

## 8 SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berg, J.S. (red.) 1999. *Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies*. Van Schaiks: Pretoria.

Bosman, A.D. 1986. Bakerville skreeu om behoud. *Restorica* Issue 20 Oct.

Breutz, P.L. 1955. *The tribes of Mafeking district*. Ethnological Publications Series. No 32. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Breutz, P.L. 1957. *Die stamme van die distrikte Lichtenburg en Delareyville*. Ethnologiese Publikasie Reeks. No 37. Pretoria: Staatsdrukker.

Erasmus, B.P.J. 1995. *Oppad in Suid Afrika*. Jonathan Ball: Johannesburg.

Lichtenburg Alluvial Diggings: The Cattle dip that became a national monument. Lichtenburg Museum.

Mason, R. 1962. *Prehistory of the Transvaal*. Wits University Press: Johannesburg.

Pistorius, J.C.C. 2007. A Phase I Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) study for the proposed new Sephaku Project near Itsotseng in the North-West Province of South Africa. *Unpublished report prepared for Sephaku Holdings*.

*Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa*. Volumes 7, 8 & 9 (1970). Nasionale Opvoedkundige Uitgewery: Cape Town.

Swart, M.J. (ed.). 1989. *Afrikanerbakens*. Nasionale Boekdrukkery: Kaapstad. (pp 294).

Van den Bergh, G. 1996. *24 Battles and Battlefields of the North West Province*. Potchefstroom.

Van Tonder, J.J. 1977. *Fotobeeld van 300 monumente, standbeelde en gedenktekens langs die pad van Suid-Afrika*. n.p. (pp171).

## **9 SPOKESPERSONS CONSULTED**

Johan Ramasilo. Resident in the Meetmekaar community.

Joseph Mokoma. Resident in the Meetmekaar community.



**REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Dr. Julius Pistorius

April 2011, Received October 2011

**A Phase I Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Study For The Proposed Mafikeng Cement Project Near Itsotseng In The North-West Province Of South Africa**

The proposed development entails an open cast mine for the extraction of limestone and associated infrastructure. The proposed development area covers part of the farm Welverdiend 4510 west of Itsotseng and south-west of Matshepe.

The assessment revealed no heritage resources present. The author notes four graveyards to the east of the project area that will be unaffected by the proposed development. The author also notes that the developer should bear in mind that limestone deposits may contain fossilised remains. The author recommends that the proposed development should proceed.

The SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite Unit supports the recommendations of the authors, and has no objection to the proposed prospecting activities (in terms of the archaeological component of the heritage resources) on condition that;

- The developer ensures a Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) is undertaken to assess whether or not the prospecting activities will impact upon palaeontological resources. SAHRA will review the PIA report and advise accordingly. If the area is deemed sensitive, a Phase 2 impact assessment process or rescue operation might be necessary. If the PIA is deemed unnecessary a letter, by a professional palaeontologist, of recommendation for exemption from the full PIA process is needed.
- If any new evidence of archaeological sites or artifacts, palaeontological fossils, graves or other heritage resources are found during the development, SAHRA or an archaeologist must be alerted immediately.

Please note that decisions on Built Environment (e.g. structures over 60 years) and Cultural Landscapes and associated Living Heritage (e.g. sacred sites) must be made by the the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority of the North West (*Mothabane Mosiane mosianem@nwpg.gov.za*) to whom this Archaeological Review Comment will be copied.

SIGNATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGIST PROCESSING REPORT: EMAIL: *asalomon@sahra.org.za*SIGNATURE OF SAHRA HEAD ARCHAEOLOGIST: EMAIL: *cscheermeyer@sahra.org.za*

NAME OF HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY: SAHRA

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE COMMENT (ABOVE OR APPENDED) CONSTITUTES THE COMMENT OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGIST AND THAT ANY DEVELOPMENT THAT INVOLVES DESTRUCTION OF ANY ARCHAEOLOGICAL/PALAEONTOLOGICAL SITE IS STILL SUBJECT TO A PERMIT/PERMISSION FOR DESTRUCTION OF SUCH SITE GIVEN TO THE DEVELOPER BY THE RELEVANT HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEONTOLOGICAL PERMIT COMMITTEE (THIS WILL BE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE PHASE 2 OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL/ PALAEONTOLOGICAL MITIGATION AS NECESSARY). THIS REPORT MAY BE TAKEN ONLY AS APPROVAL IN TERMS OF SECTION 35 OF THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT. THE PROVINCIAL MANAGER OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY MUST ADVISE AS TO APPROVAL IN TERMS OF HERITAGE ISSUES ENCOMPASSED BY OTHER ASPECTS OF THE LEGISLATION, SUCH AS ISSUES OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (STRUCTURES (E.G. FARM HOUSES), OVER 60 YEARS), INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS OR OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES AS THIS IS NOT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGIST.

PLEASE NOTE THAT SAHRA IS NOW RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE I HERITAGE RESOURCES (AND EXPORT) AND THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE II AND GRADE III HERITAGE RESOURCES, EXCEPT WHERE THERE IS AN AGENCY ARRANGEMENT WITH THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY.