

# Archaeological Impact Assessment

---

## STEELPOORT EXTENSION 20 ON PORTIONS OF THE FARM STERK FONTEIN 318 KT, STEELPOORT, LIMPOPO PROVINCE

---

Prepared For

**Lokisa Environmental Consultants**

By



**Wits Commercial Enterprise (Pty) Limited**  
(Registration No: 2002/008461/07)  
5<sup>th</sup> floor, Senate House, Jorissen Street, 2001 Braamfontein  
Private Bag 3, 2050 Wits  
South Africa

Service provider



UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND  
SCHOOL OF GEOGRAPHY, ARCHAEOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES  
PRIVATE BAG 3, P O WITS 2050  
TEL: +27 82 373 8491. E-MAIL JACO.HERITAGE@GMAIL.COM

**VERSION 1.0  
3 JUNE 2009**

# STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

## KNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT

**CLIENT:** Lokisa Environmental Consultants

**CONTACT PERSON:** Delia de Lange  
Tel: (012) 346 7655, Fax: (012) 346 6074  
lokisa@lokisa.co.za

**SIGNATURE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**LEADING CONSULTANT:** Wits Heritage Contracts Unit



**CONTACT PERSON:** Jaco van der Walt  
Field Director for Wits Heritage Contracts Unit  
Professional Member of the Association of Southern  
African Professional Archaeologist (#159)



**SIGNATURE:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Executive summary

**Site name and location:** Proposed Steelpoort Ext 20 on Remainder of portion 3 and portion 6 (a portion of portion 3) of the farm Sterkfontein 318 KT, Steelpoort, Limpopo Province.

**EIA Consultant:** Lokisa Environmental Consultants

**Heritage Consultant:** Wits Heritage Contracts Unit. University of the Witwatersrand, School of Geography, Archaeology and Environmental Studies, Private Bag 3, P.O Wits 2050, Tel: +27 82 373 8491. E –mail jaco.heritage@gmail.com.

**Date of Report:** 3 June 2009

**1:50 000 map:** 2430 CD

**Findings of the Assessment:** Four heritage sites of significance were identified during the survey. Of these sites only one site (Site 4) will require mitigation if impacted upon. Refer to section 8 of this report for a assessment of the finds.

If the recommendations made in section 8 are adhered by there is from a Heritage point of view no reason why the development can not commence.

If during construction any possible finds are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist be contacted for an assessment of the find.

**Disclaimer:** *Although all possible care is taken to identify all sites of cultural importance during the investigation of study areas, it is always possible that hidden or sub-surface sites like graves could be overlooked during the study. Wits Heritage Contracts Unit and its personnel will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result of such oversights.*

**Copyright:** Copyright in all documents, drawings and records whether manually or electronically produced, which form part of the submission and any subsequent report or project document shall vest in Wits Heritage Contracts Unit. None of the documents, drawings or records may be used or applied in any manner, nor may they be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means whatsoever for or to any other person, without the prior written consent of Wits Heritage Contracts Unit. The Client, on acceptance of any submission by Wits Heritage Contracts Unit and on condition that the Client pays to Wits

## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

Heritage Contracts Unit the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit and for the specified project only:

- The results of the project;
- The technology described in any report
- Recommendations delivered to the Client.

## CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Executive summary .....                                       | 3  |
| • 1. INTRODUCTION .....                                       | 7  |
| 1.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE .....                                  | 8  |
| 1.3 Nature of the development .....                           | 9  |
| 1.4 Description of study area .....                           | 9  |
| 2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY .....                             | 9  |
| 2.1 PHYSICAL SURVEYING .....                                  | 9  |
| 3. Abbreviations and definitions.....                         | 11 |
| 3.1 Abbreviations .....                                       | 11 |
| 3.2 Definitions .....   | 12 |
| 4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL LEGISLATION AND BEST PRACTICE .....         | 13 |
| • .....   | 15 |
| • 5. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA .....                                | 16 |
| 5.1 Evaluation of Heritage sites .....                        | 16 |
| 5.1.1 Heritage Site Significance and Mitigation Measures..... | 16 |
| • 5. Archaeological Context of study area .....               | 18 |
| 5.2 Probability of occurrence of sites .....                  | 19 |
| • 6. SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE.....                               | 21 |
| 6.1 Site.1 .....  | 23 |
| 6.2 Site.2 .....  | 24 |
| 6.3 Site.3 .....  | 25 |
| 6.4 Site.4 .....  | 26 |
| 7. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS.....                           | 27 |
| 8. ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....                       | 27 |
| • 9. LIST OF PREPARES.....                                    | 29 |
| • 10. REFERENCES.....   | 29 |
| 10.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL PAPERS.....                               | 29 |
| 10.2 CULTURAL HERITAGE PAPERS.....                            | 29 |

## ANNEXURE

### Annexure A – Locality Map

#### FIGURES

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 1: Agricultural fields.....                          | 21 |
| Figure 2: Cement brick factory .....                        | 22 |
| Figure 3: Stone cairns associated with field clearing ..... | 22 |
| Figure 4: Decorated pottery at Site 1.....                  | 23 |

## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 5: Geotechnical Pit .....             | 24 |
| Figure 6: Decorated ceramics at Site 3 ..... | 25 |
| Figure 7: Dry stone wall enclosures .....    | 26 |

## **.1. INTRODUCTION**

Wits Heritage Contracts Unit was contracted by Lokisa Environmental Consultants to conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment for the proposed Steelpoort Ext 20 development on the remainder of portion 3 and portion 6 (a portion of portion 3) of the farm Sterkfontein 318 KT, Steelpoort, Limpopo Province. The report forms part of the EIA for the proposed project. The aim of the study is to identify heritage sites, document, and assess their importance within Local, Provincial and national context. To assess the impact of the proposed project on non renewable heritage resources and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the responsible cultural resources management measures that might be required to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, in order to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999).

The report outlines the approach and methodology utilized before and during the survey, which includes in Phase 1: Information collection from various sources and consultations; Phase 2: Physical surveying of the area on foot and by vehicle; and Phase 3: Reporting the outcome of the study.

During the survey, 4 cultural heritage sites of significance were identified. General site conditions and features on sites were recorded by means of photos, GPS location, and description. Possible impacts were identified and mitigation measures are proposed in the following report.

This report must also be submitted to SAHRA provincial office for peer review.

## 1.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE

### **Conduct brief desktop study to:**

Review available literature, previous heritage studies and other relevant information sources. Gather data and compile a background history of the area. Identify all known and recorded archaeological and cultural sites; and determine whether the area is renowned for any cultural and heritage resources, such as Stone Age sites, Iron Age sites, informal graveyards or historical homesteads.

### **Conduct a field study to:**

Consult with locals (where possible) to gather information on oral history, local history, possible informal graves, cemeteries, and other areas of cultural significance. Systematically survey the proposed project area to locate, identify record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interest; and record GPS points of significant areas identified. Determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources recorded in the project area;

### **Reporting**

Identify the anticipated impacts, as well as cumulative impacts, of the operational units of the proposed project activity on the identified heritage resources for all 3 phases of the project, i.e. construction, operation and decommissioning phases. Consider alternatives should any significant sites be impacted adversely by the proposed project. Ensure that all requirements of the local Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) are met; and ensure that all studies and results are sufficient to comply with ALL the relevant requirements of the Equator Principles, World Bank Standards and IFC Principles and Performance Standards and National legislation. To assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, in order to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999).



### 1.3 Nature of the development

The application is for the establishment of a residential development including B

- Business/commercial/offices/educational and motor vehicle use.
- Tourism Related Uses (Resort/Hotel/Lodge/Restaurant) (16.33 Ha)
- Public Open Space
- Municipal Services.

### 1.4 Description of study area

The proposed area is characterised by extensive agricultural fields that have destroyed archaeological sites along the river front. Refer to main EIA report for geographical, environmental and demographic issues.

## 2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The aim of the study is to extensively cover all data available to compile a background history of the study area; this was accomplished by means of the following phases.

### 2.1 PHYSICAL SURVEYING

Due to the nature of cultural remains, the majority that occurs below surface, a physical walk through of the study area was conducted. Wits Heritage Contract Unit was appointed to conduct a survey of the proposed development. The study area of approximately 200ha was surveyed over a period of one day by a qualified archaeologists, by means of vehicle and extensive surveys on foot.

Aerial photographs and 1:50 000 maps of the area were consulted and literature of the area were studied before undertaking the survey. The purpose of this was to identify topographical areas of possible historic and pre-historic activity. All sites discovered both

## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

inside and bordering the proposed development area was plotted on 1:50 000 maps and their GPS co-ordinates noted. 35mm photographs on digital film were taken at all the sites.

## 3. Abbreviations and definitions

### 3.1 Abbreviations

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <i>ASAPA</i> : Association of South African Professional Archaeologists | <i>BPEO</i> : Best Practicable Environmental Option                              |
| <i>CRM</i> : Cultural Resource Management                               | <i>DEA&amp;DP</i> : Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning |
| <i>DEAT</i> : Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism           | <i>DWAF</i> : Department of Water Affairs and Forestry                           |
| <i>EIA practitioner</i> : Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner  | <i>EIA</i> : Environmental Impact Assessment                                     |
| <i>EIA</i> : Early Iron Age   | <i>ESA</i> : Early Stone Age   |
| <i>GPS</i> : Global Positioning System                                  | <i>HIA</i> : Heritage Impact Assessment  |
| <i>I&amp;AP</i> : Interested & Affected Party                           | <i>IDP</i> : Integrated Development Plan   |
| <i>LSA</i> : Late Stone Age   | <i>LIA</i> : Late Iron Age   |
| <i>MSA</i> : Middle Stone Age   | <i>MIA</i> : Middle Iron Age   |
| <i>NEMA</i> : National Environmental Management Act                     | <i>NHR Act</i> : National Heritage Resources Act                                 |
| <i>PHRA</i> : Provincial Heritage Resources Agency                      | <i>PSSA</i> : Palaeontological Society of South Africa                           |
| <i>ROD</i> : Record of Decision   | <i>SACLAP</i> : South African Council for the Landscape Architect Profession     |
| <i>SAHRA</i> : South African Heritage Resources Agency                  | <i>SAIA</i> : South African Institute of Architects                              |
| <i>SAPI</i> : South African Planning Institute                          | <i>SDF</i> : Spatial Development Framework                                       |

## 3.2 Definitions

### **Archaeological resources:**

This includes material remains resulting from human activity which are in a state of disuse and are in or on land and which are older than 100 years including artefacts, human and hominid remains and artificial features and structures;

### **Rock art:**

Being any form of painting, engraving or other graphic representation on a fixed rock surface or loose rock or stone, which was executed by human agency and which is older than 100 years, including any area within 10m of such representation;

### **Wrecks:**

Being any vessel or aircraft, or any part thereof which was wrecked in South Africa, whether on land, in the internal waters, the territorial waters or in the maritime culture zone of the republic as defined in the Maritimes Zones Act, and any cargo, debris or artefacts found or associated therewith, which is older than 60 years or which SAHRA considers to be worthy of conservation;

### **Military:**

Features, structures and artefacts associated with military history which are older than 75 years and the site on which they are found.

### **Cultural significance:**

This means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance

### **Development:**

This means any physical intervention, excavation, or action, other than those caused by natural forces, which may in the opinion of the heritage authority in any way result in the change to the nature, appearance or physical nature of a place or influence its stability and future well-being, including:

- construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change in use of a place or a structure at a place;

## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

- carrying out any works on or over or under a place;
- subdivision or consolidation of land comprising a place, including the structures or airspace of a place;
- constructing or putting up for display signs or hoardings;
- any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land;
- any removal or destruction of trees, or removal or vegetation or topsoil

### **Heritage resources:**

This means any place or object of cultural significance

### **Stakeholders:**

A subgroup of the public whose interests may be positively or negatively affected by a proposal or activity and/or who are concerned with a proposal or activity and its consequences. The term includes the proponent, authorities and all interested and affected parties.

## **4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL LEGISLATION AND BEST PRACTICE**

Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessments or Heritage Impact Assessments are a pre-requisite for development in South Africa as prescribed by SAHRA and stipulated by legislation. The overall purpose of a heritage specialist input is to:

- Identify any heritage resources, which may be affected;
- Assess the nature and degree of significance of such resources;
- Establish heritage informants/constraints to guide the development process through establishing thresholds of impact significance;
- Assess the negative and positive impact of the development on these resources;
- Make recommendations for the appropriate heritage management of these impacts.

## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

The AIA or HIA, as a specialist sub-section of the Environmental Impact Assessment [EIA] is required under the National Heritage Resources Act NHRA of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999), Section 38(1), Section 38(8) the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA).

The AIA should be submitted, as part of the EIA, BIA or Environmental Management Plan [EMP], to the PHRA if established in the province or to SAHRA. SAHRA will be ultimately responsible for the professional evaluation of Phase 1 AIA reports upon which review comments will be issued. 'Best practice' requires Phase 1 AIA reports and required additional development information, as per the EIA, BIA / EMP, to be submitted in duplicate to SAHRA after completion of the study. SAHRA accepts Phase 1 AIA reports authored by professional archaeologists, accredited with ASAPA. Minimum accreditation requirements include an Honours degree in archaeology or related discipline and 3 years post-university CRM experience (field supervisor level).

Minimum standards for reports, site documentation and descriptions are set by the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists [ASAPA] in collaboration with SAHRA. ASAPA is a legal body, based in South Africa, representing professional archaeology in the Southern African Development Community [SADC] region. ASAPA is primarily involved in the overseeing of archaeological ethical practice and standards. Membership is based on proposal and secondment by other professional members.

Phase 1 AIA's are primarily concerned with the location and identification of sites situated within a proposed development area. Identified sites should be assessed according to their significance. Relevant conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations should be made. Recommendations are subject to evaluation by SAHRA.

Conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations, as approved by SAHRA, are to be used as guidance in the developer's decision making process:

Phase 2 archaeological projects are primarily based on salvage / mitigation excavations preceding development destruction or impact on a site. Phase 2 excavations should be done under a permit issued by SAHRA to the appointed archaeologist. Permit conditions are prescribed by SAHRA and includes as minimum requirements reporting back strategies to SAHRA and deposition of excavated material at a accredited repository.

In the event of a site conservation option being preferred by the developer a site management plan, prepared by a professional archaeologist and approved by SAHRA, will suffice as minimum requirement.

## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

After mitigation is conducted on a site, a destruction permit must be applied for from SAHRA before development may proceed.

Human remains older than 60 years are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act, with reference to Section 36. Graves older than 60 years, but younger than 100 years fall under Section 36 of Act 25 of 1999 (National Heritage Resources Act) as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and are the jurisdiction of the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA). The procedure for Consultation Regarding Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36(5) of Act 25 of 1999) is applicable to graves older than 60 years that are situated outside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority. Graves in the category located inside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority will also require the same authorisation as set out for graves younger than 60 years over and above SAHRA authorisation. If the grave is not situated inside a formal cemetery but is to be relocated to one, permission from the local authority is required and all regulations, laws and by-laws set by the cemetery authority must be adhered to.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are protected under Section 2(1) of the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance (Ordinance no. 7 of 1925) as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and are the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the relevant Provincial Department of Health and must be submitted for final approval to the Office of the relevant Provincial Premier. This function is usually delegated to the Provincial MEC for Local Government and Planning, or in some cases the MEC for Housing and Welfare. Authorisation for exhumation and reinterment must also be obtained from the relevant local or regional council where the grave is situated, as well as the relevant local or regional council to where the grave is being relocated. All local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws must also be adhered to. In order to handle and transport human remains the institution conducting the relocation should be authorised under Section 24 of Act 65 of 1983 (Human Tissues Act).

-

## **.5. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

### **5.1 Evaluation of Heritage sites**

This chapter describes the evaluation criteria used for determining the significance of archaeological and heritage sites. The following criteria were used to establish site significance:

- The unique nature of a site
- The integrity of the archaeological deposit
- The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site
- The location of the site in relation to other similar sites or features
- The depth of the archaeological deposit (when it can be determined or is known)
- The preservation condition of the site
- Uniqueness of the site and
- potential to answer present research questions.

#### **5.1.1 Heritage Site Significance and Mitigation Measures**

Site significance classification standards prescribed by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (2006) and approved by the Association for Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) for the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region, were used for the purpose of this report.



## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

| <b>FIELD RATING</b>          | <b>GRADE</b> | <b>SIGNIFICANCE</b>        | <b>RECOMMENDED MITIGATION</b>                |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--|
| National Significance (NS)   | Grade 1      | -                          | Conservation; National Site nomination       |
| Provincial Significance (PS) | Grade 2      | -                          | Conservation; Provincial Site nomination     |
| Local Significance (LS)      | Grade 3A     | High Significance          | Conservation; Mitigation not advised         |
| Local Significance (LS)      | Grade 3B     | High Significance          | Mitigation (Part of site should be retained) |
| Generally Protected A (GP.A) | -            | High / Medium Significance | Mitigation before destruction                |
| Generally Protected B (GP.B) | -            | Medium Significance        | Recording before destruction                 |
| Generally Protected C (GP.C) | -            | Low Significance           | Destruction                                  |

## **.5. Archaeological Context of study area**

The historical background and timeframe of the study area can be divided into the Stone Age, Iron Age and Historical timeframe. These can be divided as follows:

### **Stone Age**

The Stone Age is divided in Early; Middle and Late Stone Age and refers to the earliest people of South Africa who mainly relied on stone for their tools.

*Early Stone Age:* The period from  $\pm 2.5$  million yrs -  $\pm 250\ 000$  yrs ago. Acheulean stone tools are dominant.

*Middle Stone Age:* Various lithic industries in SA dating from  $\pm 250\ 000$  yrs – 25 000 yrs before present. This period is first associated with archaic *Homo sapiens* and later *Homo sapiens sapiens*. Material culture includes stone tools with prepared platforms and stone tools attached to handles.

*Late Stone Age:* The period from  $\pm 25\ 000$ -yrs before present to the period of contact with either Iron Age farmers or European colonists. This period is associated with *Homo sapiens sapiens*. Material culture from this period includes: microlithic stone tools; ostrich eggshell beads and rock art.

### **Iron Age**

The Iron Age as a whole represents the spread of Bantu speaking people and includes both the Pre-Historic and Historic periods. Similar to the Stone Age it can be divided into three periods:

*The Early Iron Age:* Most of the first millennium AD.

*The Middle Iron Age:* 10th to 13th centuries AD

*The Late Iron Age:* 14th century to colonial period.

### **Historic Timeframe**

17th Century to present AD (1600 – 2000)

The historic timeframe intermingles with the later parts of the Stone and Iron Age, and can loosely be regarded as times when written and oral recounts of incidents became available.

## ***Previous CRM work in the area***

The Wits archaeological database shows 5 previously recorded sites on the 2430 CA, 1: 50 000 sheet although none of these sites are located within the study area. Known sites in the general area indicate occupation during the Stone Age, Early and Middle Iron Age.

## **5.2 Probability of occurrence of sites**

From the above information it is clear that a medium possibility of the occurrence of cultural heritage sites could be expected in the study area.

### **A. PALAEOLOGICAL LANDSCAPE**

#### **CONTEXT**

Fossil remains. Such resources are typically found in specific geographical areas, e.g. the Karoo and are embedded in ancient rock and limestone/calcrete formations. Exposed by road cuttings and quarry excavation: *Unknown*

### **B. ARCHAEOLOGICAL LANDSCAPE**

#### **CONTEXT**

*NOTE: Archaeology is the study of human material and remains (by definition) and is not restricted in any formal way as being below the ground surface.*

*Archaeological remains dating to the following periods can be expected with in the study area:*

#### **Stone Age finds**

- *ESA: Medium Probability*
- *MSA: Medium – High Probability*
- *LSA: Medium- High Probability*
- *LSA –Herder: Low Probability*

## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

### Iron Age Finds

- EIA: *Medium- High Probability*
- MIA: *Medium- High Probability*
- LIA: *Medium- High Probability*

### Historical finds

- Historical period: *Medium High Probability*
- Historical dumps: *Medium High Probability*
- Structural remains: *Medium High Probability*

### Military Finds

- *Battle and military sites: Low Probability*

### Burial/Cemeteries

- *Burials over 100 years: Medium Probability*
- *Burials younger than 60 years: Medium Probability*

Subsurface excavations including ground levelling, landscaping, and foundation preparation can expose any number of these.

### **.6. SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The study area is located at  $24^{\circ}41'47.68'' S$  and  $30^{\circ}14'4.28'' E$  and is situated on the eastern banks of the Steelpoort River. The provincial road between the town of Steelpoort and Burgersfort cuts through the property leaving a small piece of land that is in the process of being developed (refer to locality map). These areas were not covered during the field study since these properties do not belong to the client. Mr. Johan Coetzee who is the owner is not aware of any graves on the property.

Large parts of the study area are already disturbed to the extent that any archaeological sites in those areas would be demolished. These disturbed areas consist of extensive agricultural fields, irrigation dams, demolished mine housing and a cement brick factory (S24 41 43.2 E30 14 50.4). Several stone cairns of various sizes were located during the survey (S24 42 10.9 E30 14 29.2), these cairns are associated with clearing of the fields, and this assumption was confirmed by the owner.



Figure 1: Agricultural fields



## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---



Figure 2: Cement brick factory



Figure 3: Stone cairns associated with field clearing

## 6.1 Site.1

S24 41 54.1 E30 14 33.8

Agricultural activities exposed a low concentration of decorated and undecorated ceramics in a disused field. Diagnostic ceramics indicate a middle to late Iron Age occupation. Because of the continuous ploughing the ceramics is fragmented and scattered over a vast area. No structures or features are visible. A low frequency scatter of Stone Age artefacts are scattered over a wide area. Raw material consists of horn fells, dolerite and igneous rock.

| <i>FIELD RATING</i>          | <i>GRADE</i> | <i>SIGNIFICANCE</i> | <i>RECOMMENDED MITIGATION</i> |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Generally Protected C (GP.C) | -            | Low Significance    | Destruction                   |



Figure 4: Decorated pottery at Site 1



## 6.2 Site.2

S24 42 23.1 E30 14 15.9

On the banks of the Steelpoort River some undecorated ceramics were exposed by ploughing activities. No features or structures were exposed and the continuous ploughing fragmented the ceramics and scattered it over a vast area. Geotechnical pits in this area was investigated but no archaeological deposit was detected.

| <i>FIELD RATING</i>          | <i>GRADE</i> | <i>SIGNIFICANCE</i> | <i>RECOMMENDED MITIGATION</i> |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Generally Protected C (GP.C) | -            | Low Significance    | Destruction                   |



Figure 5: Geotechnical Pit



### 6.3 Site.3

S24 42 35.6 E30 14 16.9

Some decorated and undecorated ceramics were found in an old ploughed field on a small rise overlooking the Steelpoort River to the West. No features or structures were exposed and the continuous ploughing fragmented the ceramics and scattered it over a vast area.

| <i>FIELD RATING</i>          | <i>GRADE</i> | <i>SIGNIFICANCE</i> | <i>RECOMMENDED MITIGATION</i> |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Generally Protected C (GP.C) | -            | Low Significance    | Destruction                   |



Figure 6: Decorated ceramics at Site 3

## 6.4 Site.4

S24 41 46.4 E30 15 06.9

This is the location of ill defined dry stone walling. The site is highly overgrown and archaeological visibility is low. The total extend of the site is unknown but features include a cattle kraal with deposit and small stone enclosures. Some stone cairns are also present under the power line that runs to the west of the site.

| <i>FIELD RATING</i>          | <i>GRADE</i> | <i>SIGNIFICANCE</i> | <i>RECOMMENDED MITIGATION</i> |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Generally Protected B (GP.B) | -            | Medium Significance | Mitigation before destruction |



Figure 7: Dry stone wall enclosures

### 7. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Due to the nature of cultural remains that occur, in most cases, below surface, the possibility remains that some cultural remains may not have been discovered during the survey. Low ground visibility is present on parts of the site due to high vegetation growth and the possibility of the occurrence of unmarked graves and archaeological sites can not be excluded. Although Wits Heritage Contracts unit surveyed the area as thorough as possible, it is incumbent upon the developer to inform the relevant heritage agency should further cultural remains be unearthed or laid open during the process of development.

### 8. ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*It must be stressed that a final layout map did not exist at the time of the survey and recommendations are made as if the sites are going to be impacted upon by the proposed development.*

*A distribution map is provided in **Annexure A***

Due to the fact that **Site 1 – 3** have been extensively ploughed and mostly destroyed they are given a low significance rating. This however does not mean that these sites can't contribute to archaeological recourse. The survey of Steelpoort Ext 20 established the local culture history sequence and site distribution for the study area.

The fine herringbone decoration at **Site 1** together with Icon pottery is of interest. At first glance the site might be attributed to the *Eiland* facies (AD 1000 – 1300) of which herringbone design are characteristic. But because the herringbone designs are so fine and found in association with *Icon* pottery (AD 1300 – 1500) the site are associated with the *Broadhurst* facies of the Kalundu tradition and most probably date to AD 1300 – 1430.

Most of the Stone Age artefacts found are un-diagnostic however one artefact show faceting that is characteristic of the Middle Stone Age. The Stone Age component are also of low significance since the tools are not found in their primary context and is classified as find spots and do not constitute a archaeological site and can contribute very little to present research.

**Recommendation:** *No further action is necessary for this site.*

## STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

---

**Site 2** is of no significance since the site did not yield any archaeological deposit or features and the lack of decorated pottery prohibits us to accurately link the site to a cultural group. The site can not contribute to further research.

**Recommendation:** *No further action is necessary for this site.*

**Site 3** lacks any visible features or archaeological deposit and is destroyed by intensive ploughing. The site is therefore given a low significance rating. According to the decoration the site belongs to the Doornkop facies of the Kalundu Tradition and probably dates to AD 750 – 1000.

**Recommendation:** *No further action is necessary for this site.*

**Site 4:** The stone walled site at site 4 is associated with the Pedi that inhabited the region. Here the presence of the kraal deposit is of significance. Since it was customary to bury men in the kraal there is a high possibility that burials can be found in this locality, therefore giving the site a medium significance rating.

**Recommendation:** *It is recommended that the site is documented in the form of scaled plan sketches after which a destruction permit must be applied for from SAHRA. When the site is being destructed it is also recommended that the site is monitored by an archaeologist to mitigate and document any accidental finds.*

If these recommendations are adhered by there is from a Heritage point of view no reason why the development can not commence.

## **.9. LIST OF PREPARES**

Jaco van der Walt, BA (Hon) Archaeology (Wits)

## **.10. REFERENCES**

### **10.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL PAPERS**

Huffman, T.N. 1980. *Ceramics, classification and Iron Age entities*. African studies 39 ( 2 ): 123-174. Johannesburg.

Huffman, T.N. 1982. *Archaeology and Ethnohistory of the African Iron Age*. Annual Review of Anthropology 11:133-150

Huffman, T.N. 1989. *Ceramics, settlements and Late Iron Age migrations*. The African Archaeological Review (7):155-182.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. *A Handbook to the Iron Age: The Archaeology of Precolonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa*. Pietermaritzberg: Kwazulu-Natal University Press

Huffman T.N, Herbert. 1994. *A new perspectives on Eastern Bantu*. .Asania XXIX-XXX, 1994-1995:27-36.

Klein, R.G. 1984. Southern African Prehistory and Paleoenvironments. A.A. Balkema.

### **10.2 CULTURAL HERITAGE PAPERS**

Australia ICOMOS. The Burra Charter (The Australian ICOMOS charter for places of cultural significance). 2002.

Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. 1994.

International Council of Monuments & Site Documents. Conventions, Charters and Guidelines. 2002.

Documents on Cultural Heritage Protection. 2002.

International Council of Monuments & Site Documents. Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy. 1985.

International Council of Monuments & Site Documents. Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance. 1984.

Australian Historic Themes. A Framework for use in Heritage Assessment and Management. Australian Heritage Commission. 2001.

# **ANNEXURE A: Locality Map**



# STEELPOORT EXT 20 - AIA

