

Heritage Survey report
of
**VARIOUS PORTIONS OF THE FARM
WATERKLOOF 305JQ, RUSTENBURG MUNICIPAL DISTRICT,
NORTH WEST PROVINCE**

THE PROJECT:

Development of a golf course.

THIS REPORT:

Heritage Survey report of

**VARIOUS PORTIONS OF THE FARM WATERKLOOF 305JQ, RUSTENBURG
MUNICIPAL DISTRICT, NORTH WEST PROVINCE**

Report No: 2007/JvS/004
Status: Final
Revision No: 0
Date: April 2007

Prepared for:

Bokamoso Landscape Architects
Representative: Ms L Gregory
Tel: 012 346 3810
E-mail: Lizelleg@mweb.co.za
Postal Address: P O Box 11375, MAROELANA, 0161

Prepared by:

J van Schalkwyk (D Litt et Phil), Heritage Consultant
Tel: 012 347 7270
E-mail: jvschalkwyk@mweb.co.za
Postal Address: 62 Coetzer Ave, Monument Park, 0181

ASAPA Registration No. 164

Principal Investigator: Iron Age, Colonial Period, Industrial Heritage

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HERITAGE SURVEY OF VARIOUS PORTIONS OF THE FARM WATERKLOOF 305JQ, RUSTENBURG MUNICIPAL DISTRICT, NORTH WEST PROVINCE

The aim of the survey was to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural significance found within the area in which it is proposed to develop a golf course.

Past activities in the study area consisted of farming.

Two sites viewed to have some significance have been identified in the study area:

- An old cemetery, which is viewed to have high significance on a regional level
- An old farmhouse, which is viewed to have high significance on a local level

Based on what was found and its evaluation, it is recommended that any development can continue in the area, on condition of acceptance of the following recommendations:

- The mitigation actions proposed for the identified site (see Appendix 3) should be implemented before development takes place.
- If construction takes place and archaeological sites are exposed, it should immediately be reported to a museum, preferably one at which an archaeologist is available, so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	iv
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE	1
3. DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS	1
4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	2
5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3
6. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSESSMENT	4
7. IDENTIFICATION OF RISK SOURCES	5
8. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
9. REFERENCES.....	7
APPENDIX 1: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PROJECTS ON HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	8
APPENDIX 2. RELEVANT LEGISLATION	10
APPENDIX 3: SURVEY RESULTS	11

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**STONE AGE**

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

IRON AGE

Early Iron Age	AD 200 - AD 1000
Late Iron Age	AD 1000 - AD 1830

HISTORIC PERIOD

Since the arrival of the white settlers - c. AD 1840 in this part of the country

core - a piece of stone from which flakes were removed to be used or made into tools

ADRC	Archaeological Data Recording Centre
EIA	Early Iron Age
ESA	Early Stone Age
LIA	Late Iron Age
LSA	Late Stone Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Agency
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency

HERITAGE SURVEY OF VARIOUS PORTIONS OF THE FARM WATERKLOOF 305JQ, RUSTENBURG MUNICIPAL DISTRICT, NORTH WEST PROVINCE

1. INTRODUCTION

An independent heritage consultant was appointed to conduct a survey to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural importance found within the boundaries of an area in which it is proposed to develop a golf course.

Cultural heritage resources are broadly defined as all non-physical and physical human-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences that are associated with human activity. These include all sites, structures and artefacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The scope of work consisted of conducting a Phase 1 archaeological survey of the site in accordance with the requirements of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999).

This include:

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

The objectives were to

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

3. DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

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

- *Cultural resources* are all non-physical and physical human-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences that are associated with human activity. These include all sites, structures and artefacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development.
- The *significance* of the sites and artefacts are 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.

- 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 archaeological sites are to be treated as sensitive information by the developer and should not be disclosed to members of the public.

4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Extent of the Study

This survey and impact assessment covers the area as presented in Section 5 and as illustrated in Figure 1.

4.2 Methodology

4.1 Preliminary investigation

4.1.1 Survey of the literature

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

4.1.2 Data bases

The *Heritage Sites Database* and the *Environmental Potential Atlas* was consulted.

4.1.3 Other sources

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

4.2 Field survey

The field survey was done according to generally accepted archaeological practices, and was aimed at locating all possible sites, objects and structures. The area that had to be investigated, was identified by Bokamoso by means of maps. The area was investigated by walking across it in a number of transects. Special attention was given to topographical occurrences such as trenches, holes, outcrops and clusters of trees were investigated.

4.3 Documentation

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

Map datum used: Hartebeeshoek 94 (WGS84).

¹ 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 to correlate it with reference to the physical environment before plotting it on the map.

4.4 Limitations

The natural vegetation as well as the various planted crops was very high, making the detection of sites very difficult.

5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

5.1 Site location

The study area is portions 364, 284, 236, 98, 99, 100, 101, 39, 178, 179, 242, 208, 206, 207, 177 & 217 of the farm Waterkloof 305JQ in the Rustenburg municipal district of Northwest Province. The site is located south of the N4 and south-east of the town of Rustenburg (Fig. 1). It centres around the following coordinates: S 25.72517; E 27.28152.

5.2 Site description

The geology is made up of norite and the original vegetation is classified as Clay Thorn Bushveld. The largest part of the study area has been subjected to agricultural activities.

5.3 Identified sites

5.3.1 Stone Age

No sites, features or objects dating to the Stone Age were identified.

5.3.2 Iron Age

Similarly, no sites, objects or features dating to the Iron Age were identified. A large area in which outcrops occurs, is located to the north of the farmstead. It was investigated to determine if it contains any stone walling. Nothing was found, although it must be stated that the dense vegetation cover limited visibility very much. However, the absence of stone walled sites were confirmed by the owner of the farm, Mr G Wenhold.

5.3.3 Historic period

The farm Waterkloof was originally taken up by Paul Kruger in the early 1840s and he lived there until about 1873. In 1862 he also bought the farm Boekenhoutkloof and, after completion of the house there in c. 1873, he moved there permanently. On Waterkloof, there is the remains of his house which he built, located a short distance south of the study area. Further to the west there is a big stone wall, declared as a national monument, that was apparently built by Kruger himself.

By the late 1880, a strong German community, centring around the Hermansburg mission station on the adjacent farm Kroondal, was established in the area. Their descendants are found on most farms in the area.

6. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSESSMENT

Impact analysis of cultural resources under threat of the proposed development, are based on the present understanding of the golf course development.

The **significance** of a heritage site and artefacts is determined by its historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific 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.

Sites regarded as having low significance are viewed as being recorded in full after identification and would require no further mitigation. Impact from the development would therefore be judged to be low. Sites with a medium to high significance would therefore require mitigation. Mitigation, in most cases the excavation of a site, is in essence destructive and therefore the impact can be viewed as high and as permanent.

The sites in this area are rated as follows (see Appendix 3)

- The old cemetery contains graves of some of the earliest white settlers and their descendants in the area. In addition to this, the headstones show interesting folk art. The site is viewed as having high significance on a regional level.



Fig. 1. One of the headstones in the old cemetery.

- The old farmhouse is probably a good example of similar features in the region and it therefore holds some promise to generate information on layout, construction, lifestyle etc. As it is older than 60 years, it should be recorded (mapped and photographed) before it is demolished.

7. IDENTIFICATION OF RISK SOURCES

A Heritage Impact Assessment is focused on two phases of a proposed development: **the construction** and **operation phases**. However, from a cultural heritage perspective, this distinction does not apply. Heritage sites are fixed features in the environment, occurring within specific spatial confines. Any impact upon them is permanent and non-reversible. Those resources that cannot be avoided and that are directly impacted by the development can be excavated/recorded and a management plan can be developed for future action. Those sites that are not impacted, can be written into the management plan, whence they can be avoided or cared for in the future.

The following project actions may impact negatively on archaeological sites and other features of cultural importance. The actions are most likely to occur during the construction phase of a project.

Construction phase:

Possible Risks	Source of the risk
Actually identified risks	
- damage to sites	Construction work
Anticipated risks	
- looting of sites	Curios workers

Operation phase:

Possible Risks	Source of the risk
Actually identified risks	
- damage to sites	Not keeping to management plans
Anticipated risks	
- damage to sites	Unscheduled construction/developments
- looting of sites	Visitors removing objects as keepsakes

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

The aim of the survey was to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural significance found within the area in which it is proposed to develop a golf course.

Past activities in the study area consisted of farming.

Two sites viewed to have some significance have been identified in the study area:

- An old cemetery, which is viewed to have high significance on a regional level
- An old farmhouse, which is viewed to have high significance on a local level

Based on what was found and its evaluation, it is recommended that any development can continue in the area, on condition of acceptance of the following recommendations:

- The mitigation actions proposed for the identified site (see Appendix 3) should be implemented before development takes place.
- If construction takes place and archaeological sites are exposed, it should immediately be reported to a museum, preferably one at which an archaeologist is available, so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made.

9. REFERENCES

9.1 Data bases

Heritage Sites Database, Pretoria.

Environmental Potential Atlas, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism.

9.2 Literature

Acocks, J.P.H. 1975. *Veld Types of South Africa*. Memoirs of the Botanical Survey of South Africa, No. 40. Pretoria: Botanical Research Institute.

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

Oberholster, J.J. 1972. *The historical monuments of South Africa*. Cape Town: Rembrandt van Rijn Foundation.

Van Warmelo, N.J. 1977. *Anthropology of Southern Africa in Periodicals to 1950*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

9.3 Maps

1: 50 000 Topocadastral maps – 2527CB

9.4 Interviews

Mr G Wenhold, current owner of the farm Waterkloof, who has been living on the farm for more than 60 years.

APPENDIX 1: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PROJECTS ON HERITAGE RESOURCES

Significance

The *significance* of the sites and artefacts are 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.

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

1. Historic value					
Is it important in the community, or pattern of history					
Does it have strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in history					
Does it have significance relating to the history of slavery					
2. Aesthetic value					
It is important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group					
3. Scientific value					
Does it have potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of natural or cultural heritage					
Is it important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period					
4. Social value					
Does it have strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons					
5. Rarity					
Does it possess uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage					
6. Representivity					
Is it important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of natural or cultural places or objects					
Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a range of landscapes or environments, the attributes of which identify it as being characteristic of its class					
Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of human activities (including way of life, philosophy, custom, process, land-use, function, design or technique) in the environment of the nation, province, region or locality.					
7. Sphere of Significance			High	Medium	Low
International					
National					
Provincial					
Regional					
Local					
Specific community					
8. Significance rating of feature					
1.	Low				
2.	Medium				
3.	High				

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: More than 70% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of that impact occurring
- Possible: Only more than 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

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/action necessary
- 2 = controlled sampling and/or mapping of the site necessary
- 3 = preserve site if possible, otherwise extensive salvage excavation and/or mapping necessary
- 4 = 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. RELEVANT LEGISLATION

All archaeological and palaeontological sites, and meteorites are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act (Act no 25 of 1999) as stated in Section 35:

(1) Subject to the provisions of section 8, the protection of archaeological and palaeontological sites and material and meteorites is the responsibility of a provincial heritage resources authority: Provided that the protection of any wreck in the territorial waters and the maritime cultural zone shall be the responsibility of SAHRA.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (8)(a), all archaeological objects, palaeontological material and meteorites are the property of the State. The responsible heritage authority must, on behalf of the State, at its discretion ensure that such objects are lodged with a museum or other public institution that has a collection policy acceptable to the heritage resources authority and may in so doing establish such terms and conditions as it sees fit for the conservation of such objects.

(3) Any person who discovers archaeological or palaeontological objects or material or a meteorite in the course of development or agricultural activity must immediately report the find to the responsible heritage resources authority, or to the nearest local authority offices or museum, which must immediately notify such heritage resources authority.

(4) 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.

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act no 25 of 1999) stipulates the assessment criteria and grading of archaeological sites. The following categories are distinguished in Section 7 of the Act:

- **Grade I:** Heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance;
- **Grade II:** Heritage resources which, although forming part of the national estate, can be considered to have special qualities which make them significant within the context of a province or a region; and
- **Grade III:** Other heritage resources worthy of conservation, and which prescribes heritage resources assessment criteria, consistent with the criteria set out in section 3(3), which must be used by a heritage resources authority or a local authority to assess the intrinsic, comparative and contextual significance of a heritage resource and the relative benefits and costs of its protection, so that the appropriate level of grading of the resource and the consequent responsibility for its management may be allocated in terms of section 8.

APPENDIX 3: SURVEY RESULTS

See Appendix 1 for an explanation of the conventions used in assessing the cultural remains.

Map datum used: Hartebeeshoek 94 (WGS84).




Fig. 2. Location of the study area (outlined in green) and the identified sites (red crosses). (Map, courtesy of the Government Printer)

1. Location: Waterkloof 305JQ: S 25.73344; E 27.28254

Description: Old cemetery with unknown number of graves (due to dense vegetation it is difficult to count them). Graves of Eloff, Malan, Kruger, etc.families, some going back to 1910s. Good folk art. A number of unmarked graves occur as well.

Discussion: These are the graves of some of the earliest white settlers in the area and it should be retained. It should be properly fenced, with suitable access and the vegetation should be controlled annually.

Evaluation of significance: High on a regional level – Grade II

Significance of impact: High

Certainty of prediction: Probable

Recommended management action: 4 = preserve site at all costs

Legal requirements: SAHRA permit, Police, provincial permits.



Fig. 3. The old cemetery

2. Location: Waterkloof 305JQ: S 25.72550; E 27.28724

Description: Old farmhouse dating to the 1930s. It is well maintained and has a beautiful garden. The current owner is part of the community of German descent in the larger area.

Discussion: It probably a good/representative example of such features in the landscape and can contribute some information on the lifestyle of this community.

Evaluation of significance: Medium on a local level – Grade III

Significance of impact: High

Certainty of prediction: Probable

Recommended management action: 2 = controlled sampling and/or mapping of the site necessary

Legal requirements: SAHRA permit



Fig. 4. The old farmhouse.

3. Location: Waterkloof 305JQ: S 25.72482; E 28432

Description: An old barn and other outbuildings. It is built from bricks and cement bricks. The roof and other fitting have been removed.

Discussion: These buildings are of recent origin and do not show any interesting or unique features. The therefore need no further attention.

Evaluation of significance: Low on a local level

Significance of impact: High

Certainty of prediction: Probable

Recommended management action: 1 = no further investigation/action necessary

Legal requirements: None



Fig. 5. Some of the old outbuildings. Note the tall vegetation.