



Archaetnos Culture & Cultural
Resource Consultants
BK 98 09854/23

**A REPORT ON AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HERITAGE IMPACT
ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED SKY CHROME MINING IN THE
MOOINOOI/BRITS DISTRICT, NORTH WEST PROVINCE**

For:

M2 ENVIRONMENTAL CONNECTIONS CC

REPORT: AE801

by:

A.C. van Vollenhoven & A.J. Pelser

January 2008

Archaetnos
P.O.Box 31064
WONDERBOOMPOORT
0033
Tel: **083 291 6104**/083 459 3091/082 375 3321
Fax:086 520 4173
Email: antonv@archaetnos.co.za

Members: AC van Vollenhoven BA, BA (Hons), DTO, NDM, MA (Archaeology) [UP], MA (Culture History) [US], DPhil (Archaeology) [UP]
AJ Pelser BA (UNISA), BA (Hons) (Archaeology), MA (Archaeology) [WITS]
FE Teichert BA, BA (Hons) (Archaeology) [UP]

SUMMARY

Archaetnos cc was requested by M2 Environmental Connections cc to conduct an archaeological and heritage impact assessment on the sites for the proposed Sky chrome mining in the Mooinooi/Brits district, North West Province. This is for the placement of two shafts relating to the mining activities.

The fieldwork undertaken revealed a number of sites, but none of these seem to have enough cultural significance to be preserved. These will be directly impacted upon by the development.

This report is however seen as ample mitigation measures in this regard. Therefore the proposed development can continue.

CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	2
CONTENTS.....	3
1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE	4
3. CONDITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS	4
4. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	5
5. METHODOLOGY	6
6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA.....	6
7. DISCUSSION.....	7
8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	8
9. REFERENCES	9
APPENDIX A.....	10
APPENDIX B	11
APPENDIX C – LIST OF FIGURES	12

1. INTRODUCTION

Archaetnos cc was requested by M2 Environmental Connections cc to conduct an archaeological and heritage impact assessment for the proposed Sky Chrome development in the Mooiooi.Brits district in the North West Province. This is for two new shafts relating to the mining activities.

The client indicated the area where the proposed development is to take place, and the survey was conducted in this area. However one always needs to look a bit wider in order to ascertain that secondary impact of any development is minimized. Cultural features identified in these areas are included in this report.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference for the survey were to:

1. Identify all objects, sites, occurrences and structures of an archaeological or historical nature (cultural heritage sites) located on the property (see Appendix A).
2. Assess the significance of the cultural resources in terms of their archaeological, historical, scientific, social, religious, aesthetic and tourism value (see Appendix B).
3. Describe the possible impact of the proposed development on these cultural remains, according to a standard set of conventions.
4. Propose suitable mitigation measures to minimize possible negative impacts on the cultural resources.
5. Recommend suitable mitigation measure should there be any sites of significance that might be impacted upon by the proposed development.
6. Review applicable legislative requirements.

3. CONDITIONS & ASSUMPTIONS

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

1. Cultural Resources are all non-physical and physical man-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences associated with human activity. These include all sites, structure and artifacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development. Graves and cemeteries are included in this.
2. The significance of the sites, structures 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. The various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these aspects.

3. Cultural significance is site-specific and relates to the content and context of the site. Sites regarded as having low cultural significance have already been recorded in full and require no further mitigation. Sites with medium cultural significance may or may not require mitigation depending on other factors such as the significance of impact on the site. Sites with a high cultural significance require further mitigation (see appendix B).
4. The latitude and longitude of any archaeological or historical site or feature, is to be treated as sensitive information by the developer and should not be disclosed to members of the public.
5. All recommendations are made with full cognizance of the relevant legislation.
6. It has to be mentioned that it is almost impossible to locate all the cultural resources in a given area, as it will be very time consuming. In this case the grass cover was very dense making visibility extremely difficult. The developers should however note that the report should make it clear how to handle any other finds that might occur once the work on site commences.

4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Aspects concerning the conservation of cultural resources are dealt with mainly in two acts. These are the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998).

4.1 The National Heritage Resources Act

According to the above-mentioned law the following is protected as cultural heritage resources:

- a. Archaeological artifacts, 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.

Archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites

Section 35(4) of this act states that 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 that assists in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.
- e. alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years as protected.

The above mentioned may only be disturbed or moved by an archaeologist, after receiving a permit from the South African Heritage Resources Agency.

4.2 The National Environmental Management Act

This act 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.

5. METHODOLOGY

5.1 Field survey

The survey was conducted according to generally accepted AIA and HIA practices and was aimed at locating all possible objects, sites and features of cultural significance in the area of proposed development. If required, the location/position of any site was determined by means of a Global Positioning System (GPS), while photographs were also taken where needed.

The survey was undertaken on foot.

5.2 Documentation

All sites, objects features and structures identified were documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. Co-ordinates of individual localities were determined by means of the Global Positioning System (GPS). The information was added to the description in order to facilitate the identification of each locality.

6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

The proposed development area is located on the farms Boschfontein 458JQ and Modderspruit 461JQ. On each of these farms a new mining shaft is planned.

Mining activities is already present around these sites. Some formal and informal settlements are found close to both of the sites indicated.

It is also clear that the areas have been disturbed in the past. The vegetation mainly consists of pioneer species. This probably is the result of farming activities of the past. It is therefore possible that any historical and archaeological features were probably demolished during these farming activities.

The topography of the area is relatively flat. A stream cuts through both areas. This result in both including a marshy area which would have been unsuitable for human habitation. On the other hand the presence of water would have made the area suitable for keeping cattle. Mountains around the investigated area would have provided suitable shelter for people. It is therefore expected that the chance of finding anything of archaeological and heritage importance is very slim.

7. DISCUSSION

The fieldwork undertaken revealed five (5) features of cultural origin. Only one of these was found on the area of the proposed development, with the other being found on the area to the south thereof. These will all be impacted upon by the development, although the latter will only be a secondary impact. Mitigation measures will be indicated below.

Feature 1

No GPS measurement was taken at the first feature since it has no heritage significance. It is situated to the south of the proposed development and is on the eastern side, next to the mentioned provincial road.

The feature consists of a house and some other buildings as well as a playground. It seems to be used as a crèche presently.

The building style is fairly recent. Therefore the buildings have no heritage significance. This report is seen ample mitigation, but the developer should be sensitive about the secondary impact of the development on the activities of the crèche.

Feature 2

Again no GPS measurement was taken as this feature also has no heritage significance. The feature is situated to the west of feature no 1.

It seems to be an old farm shed and was built from so-called hollow-blocks. These were in use since the 1940's, but the foundation of the building is made from bricks which clearly are from the 1960's. Therefore it does not fall within the 60 years clause prescribed by legislation.

To the south of this structure there are also some other features. These include a prefab building, a painted building and an old petrol pump, but these clearly are younger than 60 years (**Figure 3**). These features thus also do not have any heritage significance.

Although there will be a secondary impact on all of these features, the developer should not have any concern as this report is seen as ample mitigation. The state of disrepair also is such that these features may be allowed to be demolished if needed.

Feature 3

The third feature is a building which currently hosts the Thusanang Development centre of the Olievenhoutbosch Development Association (**Figure 4**). The GPS measurement of the building is 25°55'35"S and 28°05'43"E.

The architectural style of the building is fairly recent. It seems to have originally been a farm shed or store room, which has been converted for the centre.

Although the building has no apparent cultural significant, it needs to be noted that that the proposed development may have an impact on the activities of the centre. The developer should be sensitive about this.

Feature 4

A large part of the area to the south of the proposed development contains the remains of old greenhouses used for vegetable gardening and plants in the past (**Figure 5**). These are situated to the north and west of the Thusanang Centre. A GPS measurement was taken at one of these. It is 25°55'32"S and 28°05'38"E.

The walls are made of bricks and were painted. In between the walls cement was used to make neat beds for the planting of vegetables and other plants.

Although this might have a medium heritage value it is not very unique and in a very bad state. Therefore this report is seen as ample mitigation regarding these features.

Feature 5

This is the only feature that was located on the site of the proposed development. It was located on the southern boundary of the area. The GPS measurement thereof is 25°55'30"S and 28°05'50"E.

It consists of a large building and some outbuildings, which might have been a farm yard previously. The large building now hosts the Hope Community Church (**Figure 6**). The bricks used in the construction of the building are fairly recent. It therefore has no heritage significance.

The proposed development will definitely impact upon the buildings. However due to it being fairly recent, this report is seen as ample mitigation measure.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion it is clear that nothing of cultural historical or archaeological importance was found within the area of proposed development. This is also true of the area surveyed to the south of the development.

The development may therefore continue and the features may be demolished if necessary. Due to the age of these features being fairly recent, no destruction permits will be needed from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).

This report is seen as ample mitigation measures in this regard. The developer should however note that should any archaeological feature be unearthed during construction activities, an archaeologist should immediately be contacted to investigate the find.

9. REFERENCES

- Knudson, S.J. 1978. **Culture in retrospect**. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Plan-enviro cc. Locality plan: Portion 62 (portion of portion 6) of the farm Olievenhoutbosch 389-JR.
- Plan-enviro cc. 2007. **Memorandum in support of an application for the establishment of a township on portion 62 of the farm Olievenhoutbosch 38-JR (Olievenhoutbosch extension 39)**.

Appendix A

Definition of terms:

Site: A large place with extensive structures and related cultural objects. It can also be a large assemblage of cultural artifacts, found on a single location.

Structure: A permanent building found in isolation or which forms a site in conjunction with other structures.

Feature: A coincidental find of movable cultural objects.

Object: Artifact (cultural object).

(Also see Knudson 1978: 20).

Appendix B

Cultural significance:

- Low A cultural object being found out of context, not being part of a site or without any related feature/structure in its surroundings.

- Medium Any site, structure or feature being regarded less important due to a number of factors, such as date and frequency. Also any important object found out of context.

- High Any site, structure or feature regarded as important because of its age or uniqueness. Graves are always categorised as of a high importance. Also any important object found within a specific context.

Appendix C

List of Figures:

- 1. Map of the area indicating the site of the proposed development.**
- 2. General view of the surveyed area.**
- 3. Farm building made of hollow-blocks and other associated features on the site.**
- 4. Entrance to the Thusanang Centre.**
- 5. Remains of greenhouses.**
- 6. Building used by the Hope Community Church.**