

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR
SLANDNEDO, BOSCHLUYSKLOOF, LAINGSBURG DISTRICT,
WESTERN CAPE**

for

TPS Consulting Town and Regional Planners

78 Bath Street

Montagu

6720

Tel/Fax: 023 614 1932

20 September 2006

Prepared by

Sarah Wurz

Proactive Archaeology

PO Box 929

Stellenbosch

7599

Cell: 082 449 33 62

Tel/fax: 021 851 3301

email: sjdw@iziko.org.za

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Heritage Western Cape requested a phase 1 archaeological impact assessment prior to the development of accommodation facilities for a nature reserve at Slandnedo, Boschluyskloof, Lainsburg district in fulfillment of the requirements of Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999).

Two significant heritage resources that require mitigation or a permit before development may take place, an historic core of a farmhouse and a graveyard, have been identified.

The remnants of an historic house, probably dating to 1859, form the core of a dwelling on the farm. This historic core has undergone extensive alteration and expansions, but it still retains its reed and mud ceiling, its most significant element. The historic part of the house is given a field rating of Generally Protected B (generally Medium significance) and should be recorded before destruction. This report provides the necessary mapping, documentation and photographs of the historic core of the house. A permit must be obtained from Heritage Western Cape before any destruction or alteration to the historical section takes place. It is recommended that development of the as planned goes ahead without further specialist heritage input.

A graveyard with three clearly discernable graves is situated close to a modern house. From the concentration of stones, it is estimated that a total of six graves occur in the graveyard. The graves are in a dilapidated condition and overgrown. Two of the graves have headstones that indicate that they are older than 60 years. The field rating of Local significance (Grade IIIA) is recommended for the graveyard. Mitigation as part of the development process is not advised and the site should be retained as a heritage site of high significance. It is recommended that the graveyard must be fenced and protected and that the regulations of Section 36 (as explained in section 7) should be adhered to.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT	4
2. BACKGROUND TO THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE AREA	5
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY & METHODOLOGY	5
4. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITES	6
5. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	7
6. FIELD RATING	8
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	8
8. FIGURES	10
Figure 1: Boschluyskloof (13 459 ha: 1:50 000 321AD Ladismith & 3321BC Matjiesvlei)	10
Figure 2: Development Clusters 1-3 at Slandleno	10
Figure 3a: 1:50 000 map, 3321BC Matjiesvlei, indicating the area to be developed.	10
Figure 3b: Sites 1-5 in Cluster 1	11
Figure 4: Existing footpath in Cluster 3.	11
Figure 5: View of Cluster 1 and modern farm house	11
Figure 6: View of the front of the farmhouse with the historic core.	11
Figure 7: Reed and mud ceiling in living room of historic core of farm house.	11
Figure 8: Kitchen door and window.	11
Figure 9: Fireplace	11
Figure 10: View of the kitchen from the south.	11
Figure 11: View of the kitchen from the west.	11
Figure 12: Graveyard	11
Figure 13: Grave 1	11
Figure 14: Grave 2	11
Figure 15: Grave 3	12
Figure 16: Kraal	12
Figure 17: Sheepdip	12
Figure 18: Sheepdip dam.	12
APPENDIX A: ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY OF FARMHOUSE WITH HISTORIC CORE	12
APPENDIX B: SCHEMATIC PLAN OF FARMHOUSE WITH HISTORIC CORE	12
APPENDIX C. FIELD RATING CRITERIA	12
APPENDIX D: ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES	12

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT

This AIA is part of an Environmental Impact Assessment to be submitted to DEADP (George). An application will be lodged to rezone the farm “Boschluisvloof” from Agricultural Zone 1 to Open Space Zone III, in terms of the Land Use Planning Ordinance No. 15 of 1985, and designating it a Nature Reserve, in terms of the Nature and Environmental Conservation Ordinance No. 19 of 1974. The owners, Mr and Mrs Rademeyer of Boschluisvloof Pnr (Pty) (Tel: 023 5815046) intend to utilize the area as a Nature Reserve. The totality of the property consists of 8 cadastral entities and measures 13 459 ha in extent (1:50 000 321AD Ladismith; 3321BC Matjiesvlei) (Figure 1). Only the area of approximately 5 ha at Slandnedo (33° 18.830' S 21 31.493'E) of this property that will be affected by the development was assessed. Construction will take place in an area disturbed by prior agricultural activities. A total of 21 guest units, 4 staff units and 1 unit for the property owner/ reserve manager that will be incorporated as part of the Lodge complex will be constructed. The density of the development will be low, 1 unit per 517 ha. The accommodation facilities will be developed in three clusters (Figure 2).

Cluster 1, 1.25 ha in extent, is located immediately west of the access road. The archaeological heritage resources reported on occur in this cluster. An existing farm track that will be used as a footpath bisects Cluster 1. Cluster 2 comprises 1.5 ha immediately south east of the DR 1720 (Figure 2). It previously accommodated 4 large sheep kraals that are no longer in use or visible. Cluster 3, also 1.25 ha in extent is situated immediately north west of Cluster 1. Six derelict farm worker cottages are located in this cluster.

Legislation and Terms of reference

The national legal framework for the protection and management of the cultural environment is the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) Act No. 25 of 1999, and also the legal and policy frameworks aimed at the protection of the environment, e.g. the Environment Conservation Act (ECA) (Act No. 73 of 1989) and associated EIA regulations and the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (Act No. 107 of 1998). Section 38 of the NHRA requires heritage assessments as a stand-alone or as a specialist component of the EIA process.

Heritage Western Cape requested a phase 1 archaeological impact assessment for Boschluisvloof in fulfillment of the requirements of Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999). The areas to be affected by the proposed development, additional infrastructure such as landscaping, excavation and construction work, new paths for walking and hiking and zone of 100m around the area to be developed have to be surveyed.

Heritage Western Cape also requested a short history and assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the old farmhouse. A plan of the proposed changes to the house to ensure that development will not negatively impact on style, character and the period of the building, noting that changes have been made before; and sketches of work intended (not final plans) with alternatives have to be provided.

2. BACKGROUND TO THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE AREA

The ADRC at the Iziko Museums of Cape Town shows no record of archaeological sites at Boschluisvloof. However, in the Seweweekspoort, a few kilometers away, several rock paintings have been recorded by TM Wurts (3321AD3-13). Mr Hoekstra also reported a cave site in the Klein Swartberg with rock paintings (3321AD 18). These resources are not close to Boschluisvloof and will not be impacted on by the proposed developments. The property adjacent to Boschluisvloof is Besemfontein, a Nature Conservation area. Mr Tony Marshall (082 784 1784) of Nature Conservation kindly provided the information that there are two overhangs with small rock paintings on Besemfontein.

Bosch Luis Kloof no 208 was granted to JA Kock and LA Kock in 1856. After a series of transfers the remainder of Portion 1 of Bosch Luis Kloof no 208 was sold to Daniel Lakey and Hendrik Davids in 1882 through title deed 270 (Lourens, Barker Lourens architects Appendix A). Portion 1 of Bosch Luis Kloof no 208 houses the only buildings on the farm.

The historical farmhouse was probably erected at about 1859 as the same owner has occupied the farm for a period of 18 years. The remaining features of the house, mud walls, poplar beams and reed ceilings with a mud roof are also typical of this period. Boschluisvloof functioned as an extensive sheep farm prior to 1969, but since 1969 it has not been utilized at any significant scale.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY & METHODOLOGY

The property ('Slandnedo') as recorded on the 1:50 000 map 3321 BC Matjiesvlei, (Figure 3a), magisterial district of Lainsburg, lies approximately 30 km directly north-east of Ladismith and 28 km north-west of Calitzdorp. It can be accessed from the R62, along the R309 through the Seweweekspoort Pass and along the DR 1720, a rough dirt road, which runs through the property to the Gamkapoort Dam. Slandnedo is located adjacent to the Bosluiskloof River, about 8 km from the western entrance gate into the Property.

Slandnedo is the only area of Boschluisvloof on which structures occur. Two farmhouses, one of which has a historical core dating to around 1859, 6 modern derelict and collapsed farm worker cottages and a broken cement reservoir are the most obvious structures. The structures and features that may be of heritage value are described and discussed in section 4.

A foot survey of the area of the proposed development, approximately 5 hectares, was undertaken. Areas that will be affected by additional infrastructure such as landscaping, excavation and construction, and those intended for new paths for walking and hiking as well as a buffer zone of 100m around the area to be developed were also surveyed.

Myself, accompanied an assistant and Mr & Mrs Rademeyer, traversed this area on foot for two and a half hours on Saturday 9 September 2006. GPS readings were taken using a Garmin GPS e-trex (map datum WGS84) with an accuracy of 4 meters. Extensive grass cover affected visibility. The three clusters have been disturbed extensively by previous farming and building activities. The developer, Mr Ron Brunings and the architect, Mr Henk Louwrens (021 4265362 fax) provided background information, documentation and

historical background on the house Existing paths will be utilised as foot paths and these were surveyed for potential heritage material.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITES

The sites described are indicated on Figure 3b. The area to be used as foot path was void of heritage resources (Figures 4).

Site 1: Historic house (33° 18.830' S 21° 31.493'E)

The historic house is situated approximately 50 metres from the modern farm house (Figures 5 and 6). The historic remnants of the house probably date to 1859. It has thick mud walls, some of the beams seem to be in the original poplar wood, and there is a reed and mud ceiling in the living room (Figure 7). This historic structure has been altered significantly. It has been enlarged and in the process some of the original structure has been removed. The historic core consists of the living room , kitchen (Figure 8) with fire place (Figure 9) and one bedroom (See Appendix B, Schematic Plan). The original windows and doors have been removed and the original positions and structures of the windows and doors are not visible. The fire-place had to be reinforced, and the chimney is in a particularly unstable condition (Figures 10, 11). The walls of the kitchen and bedroom appear unstable and cracked.

None of the original features of the werf is visible. This area is disturbed and is strewn with building rubble. About 50 metres south from the house three 'hunting dog kennels' occur. These structures are probably not older than 60 years.

Site 2: Well (33° 18.877' S 21° 31.433'E)

A well of uncertain age occurs next to the footpath (Figure 3b). The area is overgrown and details could not be discerned clearly, but the well may be older than 60 years.

Site 3: Graveyard (33° 18.877' S 21° 31.449'E)

A graveyard with three clearly discernable graves is situated close to the non historical house (Figure 12). From the concentration of stones, it is estimated that a total of six graves occur. The graves are in a dilapidated condition and overgrown. Two of the graves have headstones that indicate that they are older than 60 years.

Grave 1: It has no discernable details on the headstone (Figure13)

Grave 2: Grave of Martha Francina Selva, born 31.01.1883. (Figure 14)

The inscription reads:

Martha Francina Selva
Gbohn Glazer 30.01.1883.
Overlegen
25.08.1__2
Stellenreus
Plaatsvan God
_o_enC7 '82

Grave 3: Grave of AJ le Roes (Figure 15)

The inscription reads:

Ter Gedagtenis Aan
AJ le Roes
Eb 28 Jan 1871
Oorl 23 Okt 1937
Sy Wil Geskie

Site 4: Klipkraal (33° 18.883' S 21° 31.464'E) (Figure 16)

A dry stone wall kraal, 30x30 m, of uncertain age occur close to the modern farmhouse.

Site 5: Sheepdip (33° 18.878' S 21° 31.485'E) (Figures 17 & 18)

This structure is probably not older than 60 years, but is of interest because it shows a method of dipping from a bygone era. It consists of a circular fenced area with a paved floor and a canal leading to the dip dam .

5. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The heritage resources are briefly discussed in terms of the following types of significances: Aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic and technological

Site 1 Remnants of historic house:

The historical farmhouse has some architectural and historical significance. However, due to the degree of dilapidation and alteration, the house does not represent a typical example of its kind nor does it preserve unique features. Therefore its historical and architectural significance is low. The house is not significant from a scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological point of view.

Site 2 Well:

The well is not significant in terms of aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological criteria. The degradedness and degree of change of the landscape detract from this cultural heritage resource.

Site 3 Graveyard:

The graveyard is of high historical, social, scientific and spiritual significance. No historical or oral information on the graves could be found.

Site 4 Kraal:

The kraal is of no aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological significance.

Site 5 Sheepdip:

The sheepdip is of no aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological significance.

6. FIELD RATING

Site 1 Remnants of historic house:

Generally Protected B (see Appendix C): Because the structure is significantly altered and does not present an intact example of an historical house, it is of generally medium significance and should be recorded before destruction.

The historic core of the house is documented, mapped and photographed as required for a Generally Protected B site. A floor plan and future plan of development are also included (Appendix B and D).

Site 2 Well:

Generally Protected C: this site has been sufficiently recorded. It requires no further recording before destruction (generally Low significance).

Site 3 Graveyard:

Local significance (Grade IIIA). Mitigation as part of the development process is not advised. The site should be retained as a heritage site of high significance.

Site 4 Kraal:

Generally Protected C: this site has been sufficiently recorded. It requires no further recording before destruction (generally Low significance).

Site 5 Sheepdip:

Generally Protected C: this site has been sufficiently recorded. It requires no further recording before destruction (generally Low significance).

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Site 1 Remnants of historic house:

The impact of the development on the house will be high.

The reed and mud ceiling must be retained. According to the architectural plans (Appendix D), the historical core, e.g. the living room and most of the kitchen and bedroom, will be retained. ‘The proposed additions are conceptualized to ‘frame’ or ‘protect’ the original core building. The new additions either envelope or incorporate the later (less appropriate) additions. They form a new ‘style’ related to the old in the use of thick walls and small window proportions, while locating itself as ‘new’ through an interpretative formal language.’

It is recommended that development goes ahead without further specialist heritage input and that the developer proceed. The core structure of the house has been mapped and documented sufficiently. A permit must be obtained from Heritage Western Cape before any destruction or alteration takes place.

Site 2 Well:

The impact on the well is low, as the developer intends to retain and fence the well.

The structure requires no further recording before possible destruction and development may proceed.

Site 3 Graveyard:

The impact on the graveyard is low, as the developer plans to conserve the graveyard.

It is recommended that the graveyard must be fenced and protected. It may not be destroyed. The following regulations apply to the graveyard (SAHRA head office Archaeological Review Comments template):

In terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999) graves older than 60 years (not in a municipal graveyard) are protected. Human remains younger than 60 years should be handled only by a registered undertaker or an institution declared under the Human Tissues Act.

Anyone who wishes to develop an area where there are graves older than 60 years is required to follow the process described in the legislation (section 36 and associated regulations). The specialist will require a permit from the heritage resources authority:

1. Determine/ confirm the presence of the graves on the property. Normally the quickest way to proceed is to obtain the service of a professional archaeologist accredited to undertake burial relocations. The archaeologist will provide an estimate of the age of the graves. There may be a need for archival research and possibly test excavations (permit required).
2. The preferred decision may be to move the development so that the graves may remain undisturbed. If this is done, the developer must satisfy SAHRA that adequate arrangements have been made to protect the graves on site from the impact of the development. This usually involves fencing the grave(yard) and setting up a small site management plan indicating who will be responsible for maintaining the graves and how this is legally tied into the development. It is recommended that an area of 10-20 m is left undisturbed around the graves.
3. If the developer wishes to relocate or disturb the graves:
 - a. A 60-day public participation (social consultation) process as required by section 36 (and regulations - see attachment), must be undertaken to identify any direct descendants of those buried on the property. This allows for a period of consultation with any family members or community to ascertain what their wishes are for the burials. It involves notices to the public on site and through representative media. This may be done by the archaeologist, who can explain the process, but for large or sensitive sites a social consultant should be employed. Archaeologists often work with undertakers, who rebury the human remains.
 - b. If as a result of the public participation, the family (where descendants are identified) or the community agree to the relocation process then the graves may be relocated.
 - c. The archaeologist must submit a permit application to SAHRA for the disinterment of the burials. This must include written approval of the descendants or, if there has not been success in identifying direct descendants, written documentation of the social consultation process, which must indicate to SAHRA's satisfaction, the efforts that have been made to locate them. It must also include details of the exhumation process and the place to which the burials are to be relocated. (There are regulations regarding creating new cemeteries and so this usually means that relocation must be to an established communal rural or formal municipal cemetery.)

- d. Permission must be obtained before exhumation takes place from the landowner where the graves are located, and from the owners/managers of the graveyard to which the remains will be relocated.
- e. Other relevant legislation must be complied with, including the Human Tissues Act (National Department of Health) and any ordinances of the Provincial Department of Health). The archaeologist can usually advise about this.

Site 4 Kraal:

The impact of the development on the kraal is low as the developer plans to retain the kraal.

The structure requires no further recording before destruction and development may proceed.

Site 5 Sheepdip:

The impact of the development on the kraal is low as the developer plans to retain the sheepdip in its present condition.

The structure requires no further recording before destruction and development may proceed.

Acknowledgments: Mr & Mrs Rademeyr are thanked for accompanying me on the survey and Mr Ron Brunings for providing the background and architectural information.

8. FIGURES

Figure 1: Boschluyskloof (13 459 ha: 1:50 000 321AD Ladismith & 3321BC Matjiesvlei)

Figure 2: Development Clusters 1-3 at Slandledo

Figure 3a: 1:50 000 map, 3321BC Matjiesvlei, indicating the area to be developed.

Figure 3b: Sites 1-5 in Cluster 1

Figure 4: Existing footpath in Cluster 3.

Figure 5: View of Cluster 1 and modern farm house. Farmhouse with historic core to the right behind the trees.

Figure 6: View of the front of the farmhouse with the historic core.

Figure 7: Reed and mud ceiling in living room of historic core of farm house.

Figure 8: Kitchen door and window.

Figure 9: Fireplace.

Figure 10: View of the kitchen from the south. Note the cracks in the chimney, additions and alterations.

Figure 11: View of the kitchen from the west.

Figure 12: Graveyard.

Figure 13: Grave 1 (Kraal in the background)

Figure 14: Grave 2

Figure 15: Grave 3

Figure 16: Kraal

Figure 17: Sheepdip

Figure 18: Sheepdip dam.

APPENDIX A: ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY OF FARMHOUSE WITH HISTORIC CORE

APPENDIX B: SCHEMATIC PLAN OF FARMHOUSE WITH HISTORIC CORE

APPENDIX C. FIELD RATING CRITERIA

(Minimum Standards, Heritage Western Cape, April 2006)

- a) National: This site is considered to be of Grade I significance and should be nominated as such.
- b) Provincial: This site is considered to be of Grade II significance and should be nominated as such.
- c) Local: this site is of Grade IIIA significance. Mitigation as part of the development process is not advised. The site should be retained as a heritage site (High significance).
- d) Local: this site is of Grade IIIB significance. It should be mitigated and (part) should be retained as a heritage site (High significance).
- e) Generally Protected A: this site should be mitigated before destruction (generally High/Medium significance).
- f) Generally Protected B: this site should be recorded before destruction (generally Medium significance).
- g) Generally Protected C: this site has been sufficiently recorded. It requires no further recording before destruction (generally Low significance).

APPENDIX D: ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES