

**A SURVEY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES ON THE  
FARM MOOIPLAATS 355 JR,  
PRETORIA DISTRICT**

For:

Danie Joubert & Associates  
P.O. Box 15283  
SINNOVILLE  
0129

Survey conducted and report prepared by the:

**NATIONAL CULTURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**  
P.O. Box 28088  
SUNNYSIDE  
0132

Telephone - (012) 341 1320  
Telefax - (012) 341 6146  
E-mail - nchm@nchm.co.za

REPORT: 98KH09

Date of survey: May 1998

Date of report: May 1998



NASIONALE KULTURHISTORIESE MUSEUM  
NATIONAL CULTURAL HISTORY MUSEUM

**SUMMARY**

**A survey of cultural resources on the Farm Mooiplaats 355 JR in the Pretoria District**

A survey to establish the nature, extent and significance of cultural resources was made on the Farm Mooiplaats 355 JR in the Pretoria District.

A number of sites of cultural significance were identified during the field survey. All of these sites will be impacted upon by the proposed development. It is, however, recommended that the development can continue, but only after suitable mitigation measures were taken. Recommendations are put forward in section 8 of this report.

**CONTENTS**

SUMMARY .....	i
CONTENTS .....	ii
1. AIMS OF THE SURVEY .....	1
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE .....	1
3. CONDITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS.....	1
4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....	2
5. METHODOLOGY .....	3
6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA SURVEYED.....	4
7. DISCUSSION.....	4
8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5
9. REFERENCES .....	5
10. PROJECT TEAM.....	6
APPENDIX 1 .	7
APPENDIX 2 .	8
APPENDIX 3	9



**A SURVEY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES ON THE  
FARM MOOIPLAATS 355 JR,  
PRETORIA DISTRICT**

## 1. AIMS OF THE SURVEY

The National Cultural History Museum was requested by **Danie Joubert & Associates** to conduct a survey of archaeological and cultural historical sites on the farm Mooiplaats 355 JR in the Pretoria District. The development of a large residential refuse dump is being planned. The aim of the survey was to locate, identify, evaluate and document the sites, objects and structures of cultural importance found within the boundaries of the proposed development, but also in the general area of the farm.

## 2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The **Terms of Reference** for the study were to:

- 2.1 Identify all objects, sites, occurrences and structures of an archaeological or historical nature (cultural resources) located in the area of the proposed development.
- 2.2 Assess the significance of the cultural resources in terms of their historical, social, religious, aesthetic, scientific and tourism value.
- 2.3 Describe the possible impact of the proposed development on these cultural remains, according to a standard set of conventions.
- 2.4 Propose suitable mitigation measures to minimize possible negative impacts on the cultural resources.

## 3. CONDITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The following aspects have a direct bearing on the survey and the resulting report:

- **Cultural resources** are all nonphysical and physical human-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences that are associated with human activity. These include all sites, structures and artifacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development.
- The **significance** of the sites and artifacts is determined by means of their historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific value in relation to their 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.
- Significance is site-specific and relates to the content and context of the site. Sites regarded as having low significance have already been recorded in full and require no further mitigation. Sites with medium to high significance require further mitigation.

- The latitude and longitude of an archaeological site is to be treated as sensitive information by the developer, and should not be disclosed to members of the public.
- All recommendations are made with full cognisance of the relevant legislation, in this case the National Monuments Act (1969).

#### 4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Currently two of the more important Acts concerning cultural resources are the National Monuments Act (Act 28 of 1969) and the Environmental Conservation Act (Act 73 of 1989). It is however important to note that new legislation is being prepared and this might come into effect before the end of 1998.

##### 4.1 National Monuments Act

According to this law the following appropriate cultural resources are protected:

- a. Meteorites and fossils
- b. Prehistoric rock art
- c. Prehistoric tools, ornaments and structures
- d. The Anthropological and archaeological contents of graves, rock shelters, caves, middens etc.
- e. Historical sites and archaeological or paleontological finds, material or artifacts
- f. Declared national monuments
- g. Cemeteries and graves older than 50 years

The above mentioned may only be disturbed or moved by an archaeologist, after receiving a permit to do so from the National Monuments Council. A person is only regarded an archaeologist if he/she has a Honours degree in archaeology.

##### 4.2 Environmental Conservation Act

This act states that a survey and an evaluation of cultural resources should be undertaken in area where development, which will change the face of the environment, is to be made. The impact of the development on the cultural resources should also be determined and proposals to mitigate this impact is to be formulated.

##### 4.3 The White Paper on Heritage Resources

The white paper is currently being discussed by parliament and is destined to become law before the end of 1998. It will replace the National Monuments Act. The types of sites protected by this act will be more or less the same than that covered by the National Monuments Act, but provides more strict measures of protection.

Of great importance is the fact that the engineering sector will no longer be excluded from obtaining permits, via an archaeologist, in order to disturb or move a cultural resource. Another change is that all graves, cemeteries and structures older than 60 years will be protected.

#### 5. METHODOLOGY

##### 5.1 Preliminary investigation

###### 5.1.1 Data sources

The **Archaeological Data Recording Centre** (ADRC) of the National Cultural History Museum in Pretoria was consulted. This was done in order to determine if any archaeological sites have been documented previously in the

area of the survey.

## 5.2 Field survey

The survey was conducted according to generally accepted archaeological practices, and was aimed at locating all possible sites, objects and structures. Special attention was given to the area of proposed development, while areas in the proximity of the planned development were also investigated. All natural features such as prominent hills and outcrops, streambeds, clumps of trees and erosion trenches were investigated.

## 5.3 Documentation

All sites, objects and structures identified were documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. Coordinates of individual localities were determined by means of the **Global Positioning System** (GPS)<sup>1</sup> and plotted on a map. The information was added to the description in order to facilitate the identification of each locality.

## 5.4 Presentation of the information

In discussing the results of the survey, a chronological rather than a geographical approach was followed in the presentation of an overview of human occupation and land use in the area. This helps the reader to better understand and facilitate the potential impact of the development. Information on the individual objects, sites, occurrences and structures is presented in Appendix 2 and summarised in Table 1.

## 6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA SURVEYED

The topography is, basically, gently flat open veld with stretches of more dense bush and thorn trees. There are a few small hills and relatively large outcrops of syenite. Only small sections of the area has been and are being used for agricultural purposes. However, the largest part has not been ploughed and developed agriculturally at all, as the area are not very suited for that purpose. Large parts of the survey area has also been developed industrially and for urban settlement, or are in the process of being developed. A fairly large squatter settlement is situated in the northern corner of the area. Large excavations in the syenite outcrops are also found in the area.

The geology of the survey area is varied, with syenite, quartz, scree, gravel, ferricrete, silcrete, dolomite, shale and chert some of the types found. The vegetation is basically Bankenveld (Central Variation), with the veld a particularly sour, wiry grassveld, virtually ungrazable in winter. Rocky hills and ridges carry a Bushveld vegetation. In sheltered valleys and sinkholes there are traces of temperate or transitional forest, for example in Fountains Valley in Pretoria (Acocks, 1988: 113-114).

## 7. DISCUSSION

A survey of this nature has not been carried out in this area (Mooiplaats 355 JR) before. A few sites of limited importance were identified and documented during this survey.

### 7.1 Stone Age

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the manufacturer a certain deviation may be expected for each reading. Care was, however, taken to obtain as accurate a reading as possible, and then correlate it with reference to the physical environment before plotting it on the map.

No evidence of the Stone Age, such as the characteristic stone tools left by Stone Age people, were found in the survey area. The possibility of Stone Age people moving around in the area in earlier times can however not be ruled out entirely. The Hennops river situated to the north would have attracted these people to the area, as the animals they hunted would have kept near the water.

## 7.2 Iron Age

Likewise, no sites dating to this period were identified in the survey area. The rocky nature of the area, with large syenite outcrops and gravel, scree, shale, etc. would have made ploughing for agricultural purposes very difficult, while the very sour, wiry grassveld would have made grazing for cattle nearly impossible. Iron Age people would therefore not have regarded the area as suitable for settlement.

## 7.3 Historic and more recent times

Three sites dating to historic and more recent times were identified during the field survey. They are:

- (i) A graveyard with approximately 60 graves dating to within the last 50 years
- (ii) The foundations and remains of a homestead/farmstead built of local stone, about 50m south of the graveyard. The age of this structure is unknown
- (iii) The foundations and remains of 3 structures constructed with local stone. Artifacts found in the vicinity of the structures include porcelain, glass and metal, with half a horseshoe being one of the metal artifacts. The site possibly dates to the turn of the century, but more likely to within the last 50 years

## 8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It can be concluded that none of the sites identified in the survey area are of any real historical, social, aesthetic, technological or scientific value and has no research potential. The two sites with structural remains on them have been recorded in full and require no further mitigation. The grave site, however, will require mitigation, as the development will directly impact upon the site. This will entail the reburial of the contents of the graves. It is therefore recommended that development of the refuse dump continue, but that mitigation regarding the graves be carried out. It is also recommended that if, during any part of the development, sites or artifacts of cultural importance are found, the National Cultural History Museum be contacted to undertake proper scientific investigation of the finds.

## 9. REFERENCES

### 9.1 Data base

Archaeological Data Recording Centre, National Cultural History Museum, Pretoria.

### 9.2 Literary sources

Acocks, J.P.H. 1988. **Veld Types of South Africa**. Memoirs of the Botanical Survey of South Africa, No. 40. Pretoria: Botanical Research Institute.

### 9.3 Maps

Maps supplied by client (Danie Joubert & Associates).

1:50 000 Topographic series - 2528CC Centurion

1:50 000 Geological series - 2528CC Lyttelton

## 10. PROJECT TEAM

Dr. J.A van Schalkwyk - Principal Investigator

A. Pelsler - Field Supervisor

## **APPENDIX 1: STANDARDIZED SET OF CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PROJECTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES**

### **Significance of impact:**

- low where the impact will not have an influence on or require to be significantly accommodated in the project design
- medium where the impact could have an influence which will require modification of the project design or alternative mitigation
- high where it would have a "no-go" implication on the project regardless of any mitigation

### **Certainty of prediction:**

- Definite: More than 90% sure of a particular fact. Substantial supportive data to verify assessment
- Probable: Over 70% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of that impact occurring
- Possible: Only over 40% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of an impact occurring
- Unsure: Less than 40% sure of a particular fact, or the likelihood of an impact occurring

### **Status of the impact:**

With mitigation and the resultant recovery of material, a negative impact can be turned positive. Describe whether the impact is positive (a benefit), negative (a cost) or neutral

### **Recommended management action:**

For each impact, the recommended practically attainable mitigation actions which would result in a measurable reduction of the impact, must be identified. This is expressed according to the following:

1 = no further investigation necessary

2 = controlled sampling of the site necessary

3 = test excavation to determine if further work is necessary

4 = preserve site if possible, otherwise extensive salvage excavation necessary

5 = preserve site at all costs

**Legal requirements:**

Identify and list the specific legislation and permit requirements which potentially could be infringed upon by the proposed project, if mitigation is necessary

## APPENDIX 2: SURVEY RESULTS<sup>2</sup>

[See Appendix 1 for explanation of the conventions used in assessing of the cultural remains]

### 1. Site number: 2528CC107

Description: A recent graveyard site (dating to within the last 50 years) with approximately 20 graves.

Location: The site is located at 25° 50' 51.1" S; 28° 06' 09.2" E

Discussion: Only two of the graves have proper headstones, with one containing an inscription. It reads: **Isac Molife. Born 1911 Died 1968.**

Significance of impact: High

Certainty of prediction: Definite

Status of impact: Negative

Recommended management action: reburial

Legal requirements: Relocation of the graves will have to be done in accordance with Transvaal Ordinance (No.7 of 1925) and the National Monuments Act (No.28 of 1969). However, the local Authority might also have its own requirements concerning this matter, which will have to be pursued by the developer self.

### 2. Site number: 2528CC108

Description: Foundations/remains of an old homestead/farmstead.

Location: 25° 50' 51.1" S; 28° 06' 09.2" E

Discussion: Remains of structure built of stone. Situated about 50m south of the graveyard. Age unknown.

Significance of impact: Low

Certainty of prediction: Definite

Status of impact: Neutral

Recommended management action: (1) - no further investigation necessary.

Legal requirements: None.

### 3. Site number: 2528CC109

Description: Foundations/Remains of 3 structures. Constructed with local stone.

Location: 25° 50' 40.0" S; 28° 05' 31.8" E

Discussion: The site could date to the turn of the century, although it is more likely to date within the last 50 years. Cultural material found on the surface of the site include porcelain, glass and metal. On of the metal artifacts are half a horseshoe.

Significance of impact: Low

Certainty of prediction: Definite

Status of impact: Neutral

Recommended management action: (1) - no further investigation necessary.

Legal requirements: None

## APPENDIX 3: GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS

This section is included to give the reader some necessary background. It must be kept in mind, however, that these dates are all relative and serve only to give a very broad framework for interpretation.

### STONE AGE

Early Stone Age (ESA)	2 000 000 - 150 000 Before Present
Middle Stone Age (MSA)	150 000 - 30 000 BP
Late Stone Age (LSA)	30 000 - until c. AD 200

### IRON AGE

Early Iron Age (EIA)	AD 200 - AD 1000
----------------------	------------------

---

<sup>1</sup> Previous site numbers relate to other known sites on a particular 1/4 degree sheet already documented in the ADRC, and does not necessarily refer to sites occurring on or close to the specific area of development.

Late Iron Age (LIA)

AD 1000 - AD 1830

**HISTORICAL PERIOD**

Largely since the late 1840's to the mid 20th century.



**TABLE 1: Summary of sites and assessment in the Mooiplaats 355JR development area (see Appendix 2)**

Site no.	Type of site	Significance of impact	Certainty of prediction	Status of impact	Recommended management action	Legal requirement
2528CC107	Historic	High	Definite	Negative	Reburial	NMC
2528CC108	Historic	Low	Definite	Neutrale	1 = no further investigation necessary	None
2528CC109	Historic	Lowium	Definite	Neutrale	1 = no further investigation necessary	None