



**AGES LIMPOPO: PROPOSED VIRGINIA 1, 2 & 3 SOLAR
PARKS EIA PROJECT ON PORTIONS OF THE FARM
BLOMSKRAAL 216, LEJWELEPUTSWA DISTRICT
MUNICIPALITY, FREE STATE PROVINCE**

Archaeological Impact Assessment



Prepared for: **AGES Limpopo**

Prepared by: **Exigo Sustainability**

ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (AIA) ON PORTIONS OF THE FARM BLOMSKRAAL 216 FOR THE PROPOSED VIRGINIA 1, 2 & 3 SOLAR PARKS EIA PROJECT, LEJWELEPUTSWA DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, FREE STATE PROVINCE

Conducted for:

AGES Limpopo

Compiled by:

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

DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST

Name	Institution
Johan Botha	AGES Limpopo
Engela Grobler	AGES Limpopo

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Date	Version	Status
15 May 2021	1.0	Draft
2 October 2021	2.0	Final Draft

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 Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA 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.

Disclosure of Vested Interest

I do not have and will not have any vested interest (either business, financial, personal or other) in the proposed activity proceeding other than remuneration for work performed in terms of the Regulations.



Signature of specialist
Company: Exigo Sustainability
Date: 2 October 2021

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 AGES Limpopo, 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 AGES Limpopo 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).

This Archaeological Impact Assessment report has been compiled considering the National Environmental Management Act 1998 (NEMA) and Environmental Impact Regulations 2014 as amended, requirements for specialist reports, Appendix 6, as indicated in the NEMA Table below.

Requirements of Appendix 6 – GN R326 EIA Regulations of 7 April 2017	Relevant section in report	Comment where not applicable.
1.(1) (a) (i) Details of the specialist who prepared the report	Page 4, Section 1.2 and Addendum 1 of Report.	-
(ii) The expertise of that person to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vita	Section 1.2 and Addendum 1 of Report.	-
(b) A declaration that the person is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	Page 4 of the report	-
(c) An indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1.3 and Section 1.4: Project Brief and Terms of Reference	-
(cA) An indication of the quality and age of base data used for the specialist report	Section 4: Archaeo-Historical Context	-
(cB) a description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change;	Section 9: Statement of Significance and Impact Rating	-
(d) The duration, date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	Section 3: Method of Enquiry	-
(e) a description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process inclusive of equipment and modelling used	Section 3: Method of Enquiry	-
(f) details of an assessment of the specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the proposed activity or activities and its associated structures and infrastructure, inclusive of a site plan identifying site alternatives;	Section 9: Statement of Significance and Impact Rating	-
(g) An identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	Section 5: Results Archaeological Survey	-
(h) A map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers;	Section 9: Statement of Significance and Impact Rating	-
(i) A description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;	Section 3.2: Limitations and Constraints	-
(j) A description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity, including identified alternatives, on the environment	Section 9: Statement of Significance and Impact Rating	-
(k) Any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 6.3: Management Actions Section 7: Recommendations	-
(l) Any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	N/A	None required
(m) Any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 6.3: Management Actions Section 7: Recommendations	-
(n)(i) A reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised and	Section 1 & Section 7	
(n)(iA) A reasoned opinion regarding the acceptability of the proposed activity or activities; and		
(n)(ii) If the opinion is that the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan	Section 6.3: Management Actions Section 7: Recommendations	-
(o) A description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of carrying out the study	N/A	Not applicable. A public consultation process will be conducted as part of the EIA and EMPr process.
(p) A summary and copies if any comments that were received during any consultation process	N/A	Not applicable.
(q) Any other information requested by the competent authority.	N/A	Not applicable.
(2) Where a government notice by the Minister provides for any protocol or minimum information requirement to be applied to a specialist report, the requirements as indicated in such notice will apply.	Section 1.5: CRM: Legislation, Conservation and Heritage Management	-

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the results of an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project on Portions of the Farm Blomskraal 216 in the Lejweleputswa District Municipality of the Free State Province. The proposed project entails the establishment of three solar parks on Blomskraal over a total surface area of **2120ha**. 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	Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project
Project Location	S28.22510° E27.01022°
1:50 000 Map Sheet	2826BB, 2826BB & 2827AA
Farm Portion / Parcel	Portions of the Farm Blomskraal 216
Magisterial District / Municipal Area	Lejweleputswa District Municipality
Province	Free State Province

The history of the Free State Province is reflected in a rich archaeological landscape. Sites, documenting Stone Age habitation occur in places, mostly in open air locales or in sediments alongside rivers or pans. Bantu-speaking groups moved into this area during the last millennia and these presumably Basotho groups occupied the landscape during the Late Iron Age times at around AD 1500-1800. Settlement by Iron Age communities occurred on plains near rivers and close to rocky outcrops. European farmers, settling in the area since the middle of the 19th century, divided up the landscape into a number of farms. In recent years the Virginia region has seen intensive agriculture and mining development. The farm Blomskraal subject to this assessment was portioned towards the end of the 19th century and no particular reference to archaeological sites or features of heritage potential were recorded during an examination of literature thematically or geographically related to the property. An examination of historical aerial imagery and archive maps indicate that the Blomskraal property had been utilized for intensive agriculture during the last century and portions of the project area have been altered and transformed in the last century. This inference was confirmed during an archaeological site assessment which identified a number of heritage receptors and the following recommendations are made based on general observations in the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project in terms of heritage resources management.

- A large Iron Age occupation at (**Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01**) is of medium significance in terms of its regional representation in the archaeological landscape and its relation to the vast and prominent later Iron Age representations of the Free State. The site is located outside the proposed Virginia Solar Park project areas and it is primarily recommended that a heritage conservation buffer of at least 100m around the heritage receptor must be implemented. The site should be monitored by an informed ECO in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains and potential human burials.

- The study noted the remains of a small Historical Period settlement within the footprint of the Virginia Solar Park Area 3 (**Site Exigo-VSP-HP06**). Little remain of the site and it is of low heritage significance. It is recommended that the development at the site should be monitored by an informed ECO in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains and potential human burials.
- In addition, Historical Period settlements and farmsteads occur in the landscape outside of the project footprint areas (**Site Exigo-VSP-HP01 - Site Exigo-VSP-HP05**). The significance of the sites ranges from medium to medium-low significance but impacts emanating from the project are not anticipated. It is recommended that the sites be monitored by an informed ECO in order to avoid long-term and indirect impacts on the sites or the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains.
- Three burial sites occur on Blomskraal outside of the Virginia Solar Park project areas (**Site Exigo-VSP-BP01 - Site Exigo-VSP-BP03**). The sites are of high heritage significance and it is recommended that these resources be closely monitored by an informed ECO in order to detect direct or indirect impact on these sites. A conservation buffer of 50m should be observed around the sites and a Site Management Plan (SMP) should be implemented, detailing these conservation measures and indicating responsible parties in this regard. In addition, it is advisable to erect fences around the burial sites and to implement access control to the sites.
- As burials have been located on the project property, it is recommended that the EIA public participation and social consultative process address the possibility of further graves occurring in the project area.
- 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 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.

Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project Heritage Sites Locations

Site Code	Coordinate S E	Short Description	Field Rating	Mitigation Action
EXIGO-VSP-BP01	S28.24446° E26.97455°	Burial Site	4a. High Significance	Site monitoring: Weekly monitoring during initial site clearing and earth moving activities by an ECO familiar with the sensitivity of receptors, or the Heritage Consultant. Monthly monitoring of the burial sites is recommended during subsequent stages of development. A Site Management Plan (SMP) and a 50m conservation buffer should be implemented.
EXIGO-VSP-BP02	S28.21054° E27.03028°	Burial Site	4a. High Significance	
EXIGO-VSP-BP03	S28.21805° E27.03251°	Burial Site	4a. High Significance	
Exigo-VSP-HP01	S28.21863° E27.03644°	Historical Period Site		Site Monitoring: Site monitoring by the heritage consultant or an ECO familiar with the heritage occurrences of the site.
Exigo-VSP-HP02	S28.21316° E27.02874°	Historical Period Site	2a. Low Significance	
Exigo-VSP-HP03	S28.23525° E26.98127°	Historical Period Site	2a. Low Significance	

Exigo-VSP-HP04	S28.24624° E26.97652°	Historical Period Site	2a. Low Significance	
Exigo-VSP-HP05	S28.19797° E27.04970°	Historical Period Site	2a. Low Significance	
Exigo-VSP-HP06	S28.20857° E27.00485°	Historical Period Site	2a. Low Significance	Site Monitoring: Site monitoring by the heritage consultant or an ECO familiar with the heritage occurrences of the site.
Exigo-VSP-IA01	S28.21136° E27.03523°	Later Iron Age Site	3. Medium Significance	Avoidance: Implement a heritage conservation buffer of at least 100m. Site Monitoring: Strict frequent monitoring during construction by the heritage consultant or an ECO familiar with the heritage occurrences of the site.

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	6
1 BACKGROUND.....	14
1.1 SCOPE AND MOTIVATION	14
1.2 PROJECT DIRECTION	14
1.3 PROJECT BRIEF	14
1.4 TERMS OF REFERENCE	16
1.5 CRM: LEGISLATION, CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE MANAGEMENT.....	16
1.5.1 <i>Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites</i>	16
1.5.2 <i>Background to HIA and AIA Studies</i>	18
2 REGIONAL CONTEXT.....	19
2.1 AREA LOCATION	19
2.2 AREA DESCRIPTION: RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	19
2.3 SITE DESCRIPTION	19
3 METHOD OF ENQUIRY.....	22
3.1 SOURCES OF INFORMATION	22
3.1.1 <i>Desktop Study</i>	22
3.1.2 <i>Aerial Survey</i>	23
3.1.3 <i>Mapping of sites</i>	23
3.1.4 <i>Field Survey</i>	23
3.2 LIMITATIONS.....	24
3.2.1 <i>Access</i>	24
3.2.2 <i>Visibility</i>	24
3.2.3 <i>Summary: Limitations and Constraints</i>	27
3.3 IMPACT ASSESSMENT	27
4 ARCHAEO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT.....	28
4.1 THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF SOUTHERN AFRICA.....	28
4.2 DISCUSSION: THE FREE STATE HERITAGE LANDSCAPE.....	28
4.2.1 <i>Early History and the Stone Ages</i>	28
4.2.2 <i>Iron Age / Farmer Period</i>	30
4.2.3 <i>Later History: Reorganization, Colonial Contact and living heritage</i>	33
5 RESULTS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY	33
5.1 THE OFF-SITE DESKTOP SURVEY	33
5.2 THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY	40
5.2.1 <i>Iron Age Farmer Representations</i>	40
5.2.2 <i>Historical Period Sites</i>	41
5.2.3 <i>Burial Sites</i>	47
6 RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING	51
6.1 POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE RATINGS	51
6.1.1 <i>General assessment of impacts on resources</i>	51
6.1.2 <i>Direct impact rating</i>	51
6.2 EVALUATION IMPACTS	54
6.2.1 <i>Archaeology</i>	54
6.2.2 <i>Built Environment</i>	54
6.2.3 <i>Cultural Landscape</i>	54

6.2.4	<i>Graves / Human Burials Sites</i>	54
6.3	MANAGEMENT ACTIONS	55
7	RECOMMENDATIONS	58
8	BIBLIOGRAPHY	60
	ARCHIVE SOURCES AND MAPS	61
	WEB SOURCES AND LEGISLATION.....	61
9	ADDENDUM 1: SPECIALIST CV	62
10	ADDENDUM 2: HERITAGE LEGISLATION BACKGROUND	65
10.1	CRM: LEGISLATION, CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE MANAGEMENT.....	65
10.1.1	<i>Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites</i>	65
10.1.2	<i>Background to HIA and AIA Studies</i>	66
10.2	ASSESSING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	68
	- CATEGORIES OF SIGNIFICANCE	68
11	ADDENDUM 3: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE	70
11.1	SITE SIGNIFICANCE MATRIX	70
11.2	IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA.....	71
11.3	DIRECT IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	72
11.4	MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION ACTIONS.....	73

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Map indicating the proposed development areas subject to the Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project.	15
Figure 2-1: 1:50 00 Map representation of the location of the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project (sheet 2826BB, 2826BB & 2827AA).	20
Figure 2-2: Aerial map providing a regional context for the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project.	21
Figure 3-1: GPS map indicating points of interest in the project area identified from aerial photos and archive maps (green dots). These points were used as reference for the site assessment. The red lines indicate the survey track log, purple lines indicate proposed development areas and green lines indicate areas transformed by past and present agriculture.	24
Figure 3-2: View of general surroundings in the project area along the western border of Blomskraal along a dolorite outcrop.	25
Figure 3-3: View of grassland vegetation across much of the project area.	25
Figure 3-4: View of general surroundings in the project area.	25
Figure 3-5: View of maize fields and grasslands in the project area.	26
Figure 3-6: View of tall grasslands and an ESKOM powerline in the project area.	26
Figure 3-7: View of transformed areas and vegetation in the project area.	26
Figure 3-8: View of riparian and wetland vegetation in a central portion project area.	27
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).	29
Figure 4-2: Plan of typical Type Z settlement patten as classified by Maggs (1976).	31
Figure 4-3: View of preserved Iron Age stone walling on the farm Middenspruit south of Kroonstad.	31
Figure 4-4: Distribution of Iron Age sites in the north western Free State (project area indicated by yellow outline) (Maggs 1976).	32
Figure 5-1: Title deed for the farm Junctiodrift adjoining Blomskraal, dating to 1897.	34
Figure 5-2: An aerial image of the project site on Blomskraal dating to 1950 (yellow outline) indicating the presence of extensive agriculture activities (green shaded). Potential man-made structures or features of heritage potential are indicated by orange arrows and man-made water reservoirs are indicated with blue arrows.	35
Figure 5-3: Transvaal and Orange Free State Series: Winburg map dating to 1899. The general location of Blomskraal is indicated by the yellow outline.	36
Figure 5-4: The South African War Map (1899-1902) of the Winburg area dating to 1900. The farm Blomskraal is indicated by the yellow arrow as "Bloemplaat".	37
Figure 5-5: The map of the "Gold mines & mineral rights of the Greater Witwatersrand and Orange Free State - 1949. Note the mineral rights on the farm Blomskraal.	38
Figure 5-6: Historical topographic maps of Blomskraal indicating the location of the project area (black outline) in the past decades. Potential man-made structures or features of heritage potential are indicated by yellow arrows, graves are indicated by red arrows, a "ruin" is indicated with the orange arrow, green arrows indicate cultivated land and pink arrows point to eroded surfaces.	39
Figure 5-7: Aerial map indicating main clusters of stone walling at Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01.	40
Figure 5-8: View of densely overgrown stone walls at Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01.	41
Figure 5-9: View of densely overgrown collapsed stone wall foundations at Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01.	41
Figure 5-10: View of overgrown stone wall enclosers at Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01.	41
Figure 5-11: View of the historical settlement area at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP01 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (right).	42
Figure 5-12: View of the settlement remains at Site Exigo-VSP-HP01.	42
Figure 5-13: View of ash deposits (left) and a site clearing (right) at Site Exigo-VSP-HP01.	42
Figure 5-14: View of the old Bloemskraal farmstead at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP02 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (right) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (left).	43
Figure 5-15: View of the site of the old Bloemskraal farmstead at Site Exigo-VSP-HP02.	43
Figure 5-16: View of the historical settlement area at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP03 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1975 (right).	44
Figure 5-17: View of settlement remains at Site Exigo-VSP-HP03.	44
Figure 5-18: View of foundations (left) and a lower grindstone (right) at Site Exigo-VSP-HP03.	44
Figure 5-19: View of the Bloemskraal farmstead at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP04 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (right).	45
Figure 5-20: View a historical farmhouse and rondavel at Site Exigo-VSP-HP04.	45
Figure 5-21: View a the exterior and interior of another historical farmhouse at Site Exigo-VSP-HP04.	45
Figure 5-22: View of the historical settlement area at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP05 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (right).	46
Figure 5-23: View of location of Site Exigo-VSP-HP05.	46
Figure 5-24: View of the historical settlement area at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP06 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (right).	47
Figure 5-25: View of the location of Site Exigo-VSP-HP06.	47
Figure 5-26: View of the burial site and graves at Site Exigo-VSP-BP01.	48
Figure 5-27: View of the cemetery at Site Exigo-VSP-BP02.	48
Figure 5-28: View of the cemetery at Site Exigo-VSP-BP03.	49
Figure 5-29: View of marble and concrete gravestones at Site Exigo-VSP-BP03.	49
Figure 5-30: Aerial image indicating the location of heritage occurrences and landscape features in relation to proposed project footprint areas as discussed in the text.	50
Figure 6-1: Site plan indicating the proposed heritage conservation buffers in relation to proposed project footprint areas for the Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project.	57

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Scope and Motivation

Exigo Sustainability (Pty) Ltd (Exigo) was commissioned by AGES Limpopo to conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project in the Free State 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

AGES Limpopo (Pty) Ltd was appointed to undertake the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process for the proposed establishment of a Solar Power generating facility on Portions of the Farm Blomskraal 216, Lejweleputswa District Municipality in the Free State Province (hereafter referred to as the "Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project").

The project will entail the establishment of three separate PV Solar generating facilities as follows:

- Virginia Area 1 (**245ha**).
- Virginia Area 2 (**245ha**).
- Virginia Area 3 (**240ha**).
- Virginia Area 3 (**44ha**)

Power Line connections to the PV Solar generating facilities will ne constructed to link into a new powerline to be constructed from the ESKOM Substation near Virginia.




Figure 1-1: Map indicating the proposed development areas subject to the Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project.

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 Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project occurs on portions of the Farm Blomskraal 216 in the Lejweleputswa District Municipality, Free State Province. The area is situated approximately 15km south-east of Virginia and 50km north-west of Winburg. The study area appears on 1:50000 map sheets 2826BB, 2826BB & 2827AA (see Figure 2-1) and coordinates for the respective project areas are as follows:

- **S28.22510° E27.01022°**

2.2 Area Description: Receiving Environment

The development site lies within the Savanna biome which is the largest biome in Southern Africa. The original vegetation of the landscape around the subject farms is made up of Dry Sandy Highveld Grassland, but in many places has been replaced due to farming activities (ploughing). The geology of the area is made up of mudstone. The topography is described as moderately undulating plains and pans. The Maselspruit bisects the landscape to flow into the Sand River to the north. Portions of the project property have been converted to agricultural fields in past decades and other farms are being used for livestock grazing, farming and tourism.

2.3 Site Description

The landscape on the farm Blomskraal is generally open land with undulating rolling hills in places. The area is densely to sparsely grassed and can be described as typical Free State grasslands with regular outcrops of dolerite on the ridges. Trees and shrubs occur throughout the landscape and around farmsteads. Vegetation remains relatively pristine along drainage lines and rivers. The current land-use of Blomskraal is intensive crop cultivation, livestock and game farming as well as lion breeding. As such, large maize fields, a number of small livestock, game and lion enclosures occur on the property. Neighboring farms are used for livestock grazing and cattle farming. Existing infrastructure on the property comprise farmhouses, sheds, warehouses as well as workers housing.




Figure 2-1: 1:50 00 Map representation of the location of the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project (sheet 2826BB, 2826BB & 2827AA).




Figure 2-2: Aerial map providing a regional context for the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project.

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 of the western Free State has been relatively well documented in terms of its archaeology and history. A desktop study was prepared in order to contextualize the proposed project within a larger historical milieu. 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:

- Coetzee, F.P. (Unisa). 2008. Cultural Heritage Survey of the Proposed Phakisa Housing Development, Welkom, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2000. Anglo-Boer War (1899 -1902) Camps and Cemeteries at Brandfort, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2004a. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Developments at Ventersburg, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2004b. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Graves at the Proposed Housing Developments near Thabong, Welkom, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2005a. Historical Investigation of the Existing Outbuildings at the Farm Smaldeel 202, Kroonstad, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2005b. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed New Filling Station at Virginia, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2006a. First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Residential Developments at the Farm Middenspruit 151, Kroonstad, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2006b. First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Residential Developments at Katdoringfontein 379, Senekal, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2007a. Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Residential Developments at Mmamahabane (Ventersburg), Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2007b. First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Borrow Pit Sites along the R30 Main Road between Brandfort and Vet River, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2007c. First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Investigation of the Proposed Filling Station Developments at Harmonia 867, Winburg, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2008a. First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Investigation of the Proposed Oppenheimer Park Golf Estate, Welkom, Free State.
- Dreyer, C. (Private). 2008b. Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Residential Developments at Matlwantlwang (Steynsrust), Free State.
- Kusel, U. (African Heritage Consultants). 2007. Cultural Heritage Resources Impact Assessment of Portion 22 (A Portion of Portion 8) of the Farm Klipplaatsdrift 82 HP.
- Roodt, F. (R&R Cultural Resource Consultants). 2007. Heritage Resource Scoping Report: Aldam Estate, Setsoto Municipality, Free State Province.
- Van Schalkwyk, J.A. (National Cultural History Museum). 2003. Mercury Perseus 400 KV Transmission Line, Cultural Heritage Resources.

3.1.2 Aerial Survey

Aerial photography is often employed to locate and study archaeological sites, particularly where larger scale area surveys are performed. The site assessment of the Blomskraal property relied heavily on this method to assist the challenging foot and automotive site survey. Here, depressions, variation in vegetation, soil marks and landmarks were examined and 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

Similar to the aerial survey, the site assessment of the Blomskraal farm relied heavily on archive and more recent map renderings of the property to assist the challenging foot and automotive site survey where 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 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.

3.1.4 Field Survey

Archaeological survey implies the systematic procedure of the identification of archaeological sites. An archaeological survey of the Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project area was conducted over a **two-day period in May 2021**. The process encompassed a random field survey in accordance with standard archaeological practice by which heritage resources are observed and documented. As the project area large and in some instances is densely vegetated, particular focus was placed on GPS reference points identified during the aerial and mapping survey. Where possible, random spot checks were made and potentially sensitive heritage areas were investigated. 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.




Figure 3-1: GPS map indicating points of interest in the project area identified from aerial photos and archive maps (green dots). These points were used as reference for the site assessment. The red lines indicate the survey track log, purple lines indicate proposed development areas and green lines indicate areas transformed by past and present agriculture.

3.2 Limitations

3.2.1 Access

The study area is accessed via the regional road to Virginia. Access control was arranged for the site assessment and no access restrictions onto the site were encountered during the site visit. However, dense vegetation restricted free movement on certain portions of the site during the assessment.

3.2.2 Visibility

The surrounding vegetation in the project area is mostly comprised out of grassland, occasional trees, cultivated and disused farmlands with occasional dense pockets of pioneering species. The general visibility at the time of the AIA survey (May 2021) ranged from high to low and the archaeological observations on site was restricted in places by dense vegetation. In single cases during the survey sub-surface inspection was possible. Where applied, this revealed no archaeological deposits.



Figure 3-2: View of general surroundings in the project area along the western border of Blomskraal along a dolorite outcrop.



Figure 3-3: View of grassland vegetation across much of the project area.



Figure 3-4: View= of general surroundings in the project area.



Figure 3-5: View of maize fields and grasslands in the project area.



Figure 3-6: View of tall grasslands and an ESKOM powerline in the project area.



Figure 3-7: View of transformed areas and vegetation in the project area.



Figure 3-8: View of riparian and wetland vegetation in a central portion project area.

3.2.3 Summary: Limitations and Constraints

The site survey for the Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project AIA proved to be constrained and the investigation primarily focused around areas tentatively identified as sensitive and of high heritage probability (i.e. those noted during the mapping and aerial survey) as well as areas of potential high human settlement catchment. In summary, the following constraints were encountered during the site survey:

- The surrounding vegetation in the project area mostly comprised out of grassland, disused farmlands vegetated by occasional trees and mixed grasslands. Visibility proved to be a constraint in certain portions of the project area.
- Dense vegetation restricted free movement in some portions of the project area.

Cognisant of the constraints noted above, 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.

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: The Free State Heritage Landscape

The history of the Northern Free State is reflected in a rich archaeological landscape. Sites, documenting Stone Age habitation occur in places, mostly in open air locales or in sediments alongside rivers or pans. Bantu-speaking groups moved into this area during the last millennia and these presumably Sotho groups occupied the landscape during the Late Iron Age times at around AD 1500-1800. Settlement by Iron Age communities occurred near rivers and close to rocky outcrops. European farmers, settling in the area since the middle of the 19th century, divided up the landscape into a number of farms. In recent years an urban element developed, expanding at a rapid rate, largely as a result of mining development in the region.

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 at 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. Oldowan and Acheulian artefacts were also found four to five decades ago in some of the older gravels (ancient river beds and terraces) of the Vaal River and the Klip River in Vereeniging. The earliest ancestors of modern man may therefore have roamed the Vaal valley at the same time that their contemporaries occupied some of the dolomite caves near Krugersdorp. 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. 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.




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 earliest ancestors of modern man may therefore have roamed the Vaal valley at the same time that their contemporaries occupied some of the dolomite caves near Krugersdorp. 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. The Late Stone Age commenced twenty thousand years ago or somewhat earlier. The various types of 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. Habitation of the larger geographical area took place since Early Stone Age times. This is confirmed by the occurrence of stone tools dating to the Early, Middle and Late Stone Age found in a number of places. However, these are mostly located in the vicinity of rivers, such as the Doring Spruit north of Kroonstad and the Groot Vet River as well as the Sand River to the south of Ventersburg.

4.2.2 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.

The Iron Age archaeology of the Free State is characterised by a wide distribution of stone-walled sites along the flat-topped ridges and hills. Studies have revealed detail and consistency in the arrangement and design of the structures. People's expression of culture has left its imprint on the material environment. Thus, recognised settlement patterns display human perceptions with regard to social clustering, economic system and political organisation. Patterns are indicated by the arrangement of huts, byres and ash heaps in a particular order and in relation to one another. Spatial organisation in general is characterised by the central position of stock byres and the placing of the main dwelling area on the perimeter of the settlement. During the Later Iron Age, emphasis was not only on stone building, for additional structures of perishable materials, supplementing living space, have also been revealed. All the characteristics of settlement patterns allow the immediate recognition of specific cultural groups of people populating the landscape. Extensive surveying by Tim Maggs in the Free State during the 1970s culminated in an extensive framework for Late Iron Age stone-walled settlements characterised by connecting walls, surrounding walls and huts with bilobial courtyards.

Maggs established the following classification of sites (Maggs 1976):

- Type N (Ntuanatsatsi): Occurring mostly in the north eastern Free State.
- Type V (Makgwareng): Occurring mostly in the eastern Free State towards the Drakensberg.
- Type Z (OXF1): Occurring mostly in the north western regions of the Free State.
- Type R (OFD 1): Riet River area of the Free State.

The N-type settlements were built by the Fokeng and Kwena while the Taung were responsible for the construction of some of the V-type settlements. The Kubung built the Z-type settlements and Khoi Khoi groups, who lived near the Riet River, built R-type sites. The stone walled sites that have been identified in the project area constitutes mainly Z-type settlements. These types of settlement also occurred along the lower reaches of the Renoster River. Large concentrations of V-type settlements are found along the upper reaches of the Renoster and Vals Rivers, to the east of the Project Area. Stone walled sites closest to the Project Area occur on Doringberg and Beckersberg within the Willem Pretorius Nature Reserve which is located near the Allemanskraal Dam between Winburg and Ventersburg.




Figure 4-2: Plan of typical Type Z settlement patten as classified by Maggs (1976).

Maggs’ research indicated that the division of sites based on layout is confirmed by associated pottery assemblages with different decoration styles. Different settlement patterns also produced huts of different materials in different styles. The classification of sites is based on the assumption that settlement layout is bound and prescribed by cultural perceptions. The identification of different ethnic groups is thus possible from the way in which these traditional peoples have organised their different living places in terms of space and time. The final result was directed by cultural preference (choice) and function. The importance of livestock, personal status, kinship, social organisation and the diverse roles of men, women and offspring have always been important in the understanding of settlement patterns. Pottery decorations associated with this settlement type are characterised by shallow line incisions in bands and triangles below the rim and on the shoulder, combined with straight or curved lines and areas of red ochre burnish on the body of clay vessels (Maggs 1976).



Figure 4-3: View of preserved Iron Age stone walling on the farm Middenspruit south of Kroonstad.




Figure 4-4: Distribution of Iron Age sites in the north western Free State (project area indicated by yellow outline) (Maggs 1976).

4.2.3 Later History: Reorganization, Colonial Contact and living heritage.

The town of Winburg, a small mixed farming town, is the oldest proclaimed town (1837) in the Orange Free State, South Africa and thus along with Griquatown, one of the oldest settlements in South Africa located north of the Orange River. When the Voortrekkers reached the area of Winburg, there were no other tribes or inhabitants. The nearest community was that of a Tswana tribe under Chief Makwana at Thaba Nchu, 60 km south east of the town and the Basotho tribes in the mountains of the current Lesotho, 100 km east of the town. The trade of cattle for land between the Vaal and Vet Rivers, undertaken by Andries Pretorius and the Bataung Chief Makwana in 1836, led to the settlement of a dispute between the African tribes. The Voortrekkers offered protection for Chief Makwana from the Tswana tribes, against the Basotho tribes harbouring in the mountains of the current Lesotho and stealing the cattle of the Bataung tribe. In exchange for continued protection, the Voortrekkers were offered the land between the Vet and Vaal Rivers. The Voortrekker leaders had a small disagreement as to where to establish a town. A vote was held under the Burgers and Andries Pretorius's group won and elected to establish the town in its current position and to call it Winburg, after the Dutch word winnen (to win). Winburg acted as a settlement and religious centre for Voortrekkers. Winburg was originally selected as the site for the main Voortrekker Monument, but Pretoria won favour and a five-tiered secondary Voortrekker monument was built on the outskirts of Winburg instead in the 1950s. It carries the names of the Voortrekker leaders: Piet Uys, Andries Hendrik Potgieter, Andries Pretorius, Piet Retief and Gerrit Maritz. The lengths of the five tiers are proportional to the distances travelled by the respective settler groups. The monument is built near the site of the birth-house of Martinus Theunis Steyn, who was president of the Boer Republic of the Orange Free State. The town was the site of a concentration camp for women and children captured by the British Army during their scorched earth campaign during the Second Boer War. 355 children and 132 adults died in this camp due to malnutrition and contagious diseases, while kept in tents without any infrastructure or protection during the bitter cold winters of 1899 – 1901. The famous Boer General Koos de la Rey was born in the district of Winburg on the farm Doornfontein. General De La Rey was the leading Boer General of the Western Transvaal in 1899 – 1901. Winburg had a black armed commando supporting the British soldiers during the war of 1899 – 1901. The town of Virginia is located 50km north of Winburg and was laid out on the banks of the Sand River in 1954. The name of the town is derived from two American engineers who in 1890 surveyed the railway line north across Merriespruit. Whilst completing this task they chiselled the name 'Virginia' on a boulder on a hill nearby. When the railway line via Kroonstad to Gauteng was built two years later a siding with the same name was established on the spot. The name was retained when the town mushroomed in the 1950's following the discovery of gold. The name Merriespruit was given to a suburb of Virginia. Within three years Virginia became the second largest town on the goldfields and the fourth largest in the Free State. On 22 Feb 1994 the wall of a Harmony mine slimes dam broke and engulfed part of the Merriespruit suburb. Seventeen people died, 31 houses were destroyed and 72 were seriously damaged.

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 Iron Age Farmer and Colonial / Historical Period archaeology related to farming, rural expansion and warfare of the past century. The farm Bloemplaats, later renamed to "Blomskraal" was surveyed towards the end of the 19th century along with other farms in the area. An analysis of historical aerial imagery and archive maps reveals the following (see Figure 5-2 to Figure 5-6):

- The farm "Bloemplaats" (today Blomskraal) is indicated on the South African War Map (1899-1902) of the Winburg area dating to 1900.

- A mining right for Gold Mining existed on the property and adjoining farms in the 1940's and the holder of the right was the J.C.I (Bernato) Group.
- A number of so-called "huts" and two Blomskraal farmsteads appear on topographic maps dating to 1947, 1975 and 1997. The farmsteads are indicated by the name "Bloemskraal". These maps indicate vast cultivated fields occurring across the property over past decades. Interestingly, a "ruin" is indicated on the 1975 map where the Later Iron Age site (EXIGO-VSP-C1 – see later discussion) is situated.
- Aerial imagery dating to 1950 indicate that portions of the Blomskraal property - and particularly areas subject to this assessment - have been altered extensively by historical farming and agriculture.
- Buildings and potential man-made structures appear outside and within the project area on the historical aerial imagery (1950).




Figure 5-1: Title deed for the farm Junctiondrift adjoining Blomskraal, dating to 1897.




Figure 5-2: An aerial image of the project site on Blomskraal dating to 1950 (yellow outline) indicating the presence of extensive agriculture activities (green shaded). Potential man-made structures or features of heritage potential are indicated by orange arrows and man-made water reservoirs are indicated with blue arrows.




Figure 5-3: Transvaal and Orange Free State Series: Winburg map dating to 1899. The general location of Blomskraal is indicated by the yellow outline.




Figure 5-4: The South African War Map (1899-1902) of the Winburg area dating to 1900. The farm Blomskraal is indicated by the yellow arrow as "Bloemplaats".




Figure 5-5: The map of the “Gold mines & mineral rights of the Greater Witwatersrand and Orange Free State - 1949. Note the mineral rights on the farm Blomskraal.




Figure 5-6: Historical topographic maps of Blomskraal indicating the location of the project area (black outline) in the past decades. Potential man-made structures or features of heritage potential are indicated by yellow arrows, graves are indicated by red arrows, a “ruin” is indicated with the orange arrow, green arrows indicate cultivated land and pink arrows point to eroded surfaces.

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 but *in situ* heritage remains were encountered. The following observations were made during the site survey.

5.2.1 Iron Age Farmer Representations

- **Exigo-VSP-IA01 Later Iron Age Farmer Settlement**
Farm Blomskraal 216: S28.21136° E27.03523°
Field Rating: 3. Medium significance

A large stone walled site, consisting out of sections of collapsed stone walling arranged in large scalloping circular enclosures is situated in a south-western section of the project area. The cluster of stone walls extends for about 500m in all directions with a number of stone stone cairns and outlying enclosures occurring around the main wall structures. The site display densely overgrown irregular stone building with entrances which are demarcated by monoliths in places. No material culture was observed in association with the site. The site can be attributed to the Late Iron Age corresponding to Maggs' Type Z settlements patterns (refer to Section 4.6) and several Type Z stone-walled settlements, constructed by the Kubung, are known to exist in the landscape around the project area. These settlements are typically categorized according the Central Cattle Pattern (CCP) (Huffman 2007) with a large livestock kraal or enclosure at the center of the homestead and bilobial enclosures with houses surrounding it. The court / kgotla is also located in this central area and this area often demarcate burial sites of high-status men in the community. The site forms part of a complex later Iron Age landscape and it is of scientific value in terms of its regional representation and association in the Iron Age farmer period landscape of this area. The settlement occurs away from proposed project development areas and impact on the site is unlikely but potential indirect impacts to the site should be monitored.




Figure 5-7: Aerial map indicating main clusters of stone walling at Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01.



Figure 5-8: View of densely overgrown stone walls at Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01.



Figure 5-9: View of densely overgrown collapsed stone wall foundations at Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01.



Figure 5-10: View of overgrown stone wall enclosures at Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01.

5.2.2 Historical Period Sites

- **Exigo-VSP-HP01 Historical Period Remains**
Farm Blomskraal 216: S28.21863° E27.03644°
Field Rating: 3. Medium significance

The ruined remains of a Historical Period settlement area consisting out of a number of concrete and brick foundation structures, ash middens and material culture such as glass, metal and plastic were noted in the project area. The site was probably a compound of worker’s houses for the Blomskraal farm. An absolute temporal context for the settlement could not be ascertained but it appears on archive aerial photographs (1950) and historical topographical maps (1947 and 1975). As such, the site is older than 60 years - and generally protected under the National Heritage Resource Act (NHRA 1999) but structures and features are poorly preserved and no notable heritage or historical association could be established. The settlement occurs some distance from proposed project development areas and impact on the site is unlikely but

potential indirect impacts to the site should be monitored as it is rated as medium-low significance.




Figure 5-11: View of the historical settlement area at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP01 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (right).



Figure 5-12: View of the settlement remains at Site Exigo-VSP-HP01.



Figure 5-13: View of ash deposits (left) and a site clearing (right) at Site Exigo-VSP-HP01.

- **Exigo-VSP-HP02 Historical Period Farmstead Remains**
Farm Bloemskraal 216: S28.21316° E27.02874°
Field Rating: 3. Medium significance

The Historical Period Bloemskraal farmstead is visible on an archive aerial photograph (1950) and it is indicated as “Bloemskraal” on topographical maps of the project property (1947, 1975 and 1997). However,

the farmstead seems to have been demolished in recent years and besides for pioneering vegetation no remains of the feature could be located during the site assessment. The settlement occurs some distance from proposed project development areas and impact on the site is unlikely but potential indirect impacts to the site should be monitored. The site is rated as low significance.



Figure 5-14: View of the old Bloemskraal farmstead at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP02 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (right) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (left).



Figure 5-15: View of the site of the old Bloemskraal farmstead at Site Exigo-VSP-HP02.

- **Exigo-VSP-HP03 Historical Period Remains**
Farm Blomskraal 216: S28.23525° E26.98127°
Field Rating: 3. Medium significance
S23.09392° E30.07186°

The ruined remains of another Historical Period settlement area consisting out of a number of concrete and brick foundation structures, ash middens and material culture such as glass, metal, plastic and a lower grind stone were noted in the project area. The site was probably a compound of worker’s houses for the Blomskraal farm. An absolute temporal context for the settlement could not be ascertained but it appears on archive aerial photographs (1950) and historical topographical maps (1947 and 1975). As such, the site is older than 60 years - and generally protected under the National Heritage Resource Act (NHRA 1999) but structures and features are poorly preserved and no notable heritage or historical association could be established. The settlement occurs some distance from proposed project development areas and impact on the site is unlikely but potential indirect impacts to the site should be monitored as it is rated as medium-low significance.




Figure 5-16: View of the historical settlement area at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP03 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1975 (right).



Figure 5-17: View of settlement remains at Site Exigo-VSP-HP03.



Figure 5-18: View of foundations (left) and a lower grindstone (right) at Site Exigo-VSP-HP03.

- **Exigo-VSP-HP04 Historical Period Farmstead**
Farm Blomskraal 216: S28.24624° E26.97652°
Field Rating: 3. Medium significance
S23.09392° E30.07186°

The Historical Period Blomskraal or “Bloemskraal” farmstead occurs in the larger project landscape. Here, a number of farmhouses, rondavels, outbuildings, worker’s houses, sheds and barns as well as cattle enclosures occur within the farmstead complex. The farmhouses and some of the outbuildings were constructed in a vernacular Free State farmhouse architectural building style displaying gables, attics,

plastered up walls with pitched corrugated iron roofs, wooden window frames and wooden doors. Some of the buildings have been altered over the years. An analysis of historical topographical maps and aerial photographs indicate the presence of the farmstead from at least 1947 and the site is thus older than 60 years and generally protected under the National Heritage Resource Act (NHRA 1999). The site affords a better understanding of architectural, settlement and social developments in the Virginia landscape and it is of medium heritage significance. The farmstead is situated some distance from proposed project development areas and impact on the site is unlikely but potential indirect impacts to the site should be monitored.




Figure 5-19: View of the Bloemskraal farmstead at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP04 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (right).



Figure 5-20: View a historical farmhouse and rondavel at Site Exigo-VSP-HP04.



Figure 5-21: View a the exterior and interior of another historical farmhouse at Site Exigo-VSP-HP04.

- **Exigo-VSP-HP05 Historical Period Remains**
Farm Blomskraal 216: S28.19797° E27.04970°
Field Rating: 3. Medium significance

The remains of a small Historical Period settlement area consisting out of ash middens and material culture such as glass, metal and plastic were noted in the project area. An absolute temporal context for the settlement could not be ascertained but it appears on archive aerial photographs (1950) and historical topographical maps (1947 and 1975). As such, the site is older than 60 years - and generally protected under the National Heritage Resource Act (NHRA 1999) but structures and features are poorly preserved and no notable heritage or historical association could be established. The settlement occurs some distance from proposed project development areas and impact on the site is unlikely but potential indirect impacts to the site should be monitored. It is rated as low significance.



Figure 5-22: View of the historical settlement area at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP05 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (right).



Figure 5-23: View of location of Site Exigo-VSP-HP05.

- **Exigo-VSP-HP06 Historical Period Remains**
Farm Blomskraal 216: S28.20857° E27.00485°
Field Rating: 3. Medium significance

The remains of a small Historical Period settlement area consisting out of ash middens and material culture such as metal and plastic were noted in the project area. An absolute temporal context for the settlement could not be ascertained but it appears on archive aerial photographs (1950) and historical topographical maps (1947 and 1975). As such, the site is older than 60 years - and generally protected under the National

Heritage Resource Act (NHRA 1999) but structures and features are poorly preserved and no notable heritage or historical association could be established. The settlement occurs within the footprint proposed for the Virginia Solar Park 3 and it is rated as low significance.



Figure 5-24: View of the historical settlement area at Site EXIGO-VSP-HP06 on an aerial image dating to 1947 (left) and indicated on a topographical map dating to 1950 (right).



Figure 5-25: View of the location of Site Exigo-VSP-HP06.

5.2.3 Burial Sites

- **Exigo-VSP-BP01 Burial Site**
Farm Blomskraal 216: S28.24446° E26.97455°
Field Rating: 4b. High significance

A Historical Period burial site holding at least two graves was noted near the Blomskraal farmstead in the larger project area in a densely vegetated area. The graves are indicated by marble gravestones with inscribed headstones and the one grave bears a marble statuette of a grieving lady. The graves, which are fenced, belong to Johannes Gerhardus Delport and N.A Olive Delport and the dates of internment is 1952 and 1933 (?). The burial site, which is of high heritage significance, occurs some distance from proposed project development areas and impact on the site is unlikely but potential indirect impacts to the site should be monitored (see Section 6).



Figure 5-26: View of the burial site and graves at Site Exigo-VSP-BP01.

- **Exigo-VSP-BP02 Burial Site**
Farm Blomskraal 216: S28.21054° E27.03028°
Field Rating: 4b. High significance

A Historical Period burial site holding at least three graves was noted near the north-eastern Blomskraal farmstead location in the larger project area in a densely vegetated area. The graves are indicated by marble gravestones with inscribed headstones and they belong to the Delport family. The desnely overgrown burial site is fenced off within a cast-iron enclosure with an access gate and sandstone gate posts. The burial site, which is of high heritage significance, occurs some distance from proposed project development areas and impact on the site is unlikely but potential indirect impacts to the site should be monitored (see Section 6).



Figure 5-27: View of the cemetery at Site Exigo-VSP-BP02.

- **Exigo-VSP-BP03 Burial Site**
Farm Blomskraal 216: S28.21805° E27.03251°
Field Rating: 4b. High significance

An informal burial site holding a large number of graves was noted in a densely vegetated part of the project area. Some of the graves are dressed with marked marble and concrete headstones and other burials are indicated by elongated stone cairn and circle features filled in with earth. The burials area positioned in a relative east-west orientation, the site is not fenced off and its condition of preservation is poor. Material culture such as enamel and glass containers were noted on the surface in association with the graves. The burial site, which is of high heritage significance, occurs some distance from proposed project development areas and impact on the site is unlikely but potential indirect impacts to the site should be monitored (see Section 6).



Figure 5-28: View of the cemetery at Site Exigo-VSP-BP03.



Figure 5-29: View of marble and concrete gravestones at Site Exigo-VSP-BP03.




Figure 5-30: Aerial image indicating the location of heritage occurrences and landscape features in relation to proposed project footprint areas as discussed in the text.

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).

The following table summarizes impacts to the **medium** significance Iron Age site (**Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01**) located outside of the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project area.

NATURE OF IMPACT: Impacts could involve displacement or destruction of Iron Age material in the project area.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
EXTENT	Local	Local
DURATION	Permanent	Permanent
MAGNITUDE	Major	Minor
PROBABILITY	Improbable	Improbable
SIGNIFICANCE	High	Low
STATUS	Negative	Neutral
REVERSIBILITY	Non-reversible	Non-reversible
IRREPLACEABLE LOSS OF RESOURCES?	No	No
CAN IMPACTS BE MITIGATED?	Yes	
MITIGATION: Avoidance, Monitoring by ECO.		

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

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: No cumulative impact is anticipated.
RESIDUAL IMPACTS: n/a

The following table summarizes impacts to the **low** significance Historical Period site located in the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project area (**Site Exigo-VSP-HP06**):

NATURE OF IMPACT: Impact could involve displacement or destruction of heritage material in the study area.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
EXTENT	Local	Local
DURATION	Permanent	Permanent
MAGINITUDE	Minor	Minor
PROBABILITY	Definite	Very improbable
SIGNIFICANCE	Low	Low
STATUS	Negative	Neutral
REVERSIBILITY	Non-reversible	Non-reversible
IRREPLACEABLE LOSS OF RESOURCES?	Yes	No
CAN IMPACTS BE MITIGATED?	Yes	
MITIGATION: Site monitoring.		
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: Site monitoring by ECO.		
RESIDUAL IMPACTS: n/a		

The following table summarizes impacts to the **medium-low** significance Historical Period site located outside of the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project area (**Site Exigo-VSP-HP01 - Site Exigo-VSP-HP03**):

NATURE OF IMPACT: Impact could involve displacement or destruction of heritage material in the study area.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
EXTENT	Local	Local
DURATION	Permanent	Permanent
MAGINITUDE	Minor	Minor
PROBABILITY	Improbable	Very improbable
SIGNIFICANCE	Medium-Low	Low
STATUS	Negative	Neutral
REVERSIBILITY	Non-reversible	Non-reversible
IRREPLACEABLE LOSS OF RESOURCES?	Yes	No
CAN IMPACTS BE MITIGATED?	Yes	
MITIGATION: Site monitoring.		
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: Site monitoring by ECO.		
RESIDUAL IMPACTS: n/a		

The following table summarizes impacts to the **medium** significance Historical Period site located outside of the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project area (**Site Exigo-VSP-HP04**):

NATURE OF IMPACT: Impact could involve displacement or destruction of heritage material in the study area.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
EXTENT	Local	Local
DURATION	Permanent	Permanent
MAGINITUDE	Minor	Minor
PROBABILITY	Improbable	Very improbable
SIGNIFICANCE	Medium	Low
STATUS	Negative	Neutral
REVERSIBILITY	Non-reversible	Non-reversible
IRREPLACEABLE LOSS OF RESOURCES?	Yes	No
CAN IMPACTS BE MITIGATED?	Yes	
MITIGATION: Site monitoring.		
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: Site monitoring by ECO, site management plan.		
RESIDUAL IMPACTS: n/a		

The following table summarizes impacts to the **high** significance burial sites located outside of the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project area (**Site Exigo-VSP-BP01, Site Exigo-VSP-BP02, Site Exigo-VSP-BP03**):

NATURE OF IMPACT: Impact could involve displacement or destruction of heritage material in the study area.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
EXTENT	Local	Local
DURATION	Permanent	Permanent
MAGINITUDE	Major	Minor
PROBABILITY	Improbable	Very improbable
SIGNIFICANCE	High	Low
STATUS	Negative	Neutral
REVERSIBILITY	Non-reversible	Non-reversible
IRREPLACEABLE LOSS OF RESOURCES?	Yes	No
CAN IMPACTS BE MITIGATED?	Yes	
MITIGATION: Avoidance, strict site monitoring by ECO.		
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: No cumulative impact is anticipated.		
RESIDUAL IMPACTS: n/a		

6.2 Evaluation Impacts

A number of archaeological and historical studies have been conducted in this section of the Free State Province which points to a rich and diverse archaeological landscape. The heritage legacy of this area is mostly dominated by Iron Age Farmer and Colonial / Historical Period archaeology primarily related to farming, rural expansion and warfare of the past century.

6.2.1 Archaeology

A later Iron Age occupation site in the project landscape is of medium significance in terms of its regional representation in the Iron Age farmer period landscape of the area. The site is located away from the proposed Virginia Solar Park and impact on the site by the proposed development is improbable.

6.2.2 Built Environment

The study noted the remains of a poorly preserved Historical Period settlement within the footprint of the Virginia Solar Park Area 3. The site is rated as low heritage significance and the significance of impact on the site is low. The Blomskraal farmstead and the poorly preserved remains of the old north-eastern Blomskraal farmstead as well as other settlement areas occur outside of proposed project areas and no impact on the sites by the proposed development is anticipated. Generally, no impact on the built environment and related features is anticipated. As for the rest of the project area, the general landscape holds varied significance in terms of the built environment as the area comprises historical farming remnants and relatively newly established settlements and townlands.

6.2.3 Cultural Landscape

Generally, the proposed project area and its surrounds are characterised by rural farmlands and rolling hills with grassland vegetation. Further away from the project area, the landscape displays undulating hills with flatter plains in-between where farms and mines occur sporadically. This landscape stretches over many kilometres and the proposed project is unlikely to result in a significant impact on the or the landscape sense of place.

6.2.4 Graves / Human Burials Sites

At least 3 human burial sites were located outside of the project area. These receptors are of high significance in terms of heritage, social and cultural value but the potential impact on the resources is regarded negligible. In the rural areas of the Free State Province, graves and cemeteries often occur around farmsteads in family burial grounds but they are also randomly scattered around archaeological and historical settlements. The probability of informal human burials encountered during development should thus not be excluded. In addition, human remains and burials are commonly found close to archaeological sites; they may be found in "lost" graveyards, or occur sporadically anywhere as a result of prehistoric activity, victims of conflict or crime. It is often difficult to detect the presence of archaeological human remains on the landscape as these burials, in most cases, are not marked at the surface. Human remains are usually observed when they are exposed through erosion. In some instances packed stones or rocks may indicate the presence of informal pre-colonial burials. 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. Where human remains are part of a burial they would need to be exhumed under a permit from either SAHRA (for pre-colonial burials as well as burials later than about AD 1500). Should any unmarked human burials/remains be found during the course of construction, work in the immediate vicinity should cease and the find must immediately be reported to the archaeologist, or the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA). Under no circumstances may burials be disturbed or removed until such time as necessary statutory procedures required for grave relocation have been met

6.3 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.

For the significant Iron Age Site (Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01) occurring outside of the project area the following are required in terms of heritage management and mitigation:

PROJECT COMPONENT/S	All phases of construction and operation.		
POTENTIAL IMPACT	Damage/disturbance to sites and subsurface features and deposits.		
ACTIVITY RISK/SOURCE	Digging foundations and trenches into sensitive deposits that are not visible at the surface.		
MITIGATION: TARGET/OBJECTIVE	To conserve the historical fabric of the sites and to locate undetected heritage remains as soon as possible after disturbance so as to maximize the chances of successful rescue/mitigation work.		
MITIGATION: ACTION/CONTROL	RESPONSIBILITY	TIMEFRAME	
Preferred Mitigation Procedure			
Avoidance: Implement a heritage conservation buffer of at least 100m around the heritage receptor.	DEVELOPER QUALIFIED SPECIALIST	HERITAGE	Prior to the commencement of construction and earth-moving.
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.		

For the Historical Period site of low significance (Site Exigo-VSP-HP06) within the project area the following are required in terms of heritage management and mitigation:

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 in order to detect and preserve previously undocumented heritage receptors.	ECO, HERITAGE ASSESSMENT PRACTITIONER		Monitor as frequently as practically possible. Prior to the commencement of construction and earth-moving.
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	Archaeological sites are discovered and mitigated with the minimum amount of unnecessary disturbance.		
MONITORING	Successful location of sites by person/s monitoring.		

For the Historical Period sites of medium-low significance (**Site Exigo-VSP-HP01 - Site Exigo-VSPHP05**) outside the project area the following are required in terms of heritage management and mitigation:

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 in order to detect and preserve previously undocumented heritage receptors.	ECO, HERITAGE ASSESSMENT PRACTITIONER	Monitor as frequently as practically possible. Prior to the commencement of construction and earth-moving.	
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	Archaeological sites are discovered and mitigated with the minimum amount of unnecessary disturbance.		
MONITORING	Successful location of sites by person/s monitoring.		

For highly significant single burial sites (**Site Exigo-VSP-BP01 - Site Exigo-VSP-BP03**) occurring outside the proposed Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project the following are required in terms of heritage management and mitigation:

PROJECT COMPONENT/S	All phases of construction and operation.		
POTENTIAL IMPACT	Damage/disturbance to subsurface burials and surface burial features.		
ACTIVITY RISK/SOURCE	Digging foundations and trenches into sensitive deposits that are not visible at the surface.		
MITIGATION: TARGET/OBJECTIVE	To locate human burials as soon as possible after disturbance so as to maximize the chances of successful rescue/mitigation work.		
MITIGATION: ACTION/CONTROL	RESPONSIBILITY	TIMEFRAME	
Preferred Mitigation Procedure			
Avoidance: Implement a heritage conservation buffer of at least 50m around the burial sites. Erect fences around the burial sites and apply access control with signage to indicate visitation contacts. Monitoring during initial site clearing and earth moving activities by an ECO familiar with the sensitivity of receptors, or the Heritage Consultant.	DEVELOPER QUALIFIED HERITAGE SPECIALIST	Prior to the commencement of construction and earth-moving.	
Fixed Mitigation Procedure (required)			
Site Monitoring: Regular examination of trenches and excavations in this area in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected burials or heritage remains.	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.		




Figure 6-1: Site plan indicating the proposed heritage conservation buffers in relation to proposed project footprint areas for the Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

The larger landscape around the project area indicate a rich heritage horizon encompassing Iron Age Farmer and Colonial / Historical Period archaeology primarily related to farming, rural expansion and warfare of the past century. Locally, the project area has seen transformation by agriculture activities potentially 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 Virginia 1, 2 & 3 Solar Parks EIA Project area:

- A large Iron Age occupation at (**Site EXIGO-VSP-IA01**) is of medium significance in terms of its regional representation in the archaeological landscape and its relation to the vast and prominent later Iron Age representations of the Free State. The site is located outside the proposed Virginia Solar Park project areas and it is primarily recommended that a heritage conservation buffer of at least 100m around the heritage receptor must be implemented. The site should be monitored by an informed ECO in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains and potential human burials.
- The study noted the remains of a small Historical Period settlement within the footprint of the Virginia Solar Park Area 3 (**Site Exigo-VSP-HP06**). Little remain of the site and it is of low heritage significance. It is recommended that the development at the site should be monitored by an informed ECO in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains and potential human burials.
- In addition, Historical Period settlements and farmsteads occur in the landscape outside if the project footprint areas (**Site Exigo-VSP-HP01 - Site Exigo-VSP-HP05**). The significance of the sites ranges from medium to medium-low significance but impacts emanating from the project are not anticipated. It is recommended that the sites be monitored by an informed ECO in order to avoid long-term and indirect impacts on the sites or the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains.
- Three burial sites occur on Blomskraal outside of the Virginia Solar Park project areas (**Site Exigo-VSP-BP01 - Site Exigo-VSP-BP03**). The sites are of high heritage significance and it is recommended that these resources be closely monitored by an informed ECO in order to detect direct or indirect impact on these sites. A conservation buffer of 50m should be observed around the sites and a Site Management Plan (SMP) should be implemented, detailing these conservation measures and indicating responsible parties in this regard. In addition, it is advisable to erect fences around the burial sites and to implement access control to the sites.
- As burials have been located on the project property, it is recommended that the EIA public participation and social consultative process address the possibility of further graves occurring in the project area.
- 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 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 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acocks, J.P.H. 1988. Veld types of South Africa (3rd edition). Memoirs of the Botanical Survey of South Africa 57: 1-146

Cameron, T. (ed)(1986). An Illustrated History of South Africa, Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.

Coetzee, F.P. 2019. Phase 1 Investigation for the Amendment of an Existing Environmental Authorisation for an Existing Mining Right of Corobrick (Pty) Ltd (Odendaalsrus Factory) on the Farm Hesters Rust 29, near Welkom, Matjhabeng Local Municipality and Lejweleputswa District Municipality, Free State Province

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.

Guelke L and Shell Robert, 1992, Landscape of Conquest: Frontier Water Alienation and Khoikhoi Strategies of Survival, 1652 – 1780, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 803 – 824.

Hall, M. 1987. The Changing Past :Farmers, Kings & Traders in Southern Africa 200 – 1860 Cape Town, Johannesburg: David Philip

Holm, S.E. 1966. Bibliography of South African Pre-and Protohistoric archaeology. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Evers, T.M. 1981. The Iron Age in eastern Transvaal, South Africa. In: Voigt, E.A. (ed.) Guide to archaeological sites in the northern and eastern Transvaal. Pretoria: Transvaal Museum.

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.

Lombard, M., Wadley, L., Deacon, J., Wurz, S., Parsons, I., Mohapi, M., Swart, J. & Mitchell, P. 2012. South African and Lesotho Stone Age Sequence Update (I). The South African Archaeological Bulletin. Vol 67 (195): 123-144.

Maggs, T. 1976. Iron Age communities of the southern Highveld. (Occasional Publication 2). Pietermaritzburg : Council of the Natal Museum.

Mason, R.J. 1986. Origins of black people of Johannesburg and the southern western central Transvaal AD 350--1880. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

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

Pistorius 2004. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) study for the EMP for the Voorspoed Diamond Mine near Kroonstad in the Free State Province of South Africa. Unpublished report for De Beers and Metago Environmental Engineers.

Pistorius 2005. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) study for the proposed new water pipe line to be established from the Renosterdam to the proposed new Voorspoed Diamond Mine near Kroonstad in the Free State Province of South Africa. Unpublished report for De Beers and Metago Environmental Engineers.

Pistorius 2008. A Phase I Heritage Impact Assessment study for the proposed remining and processing of Tailings Storage Facilities at the operations of Harmony Gold Mining Company Limited (Harmony) in the Welkom area in the Free State Province of South Africa. Unpublished report prepared for Golder Associates Africa (Pty) Ltd.

Shillington, K. 1995. History of Africa. Macmillan: London

Raper, P.E. 2004. South African place names. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball Publishers

Swanepoel, N. et al (Eds.) 2008. Five hundred years rediscovered. Johannesburg: Wits University Press
Taylor, M.O.V. 1979a. Late Iron Age settlements on the northern edge of the Vredefort Dome. MA Dissertation. University of Johannesburg. Johannesburg

Vinnicombe, P 1972. Myth, motive, and selection in southern African rock art. Africa: Journal of the International African Institute 42: 192-204

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.

Archive Sources and Maps

South African War Map (1899-1902) of the Winburg area dating to 1900
Transvaal and Orange Free State Series: Winburg map dating to 1899
Gold mines & mineral rights of the Greater Witwatersrand and Orange Free State 1949

Web Sources and Legislation

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.

www.sahra.org.za/sahris

Accessed 2021-05-15

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

Accessed 2021-05-15

9 ADDENDUM 1: SPECIALIST CV

NELIUS LE ROUX KRUGER

BHCS Hons. (Archaeology)
(Date compiled: 2021/01/10)

PERSONAL DETAILS

Nationality:	South African
Date of Birth:	3 April 1979
Postal Address:	Postnet Suite 74, Private Bag x04, Menlo Park, 0102
Work Address:	70 Regency Dr, Route 21 Business Park, Centurion, 0178
Telephone numbers:	W: +27 12 751 2160 C: +27 82 967 2131
Identity number:	790403 5029 087
Languages:	English, Afrikaans, Sepedi (Basic)

HIGHER EDUCATION

University Attended:	University of the Pretoria
Degree Obtained:	BA Archaeology (<i>Cum Laude</i>) 2002
Major Subjects:	Anthropology, Archaeology, English, Afrikaans
University Attended:	University of the Pretoria
Degree Obtained:	BHCS Hons. Archaeology (<i>Cum Laude</i>) 2004

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Member of the Association for South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA).
 Member of the Council of the Association for South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA): CRM Portfolio
 Member of the CRM Section of the Association for South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA).
 Member of the Society of Africanist Archaeologists (SAFA).
 Member of the South African Museums Association (SAMA).
 Accredited Professional Archaeologist & CRM Practitioner by the Association for South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) & Heritage Natal (AMAFA).

HONOURS AND AWARDS

Age V. Jensen Development Foundation (Denmark) grant for participation in the joint SAFA/PAA Congress, Dakar, Senegal (2010).
 Five Hundred Years Initiative (NRF) Research Grant (2008 – 2009).
 University of Pretoria post-graduate Merit Grant for MA studies in Archaeology (2004 – 2008).
 University of Pretoria (CINDEK) bursary for post-graduate studies awarded by the Centre of Indigenous Knowledge (2003).
 South African Archaeological Society’s Hanisch Award for best graduate student in the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology at the University of Pretoria (2003).
 University of Pretoria Academic Honorary Colours (2002).
 University of Pretoria Graduate Merit Grant (2002).
 University of Pretoria honorarium for archaeological collections management at the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology (2001).

CURRENT STATUS

Heritage Resources Manager for Exigo Sustainability
 Social impact Assessor and Research Associate for Exigo Sustainability
 Associate and Unit Manager at Exigo Sustainability (formerly AGES Gauteng)
 Part-time Lecturer (Archaeology) Department Anthropology and Archaeology (University of Pretoria)

SPECIALITY FIELDS

- *Integrated Heritage and Archaeological Impact Assessment (Phase 1, 2 & 3), complying to SAHRA, PHRA and industry standards for heritage impact assessments.*
- *Industry standard Heritage Resources Management Plans, complying to SAHRA & PHRA standards for heritage impact assessments.*
- *Heritage destruction / alteration / excavation permitting facilitation and associated research.*
- *General facilitation in consultation and negotiation with heritage resources authorities (SAHRA, PHRA's).*
- *Heritage-related social consultation and focus group facilitation (for example, with Interested and Affected parties).*
- *Historical and anthropological studies.*
- *Heritage and Social Spatial Development Frameworks & Strategic Development Area Frameworks for municipalities.*
- *Industry standard and compliant Social Impact Assessments (SIA's).*
- *Mine Social and Labour Plans (SLP's) and social facilitation.*
- *Socio-cultural baseline studies and research.*
- *GIS and geo-spatial referencing and data analysis, heritage and social mapping.*

PROFESSIONAL SKILLS & EXPERIENCE

Nelius Le Roux Kruger, an associate at Exigo Sustainability, is an accredited ASAPA (Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists) archaeologist and Culture Resources Management (CRM) Practitioner with over 15 years' experience in the fields of heritage resources assessment, conservation management and social studies. In addition, he is involved in various aspects of social research and social impact assessment. He holds a BHCS (Hons) Archaeology degree from the University of Pretoria specializing in the Iron Age Farmer and Colonial Periods of South Africa. He has worked extensively on archaeological and heritage sites of the time periods and cultural contexts present in Southern Africa, both in the commercial and academics spheres and he holds vast experience in human remains relocation and related social consultation. Nelius has conducted social research projects across Southern Africa involving Social Impact Assessments as well as the compilation and monitoring of mining social and labor plans, public meeting facilitation and socio-cultural studies. His experience is not limited to South Africa and he has worked on archaeological and socio-cultural research projects across Africa and the Middle East. His publication record includes a number of academic publications in peer reviewed journals and books as well as a vast number of Heritage Management Reports. Nelius' expertise includes CRM assessment and management, applications in heritage legislation, Social Impact Assessment, social consulting as well as geospatial and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) applications in archaeology and CRM. Nelius is a conscientious and committed archaeologist and social scientist who is dedicated to the professionalism of the discipline of archaeology and social studies. He approaches all aspects of his specialist fields with enthusiasm, maintaining best practise at all times. When working with people, he strives to manage interpersonal communication and group dynamics with dedication, promoting positive group cohesion.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

- Kruger, N. In Prep. Living the frontier: Ritual and Conflict in Ha-Tshirundu.
- Kruger, N. 2016. Forthcoming. The Crocodile in his Pool: Notes on a significant find in the Ha-Tshirundu area, Limpopo Valley, South Africa. Nyame Akuma Bulletin of the Association of Africanist Archaeologists.

- Antonites, A. & Kruger, N. et al. 2014. Report on excavations at Penge, a first-millennium Doornkop settlement. Southern African Humanities 26:177-92
- Antonites, A. & Kruger, N. 2012. **A Preliminary Assessment of Animal Distribution on a 19th Century VhaVenda Settlement.** Nyame Akuma Bulletin of the Association of Africanist Archaeologists. 2012:77
- Kruger, N. In Prep. Living the frontier: Ritual and Conflict in Ha-Tshirundu.
- Kruger, N. 2009. Forthcoming. The Crocodile in his Pool: Notes on a significant find in the Ha-Tshirundu area, Limpopo Valley, South Africa. Nyame Akuma Bulletin of the Association of Africanist Archaeologists.
- Kruger, N. 2008. Ha Tshirundu: Landscape, Lived experience and Land Reform. Poster presented at the South African Association for Archaeologists Biannual Congress, Cape Town, March 2008.
- Mathers, K. & Kruger, N. 2008. The Past is another Country: Archaeology in the Limpopo Province in Smith, A. & Gazin-Schwartz, A (Eds.). 2008. Landscapes of Clearance: Archaeological and Anthropological Perspectives. California: Left Coast Press

SELECTED PROJECTS

NATIONAL

- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and further heritage management for the upgrading of the Warrenton Anglo Boer War blockhouse, Warrenton, Northern Cape Province
- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and Phase 2 Site Investigation for the restoration of the old Johannesburg Fort, Constitution Hill, Johannesburg, Gauteng Province
- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and further heritage management for the upgrading/refurbishment of the Burgershoop MPCC, Mogale City, Gauteng Province
- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) of historical period heritage sites on the farm Roodekrans, Dullstroom area, Mpumalanga Province
- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) of a historical bridge on the farm Pienaarspoort 339jr at Delfsand, Gauteng Province
- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Basements (HIAs) for 20 PV Solar Parks on location at Upington, Kimberley, Vryburg, Kuruman, Kathu, Hotazel, Douglas, Groblershoop and Prieska, Northern Cape Province, South Africa.
- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) for 18 large scale water supply projects on location at East London, Mthatha, Ngcobco, Barley East, Elliot, Cathcart, King Williams Town and Mdantsane, Eastern Cape Province, South Africa.
- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) for more than 40 residential infrastructure developments across South Africa.

INTERNATIONAL

- Heritage Impact Assessment for the Kitumba Copper-Gold Project (KCGP), Zambia
- Heritage Scoping Study for the BTR Kitumba Project, Mumbwa, Zambia
- Heritage Scoping Study for the Buckreef Gold Project, Geita, Tanzania
- Phase 2 mitigation and heritage assessment of the Koidu Monkey Hill Iron Age metallurgy site, Koidu Diamond Mine, Sierra Leone
- Phase 2 heritage site mitigation of the Sessenge archaeological site, Kibali Gold Mine, Democratic Republic of the Congo

10 ADDENDUM 2: 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 3: 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>
--

