



Archaetnos Culture & Cultural  
Resource Consultants  
BK 98 09854/23

---

**A REPORT ON A HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE  
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF WATERVAL EAST EXTENSION 7 IN  
RUSTENBURG, NORTH WEST PROVINCE**

For:

***K2M TECHNOLOGIES***

On behalf of

***MAXIM PLANNING SOLUTIONS***

**REPORT: AE803**

By:

***Dr. A.C. van Vollenhoven & A.J. Pelsler***

***February 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 Pelsler BA (UNISA), BA (Hons) (Archaeology), MA (Archaeology) [WITS]  
FE Teichert BA, BA (Hons) (Archaeology) [UP]

## SUMMARY

Archaetnos cc was requested by K2M Technologies on behalf of Maxim Planning Solutions to conduct a heritage impact assessment for the proposed development on Waterval East extension 7 in Rustenburg, North West Province. This is for a residential development, including a shopping mall.

The fieldwork undertaken revealed one site of high cultural significance, but this seems to be just outside of the development area. However there will be a secondary impact on the site and therefore it is discussed.

The recommendations in this regard should be seriously considered. However 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 .....	7
6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA.....	7
7. DISCUSSION.....	7
8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	9
9. REFERENCES .....	10
APPENDIX A.....	11
APPENDIX B .....	12
APPENDIX C – LIST OF FIGURES .....	13

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Archaeos cc was requested by K2M Technologies on behalf of Maxim Planning Solutions to conduct a heritage impact assessment for the proposed development on Waterval East extension 7 in Rustenburg, North West Province. This is for a residential development, including a shopping mall.

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.

### **Human remains**

In terms of Section 36(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act, no person may, without a permit issued by the relevant heritage resources authority:

- a. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position of otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;
- b. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or
- c. bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are subject to provisions of the Human Tissue Act (Act 65 of 1983) and to local regulations. Exhumation of graves must conform to the standards set out in the **Ordinance on Excavations (Ordinance no. 12 of 1980)** (replacing the old Transvaal Ordinance no. 7 of 1925).

Permission must also be gained from the descendants (where known), the National Department of Health, Provincial Department of Health, Premier of the Province and local police. Furthermore, permission must also be gained from the various landowners (i.e. where the graves are located and where they are to be relocated) before exhumation can take place.

Human remains can only be handled by a registered undertaker or an institution declared under the **Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983 as amended)**.

Unidentified/unknown graves are also handled as older than 60 until proven otherwise.

## **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 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 by four wheel drive vehicle and where possible 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 portions 54, 55, 218, 262, 270, 296 and 336 of the farm Waterkloof 305JQ. The development is called Waterval East Extension 7 and consists of a township development.

It is clear that the area have been disturbed in the past, mainly by agricultural activities (Figure 1-2). Sunflowers are still cultivated in most of the area. The remainder shows signs of being ploughed in the past. The vegetation mainly consists of pioneer species. 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 forms the western boundary of the area. The soil type is turf which would have been unsuitable for human habitation. On the other hand the presence of water would have made the area suitable for keeping livestock. The Magaliesberg Mountain is a few kilometers to the south, which is relatively close and one would rather expect signs of settlement here as the mountain 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 two (2) features of cultural origin. One of these is found in the area of the proposed development and the second just on the southern boundary

thereof. Both will be impacted upon by the development. Mitigation measures will be indicated below.

Before discussing these sites in detail a background regarding the different phases of human history is needed. This will enable the reader to better understand the sites found during the survey.

### 7.1 Stone Age

The Stone Age is the period in human history when lithic material was mainly used to produce tools (Coertze & Coertze 1996: 293). In South Africa the Stone Age can be divided in three periods. It is however important to note that dates are relative and only provide a broad framework for interpretation. The division for the Stone Age according to Korsman & Meyer (1999: 93-94) is as follows:

Early Stone Age (ESA) 2 million – 150 000 years ago  
Middle Stone Age (MSA) 150 000 – 30 000 years ago  
Late Stone Age (LSA) 40 000 years ago – 1850 - A.D.

No Stone Age material was found during the survey. This probably is due to the dense vegetation. It is known that Stone Age people were present in the area between Brits and Rustenburg (Bergh 1999: 4-5).

### 7.2 Iron Age

The Iron Age is the name given to the period of human history when metal was mainly used to produce artifacts (Coertze & Coertze 1996: 346). In South Africa it can be divided in two separate phases according to Van der Ryst & Meyer (1999: 96-98), namely:

Early Iron Age (EIA) 200 – 1000 A.D.  
Late Iron Age (LIA) 1000 – 1850 A.D.

The surveyed area falls within a band stretching roughly from Brits in the east to Zeerust in the west where many Iron Age sites have been discovered previously (Bergh 1999: 7). The Rustenburg area is well known for Iron Age mining activities (Bergh 1999: 8-9). The Fokeng, Po, Kwena and Taung, who are Tswana speaking people, inhabited the area since early times (Bergh 1999: 10).

### 7.3 Historical Age

The historical age started when the first people that were able to read and write moved into the area. Early travelers have moved through Northwest and may have moved through the area during the early 1800's. The travelers Robert Moffat and James Archbell visited the area between Brits and Rustenburg during 1829. David Hume visited the area in 1830, followed by WC Harris in 1836 and David Livingstone in 1847 (Bergh 1999: 12-13).

After this the Missionaries came into the area. The area between Pretoria and Zeerust, including Rustenburg was inhabited by white farmers between 1839 and 1840 (Bergh 1999: 15). The farm Waterkloof was one of the first historical farms in the Magaliesberg district,



which refers to modern day Rustenburg. JC Kronie requested that this farm be granted to him on 18 December 1839 (Van Vollenhoven 2000: 197-198). The town and district of Rustenburg was proclaimed in 1851 (Bergh 1999: 17).

Both features found during the survey date from the Historical Age. This indicates that the area was occupied during the historical period.

#### 7.4 Discussion of sites identified during the survey

##### Feature 1

This feature was found next to one of the ploughed fields used for sunflowers. It is a heap of rubble consisting of bricks, stones, pieces of ceramic water pipes and other building material (Figure 3). Similar material was identified lying around throughout the area in the ploughed fields. This feature is just a heap of such material.

No GPS measurement was taken as the feature is not seen as having any cultural significance. It is mentioned to indicate that it does prove the existence of historical structures and to indicate that these have been demolished through agricultural activities.

The feature will be directly impacted upon by the proposed development. This report is however seen as ample mitigation measures in this regard.

##### Feature 2

This is a graveyard situated right next to the southern boundary of the proposed development. Two graves are visible, but depressions in the soil and flower pots seem to indicate that there may be more (Figure 4-6).

The GPS measurement of the site is 25°42'07"S and 27°17'06"E.

The graves are those of Dawid Jacobus Nieuwenhuizen (born 27 July 1927; died 1 January 1957) and Hermanus Barend Nieuwenhuizen (born 4 July 1884; died 24 November 1933). Apparently there is servitude on the graveyard in favor of the descendants.

The cultural significance of the graves is high. There will be a secondary impact on the site by the development. It was indicated to us that it lies within the road reserve. The graves will therefore have to be moved, but that will be the responsibility of the road builders. As one of the graves is older than 60 years, an archaeologist will have to be involved in the whole process of social consultation, exhumation and reinternment.

## 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. The development may therefore continue.

Since there will be a secondary impact by this development on the graves, these need to be safeguarded. As there will be a primary impact on these by the widening of the road, the road builders should be informed of their responsibilities in this regard. The developer should therefore inform the road builders as it is their co-responsibility. This is due to their development impacting on the graves.

This report is seen as ample mitigation measures for the area of proposed development. 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. There is a high possibility of this happening since the extremely long grass and wet soil made it impossible to thoroughly scrutinize the whole area.

## 9. REFERENCES

- Bergh, J.S. (red.). 1999. **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.** Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Coertze, P.J. & Coertze, R.D. 1996. **Verklarende vakwoordeboek vir Antropologie en Argeologie.** Pretoria: R.D. Coertze.
- Knudson, S.J. 1978. **Culture in retrospect.** Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Korsman, S.A. & Meyer, A. 1999. Die Steentydperk en rotskuns. Bergh, J.S. (red.). **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.** Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Map supplied by the client.
- Republic of South Africa. 1999. **National Heritage Resources Act** (No 25 of 1999). Pretoria: the Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1998. **National Environmental Management Act** (no 107 of 1998). Pretoria: The Government Printer.
- Van der Ryst, M.M. & Meyer, A. 1999. Die Ystertydperk. Bergh, J.S. (red.). **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.** Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Van Vollenhoven, 2000. **‘n Voorgestelde paradigma vir navorsing op histories-argeologiese erfenishulpbronterreine in Suid-Afrika aan die hand van gevallestudies in noordelike Gauteng.** (Unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, University of Pretoria).

## 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. General view of the area showing a sunflower field.
2. General view of the area showing long grass and turf soil of earlier ploughed fields.
3. Heap of building rubble found in the surveyed area.
4. Grave of Dawid Jacobus Nieuwenhuizen.
5. Grave of Hermanus Barend Nieuwenhuizen.
6. General view of the graveyard.