wordpress.com/>

Accessed 2019-05-20

<http://csg.dla.gov.za/index.html>

Accessed 2019-05-20

<http://www.thepresidency.gov.za/pebble.asp?relid=7643>

Accessed 2019-05-20

10 ADDENDUM 1: HERITAGE LEGISLATION BACKGROUND

10.1 CRM: Legislation, Conservation and Heritage Management

The broad generic term Cultural Heritage Resources refers to any physical and spiritual property associated with past and present human use or occupation of the environment, cultural activities and history. The term includes sites, structures, places, natural features and material of palaeontological, archaeological, historical, aesthetic, scientific, architectural, religious, symbolic or traditional importance to specific individuals or groups, traditional systems of cultural practice, belief or social interaction.

10.1.1 Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and their provincial offices aim to conserve and control the management, research, alteration and destruction of cultural resources of South Africa. It is therefore vitally important to adhere to heritage resource legislation at all times.

d. National Heritage Resources Act No 25 of 1999, section 35

According to the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 a historical site is any identifiable building or part thereof, marker, milestone, gravestone, landmark or tell older than 60 years. This clause is commonly known as the "60-years clause". Buildings are amongst the most enduring features of human occupation, and this definition therefore includes all buildings older than 60 years, modern architecture as well as ruins, fortifications and Iron Age settlements. "Tell" refers to the evidence of human existence which is no longer above ground level, such as building foundations and buried remains of settlements (including artefacts).

The Act identifies heritage objects as:

- objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa including archaeological and palaeontological objects, meteorites and rare geological specimens
- visual art objects
- military objects
- numismatic objects
- objects of cultural and historical significance
- objects to which oral traditions are attached and which are associated with living heritage
- objects of scientific or technological interest
- any other prescribed category

With regards to activities and work on archaeological and heritage sites this Act states that:

"No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years without a permit by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority." (34. [1] 1999:58)

and

"No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority-

- (d) *destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;*
- (e) *destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological material or object or any meteorite;*

- (f) *trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or palaeontological material or object, or any meteorite; or*
- (g) *bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites. (35. [4] 1999:58)."*

and

"No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources agency-

- (h) *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;*
- (i) *destroy, damage, alter, exhume, 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;*
- (j) *bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) and excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals (36. [3] 1999:60)."*

e. Human Tissue Act of 1983 and Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies of 1925

Graves 60 years or older are heritage resources and fall under the jurisdiction of both the National Heritage Resources Act and the Human Tissues Act of 1983. However, graves younger than 60 years are specifically protected by the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and the Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies (Ordinance 7 of 1925) as well as any local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws. Such burial places also fall under the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the Provincial Health Departments. Approval for the exhumation and re-burial must be obtained from the relevant Provincial MEC as well as the relevant Local Authorities.

10.1.2 Background to HIA and AIA 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. Heritage sites are frequently threatened by development projects and both the environmental and heritage legislation require impact assessments (HIAs & AIAs) that identify all heritage resources in areas to be developed. Particularly, these assessments are required to make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact of the sites. HIAs and AIAs should be done by qualified professionals with adequate knowledge to (a) identify all heritage resources including archaeological and palaeontological sites that might occur in areas of developed and (b) make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact on the sites.

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:

“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:

- (k) The identification and mapping of all heritage resources in the area affected;
- (l) 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;
- (m) an assessment of the impact of the development on such heritage resources;
- (n) 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;
- (o) the results of consultation with communities affected by the proposed development and other interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources;
- (p) if heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the consideration of alternatives; and
- (q) plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after the completion of the proposed development (38. [3] 1999:64).”

Consequently, section 35 of the Act requires Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) or Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIAs) to be done for such developments in order for all heritage resources, that is, all places or objects of aesthetics, architectural, historic, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance to be protected. Thus any assessment should make provision for the protection of all these heritage components, including archaeology, shipwrecks, battlefields, graves, and structures older than 60

years, living heritage, historical settlements, landscapes, geological sites, palaeontological sites and objects. Heritage resources management and conservation.

10.2 Assessing the Significance of Heritage Resources

Archaeological sites, as previously defined in the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) are places in the landscape where people have lived in the past – generally more than 60 years ago – and have left traces of their presence behind. In South Africa, archaeological sites include hominid fossil sites, places where people of the Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age lived in open sites, river gravels, rock shelters and caves, Iron Age sites, graves, and a variety of historical sites and structures in rural areas, towns and cities. Palaeontological sites are those with fossil remains of plants and animals where people were not involved in the accumulation of the deposits. The basic principle of cultural heritage conservation is that archaeological and other heritage sites are valuable, scarce and *non-renewable*. Many such sites are unfortunately lost on a daily basis through development for housing, roads and infrastructure and once archaeological sites are damaged, they cannot be re-created as site integrity and authenticity is permanently lost. Archaeological sites have the potential to contribute to our understanding of the history of the region and of our country and continent. By preserving links with our past, we may not be able to revive lost cultural traditions, but it enables us to appreciate the role they have played in the history of our country.

- Categories of significance

Rating the significance of archaeological sites, and consequently grading the potential impact on the resources is linked to the significance of the site itself. The significance of an archaeological site is based on the amount of deposit, the integrity of the context, the kind of deposit and the potential to help answer present research questions. Historical structures are defined by Section 34 of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999, while other historical and cultural significant sites, places and features, are generally determined by community preferences. The guidelines as provided by the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999) in Section 3, with special reference to subsection 3 are used when determining the cultural significance or other special value of archaeological or historical sites. In addition, ICOMOS (the Australian Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites) highlights four cultural attributes, which are valuable to any given culture:

- *Aesthetic value:*

Aesthetic value includes aspects of sensory perception for which criteria can and should be stated. Such criteria include consideration of the form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric, the general atmosphere associated with the place and its uses and also the aesthetic values commonly assessed in the analysis of landscapes and townscape.

- *Historic value:*

Historic value encompasses the history of aesthetics, science and society and therefore to a large extent underlies all of the attributes discussed here. Usually a place has historical value because of some kind of influence by an event, person, phase or activity.

- *Scientific value:*

The scientific or research value of a place will depend upon the importance of the data involved, on its rarity, quality and on the degree to which the place may contribute further substantial information.

- *Social value:*

Social value includes the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a certain group.

It is important for heritage specialist input in the EIA process to take into account the heritage management structure set up by the NHR Act. It makes provision for a 3-tier system of management including the South Africa Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) at a national level, Provincial Heritage Resources Authorities (PHRAs) at a provincial and the local authority. The Act makes provision for two types or forms of protection of heritage resources; i.e. formally protected and generally protected sites:

Formally protected sites:

- Grade 1 or national heritage sites, which are managed by SAHRA
- Grade 2 or provincial heritage sites, which are managed by the provincial HRA (MP-PHRA).
- Grade 3 or local heritage sites.

Generally protected sites:

- Human burials older than 60 years.
- Archaeological and palaeontological sites.
- Shipwrecks and associated remains older than 60 years.
- Structures older than 60 years.

With reference to the evaluation of sites, the certainty of prediction is definite, unless stated otherwise and if the significance of the site is rated high, the significance of the impact will also result in a high rating. The same rule applies if the significance rating of the site is low. The significance of archaeological sites is generally ranked into the following categories.

Significance	Rating Action
No significance: sites that do not require mitigation.	None
Low significance: sites, which may require mitigation.	2a. Recording and documentation (Phase 1) of site; no further action required 2b. Controlled sampling (shovel test pits, auguring), mapping and documentation (Phase 2 investigation); permit required for sampling and destruction
Medium significance: sites, which require mitigation.	3. Excavation of representative sample, C14 dating, mapping and documentation (Phase 2 investigation); permit required for sampling and destruction [including 2a & 2b]
High significance: sites, where disturbance should be avoided.	4a. Nomination for listing on Heritage Register (National, Provincial or Local) (Phase 2 & 3 investigation); site management plan; permit required if utilised for education or tourism
High significance: Graves and burial places	4b. Locate demonstrable descendants through social consulting; obtain permits from applicable legislation, ordinances and regional by-laws; exhumation and reinterment [including 2a, 2b & 3]

Furthermore, the significance of archaeological sites was based on six main criteria:

- Site integrity (i.e. primary vs. secondary context),
- Amount of deposit, range of features (e.g., stonewalling, stone tools and enclosures),
- Density of scatter (dispersed scatter),
- Social value,
- Uniqueness, and
- Potential to answer current and future research questions.

11 ADDENDUM 2: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE

11.1 Site Significance Matrix

According to the NHRA, Section 2(vi) the **significance** of heritage sites and artefacts is determined by it 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. The following matrix is used for assessing the significance of each identified site/feature.

2. SITE EVALUATION			
2.1 Heritage Value (NHRA, section 2 [3])	High	Medium	Low
It has importance to the community or pattern of South Africa’s history or pre-colonial history.			
It possesses unique, uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage.			
It has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa’s natural and cultural heritage.			
It is of importance in demonstrating the principle characteristics of a particular class of South Africa’s natural or cultural places or objects.			
It has importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a particular community or cultural group.			
It has importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period.			
It has marked or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (sense of place).			
It has strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa.			
It has significance through contributing towards the promotion of a local sociocultural identity and can be developed as a tourist destination.			
It has significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.			
It has importance to the wider understanding of temporal changes within cultural landscapes, settlement patterns and human occupation.			
2.2 Field Register Rating			
National/Grade 1 [should be registered, retained]			
Provincial/Grade 2 [should be registered, retained]			
Local/Grade 3A [should be registered, mitigation not advised]			
Local/Grade 3B [High significance; mitigation, partly retained]			
Generally Protected A [High/Medium significance, mitigation]			
Generally protected B [Medium significance, to be recorded]			
Generally Protected C [Low significance, no further action]			
2.3 Sphere of Significance	High	Medium	Low
International			
National			
Provincial			
Local			
Specific community			

11.2 Impact Assessment Criteria

The following table provides a guideline for the rating of impacts and recommendation of management actions for sites of heritage potential.

Significance of the heritage resource

This is a statement of the nature and degree of significance of the heritage resource being affected by the activity. From a heritage management perspective, it is useful to distinguish between whether the significance is embedded in the physical fabric or in associations with events or persons or in the experience of a place; i.e. its visual and non-visual qualities. This statement is a primary informant to the nature and degree of significance of an impact and thus needs to be thoroughly considered. Consideration needs to be given to the significance of a heritage resource at different scales (i.e. site-specific, local, regional, national or international) and the relationship between the heritage resource, its setting and its associations.

Nature of the impact

This is an assessment of the nature of the impact of the activity on a heritage resource, with some indication of its positive and/or negative effect/s. It is strongly informed by the statement of resource significance. In other words, the nature of the impact may be historical, aesthetic, social, scientific, linguistic or architectural, intrinsic, associational or contextual (visual or non-visual). In many cases, the nature of the impact will include more than one value.

Extent

Here it should be indicated whether the impact will be experienced:

- On a site scale, i.e. extend only as far as the activity;
- Within the immediate context of a heritage resource;
- On a local scale, e.g. town or suburb
- On a metropolitan or regional scale; or
- On a national/international scale.

Duration

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

- Short term, (needs to be defined in context)
- Medium term, (needs to be defined in context)
- Long term where the impact will persist indefinitely, possibly beyond the operational life of the activity, either because of natural processes or by human intervention; or
- Permanent where mitigation either by natural process or by human intervention will not occur in such a way or in such a time span that the impact can be considered transient.

Of relevance to the duration of an impact are the following considerations:

- Reversibility of the impact; and
- Renewability of the heritage resource.

Intensity

Here it should be established whether the impact should be indicated as:

- Low, where the impact affects the resource in such a way that its heritage value is not affected;
- Medium, where the affected resource is altered but its heritage value continues to exist albeit in a modified way; and
- High, where heritage value is altered to the extent that it will temporarily or permanently be damaged or destroyed.

Probability

This should describe the likelihood of the impact actually occurring indicated as:

- Improbable, where the possibility of the impact to materialize is very low either because of design or historic experience;
- Probable, where there is a distinct possibility that the impact will occur;
- Highly probable, where it is most likely that the impact will occur; or
- Definite, where the impact will definitely occur regardless of any mitigation measures

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.

Impact Significance

The significance of impacts can be determined through a synthesis of the aspects produced in terms of the nature and degree of heritage significance and the nature, duration, intensity, extent, probability and confidence of impacts and can be described as:

- Low; where it would have a negligible effect on heritage and on the decision
- Medium, where it would have a moderate effect on heritage and should influence the decision.
- High, where it would have, or there would be a high risk of, a big effect on heritage. Impacts of high significance should have a major influence on the decision;
- Very high, where it would have, or there would be high risk of, an irreversible and possibly irreplaceable negative impact on heritage. Impacts of very high significance should be a central factor in decision-making.

11.3 Direct Impact Assessment Criteria

The following table provides an outline of the relationship between the significance of a heritage context, the intensity of development and the significance of heritage impacts to be expected

HERITAGE CONTEXT	TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT			
	CATEGORY A	CATEGORY B	CATEGORY C	CATEGORY D
CONTEXT 1 High heritage Value	Moderate heritage impact expected	High heritage impact expected	Very high heritage impact expected	Very high heritage impact expected
CONTEXT 2 Medium to high heritage value	Minimal heritage impact expected	Moderate heritage impact expected	High heritage impact expected	Very high heritage impact expected
CONTEXT 3 Medium to low heritage value	Little or no heritage impact expected	Minimal heritage impact expected	Moderate heritage impact expected	High heritage impact expected
CONTEXT 4 Low to no heritage value	Little or no heritage impact expected	Little or no heritage impact expected	Minimal heritage value expected	Moderate heritage impact expected
NOTE: A DEFAULT "LITTLE OR NO HERITAGE IMPACT EXPECTED" VALUE APPLIES WHERE A HERITAGE RESOURCE OCCURS OUTSIDE THE IMPACT ZONE OF THE DEVELOPMENT.				
HERITAGE CONTEXTS		CATEGORIES OF DEVELOPMENT		
<p>Context 1: Of high intrinsic, associational and contextual heritage value within a national, provincial and local context, i.e. formally declared or potential Grade 1, 2 or 3A heritage resources</p> <p>Context 2: Of moderate to high intrinsic, associational and contextual value within a local context, i.e. potential Grade 3B heritage resources.</p> <p>Context 3:</p>		<p>Category A: Minimal intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No rezoning involved; within existing use rights. - No subdivision involved. - Upgrading of existing infrastructure within existing envelopes - Minor internal changes to existing structures - New building footprints limited to less than 1000m². <p>Category B: Low-key intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spot rezoning with no change to overall zoning of a site. - Linear development less than 100m 		

<p>Of medium to low intrinsic, associational or contextual heritage value within a national, provincial and local context, i.e. potential Grade 3C heritage resources</p> <p>Context 4: Of little or no intrinsic, associational or contextual heritage value due to disturbed, degraded conditions or extent of irreversible damage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building footprints between 1000m²-2000m² - Minor changes to external envelop of existing structures (less than 25%) - Minor changes in relation to bulk and height of immediately adjacent structures (less than 25%). <p>Category C: Moderate intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rezoning of a site between 5000m²-10 000m². - Linear development between 100m and 300m. - Building footprints between 2000m² and 5000m² - Substantial changes to external envelop of existing structures (more than 50%) - Substantial increase in bulk and height in relation to immediately adjacent buildings (more than 50%) <p>Category D: High intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rezoning of a site in excess of 10 000m² - Linear development in excess of 300m. - Any development changing the character of a site exceeding 5000m² or involving the subdivision of a site into three or more erven. - Substantial increase in bulk and height in relation to immediately adjacent buildings (more than 100%)
--	--

11.4 Management and Mitigation Actions

The following table provides a guideline of relevant heritage resources management actions is vital to the conservation of heritage resources.

<p>No further action / Monitoring</p> <p>Where no heritage resources have been documented, heritage resources occur well outside the impact zone of any development or the primary context of the surroundings at a development footprint has been largely destroyed or altered, no further immediate action is required. 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.</p> <p>Avoidance</p> <p>This is appropriate 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. Mitigation is not acceptable or not possible. This measure often includes the change / alteration of development planning and therefore impact zones in order not to impact on resources.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>This is appropriate where development occurs in a context of heritage significance and where the impact is such that it can be mitigated to a degree of medium to low significance, e.g. the high to medium impact of a development on an archaeological site could be mitigated through sampling/excavation of the remains. Not all negative impacts can be mitigated.</p> <p>Compensation</p> <p>Compensation is generally not an appropriate heritage management action. The main function of management actions should be to conserve the resource for the benefit of future generations. Once lost it cannot be renewed. The circumstances around the potential public or heritage benefits would need to be exceptional to warrant this type of action, especially in the case of where the impact was high.</p> <p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>Rehabilitation is considered in heritage management terms as a intervention typically involving the adding of a new heritage layer to enable a new sustainable use. It is not appropriate when the process necessitates the removal of previous historical layers, i.e. restoration of a building or place to the previous state/period. It is an appropriate heritage management action in the following cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - Where the rehabilitation process will not result in a negative impact on the intrinsic value of the resource. <p>Enhancement</p>
--

