

**Phase 1 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment:**

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TILIOS SHEEP FEEDING LOT ON A PORTION OF THE FARM RIETFONTEIN  
173, STEYNSRUS REGION, MOQHAKA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY,  
FREE STATE PROVINCE**

**Prepared for:**

Environamics: Ms C van Dyk

PO Box 6484, Baillie Park, 2526; Tel: 086 762 8336; E-mail: christia@environamics.co.za

**Prepared by:**

J A van Schalkwyk (D Litt et Phil),

- Heritage Consultant: ASAPA Registration No.: 164 - Principal Investigator: Iron Age, Colonial Period, Industrial Heritage.
- Postal Address: 62 Coetzer Avenue, Monument Park, 0181; Tel: 076 790 6777; E-mail: jvschalkwyk@mweb.co.za

**Report No:** 2022/JvS/043

- Status: Final
- Date: August 2022
- Revision No: -
- Date: -

**Submission of the report:**

It remains the responsibility of the client to submit the report to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) or relevant Provincial Heritage Resources Agency (PHRA) by means of the online SAHRIS System.




**Copyright:**

This report is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed or to whom it was meant to be addressed. It is provided solely for the purposes set out in it and may not, in whole or in part, be used for any other purpose or by a third party, without the author's prior written consent.

The copyright of all photographs used for background illustration purposes, unless otherwise indicated, is retained by the author of this report. This does not include photographs that resulted as a direct consequence of the project, which is available for use by the client, but only in relation to the current project.

**Specialist competency:**

Johan A van Schalkwyk, D Litt et Phil, heritage consultant, has been working in the field of heritage management for more than 40 years. Originally based at the National Museum of Cultural History, Pretoria, he has actively done research in the fields of anthropology, archaeology, museology, tourism and impact assessment. This work was done in Limpopo Province, Gauteng, Mpumalanga, North West Province, Eastern Cape Province, Northern Cape Province, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Lesotho and Swaziland. Based on this work, he has curated various exhibitions at different museums and has published more than 70 papers, most in scientifically accredited journals. During this period, he has done more than 2000 impact assessments (archaeological, anthropological, historical and social) for various government departments and developers. Projects include environmental management frameworks, roads, pipeline-, and power line developments, dams, mining, water purification works, historical landscapes, refuse dumps and urban developments.



J A van Schalkwyk  
Heritage Consultant  
August 2022



**SPECIALIST DECLARATION**

---

I, J A van Schalkwyk, as the appointed independent specialist, in terms of the 2014 EIA Regulations (as amended), hereby declare that I:

- I act as the independent specialist in this application;
- I perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant;
- regard the information contained in this report as it relates to my specialist input/study to be true and correct, and do not have and will not have any financial interest in the undertaking of the activity, other than remuneration for work performed in terms of the NEMA, the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (as amended) and any specific environmental management Act;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this application, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I will comply with the Act, Regulations and all other applicable legislation;
- I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I have no vested interest in the proposed activity proceeding;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- I have ensured that information containing all relevant facts in respect of the specialist input/study was distributed or made available to interested and affected parties and the public and that participation by interested and affected parties was facilitated in such a manner that all interested and affected parties were provided with a reasonable opportunity to participate and to provide comments on the specialist input/study;
- I have ensured that the comments of all interested and affected parties on the specialist input/study were considered, recorded and submitted to the competent authority in respect of the application;
- all the particulars furnished by me in this specialist input/study are true and correct; and
- I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 48 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act.

Signature of the specialist



J A van Schalkwyk  
August 2022

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

**Phase 1 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment:  
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TILIOS SHEEP FEEDING LOT ON A PORTION OF THE FARM  
RIETFONTEIN 173, STEYNSRUS REGION, MOQHAKA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY,  
FREE STATE PROVINCE**

*Environamics* was appointed by *Smit Boerderye* to conduct the Environmental Impact Assessment process for the development of the Tilios Sheep Feeding Lot on a Portion of the Rietfontein 173, south of Steynsrus in the Moqhaka Local Municipality of Free State Province.

In accordance with Section 38 of the NHRA, an independent heritage consultant was appointed by *Environamics* to conduct a cultural heritage assessment to determine if the development of the sheep feeding lot and associated infrastructure would have an impact on any sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance.

This report describes the methodology used, the limitations encountered, the heritage features that were identified and the recommendations and mitigation measures proposed relevant to this. The investigation consisted of a desktop study (archival sources, database survey, maps and aerial imagery) and a physical survey that also included the interviewing of relevant people. It should be noted that the implementation of the mitigation measures is subject to SAHRA/PHRA's approval.

The cultural landscape qualities of the region essentially consist of two components. The first is a rural area in which the human occupation is made up of a very limited pre-colonial Stone Age and Iron Age occupation. The second and much later component is a colonial farmer one, with a very limited urban component consisting of a number of smaller towns, most of which developed during the last 120 to 150 years.

#### Identified sites

During the survey no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified.

#### Limitations encountered

- During the site visit, the high and dense vegetation that covered the project area limited ground visibility very much.

#### Impact assessment and proposed mitigation measures

Impact analysis of cultural heritage resources under threat of the proposed development, is based on the present understanding of the development:

- For the current study, as no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified, no mitigation measures are proposed.

#### Legal requirements

The legal requirements related to heritage specifically are specified in Section 3 of this report.

- For this proposed project, the assessment has determined that no sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance occur in the project area, therefore no permits are required from SAHRA or the PHRA.


- If heritage features are identified during construction, as stated in the management recommendation, these finds would have to be assessed by a specialist, after which a decision will be made regarding the application for relevant permits.

Reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity should be authorised:

- From a heritage point of view, it is recommended that the Proposed Project be allowed to continue on acceptance of the conditions proposed below.

Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation:

- The Palaeontological Sensitivity Map (<http://www.sahra.org.za/sahris/map/palaeo>) indicate that the project area has a very high sensitivity of fossil remains to be found and therefore a palaeontological assessment would be required.
- Should archaeological sites or graves be exposed during construction work, it must immediately be reported to a heritage practitioner so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made. The appropriate steps to take are indicated in Section 9 of the report, as well as in the **Management Plan: Burial Grounds and Graves, with reference to general heritage sites**, in the Addendum, Section 13.5.




J A van Schalkwyk  
Heritage Consultant  
August 2022

**TECHNICAL SUMMARY**

| Project description |                                |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Description         | Development of a sheep feedlot |
| Project name        | Tilios Feedlot                 |

| Applicant      |
|----------------|
| Smit Boerderye |

| Environmental assessment practitioner |
|---------------------------------------|
| Ms C van Dyk                          |
| Environamics                          |

| Property details     |  |            |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
|----------------------|--|------------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|---|------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Province             | Free State   |            |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
| Magisterial district | Senekal  |            |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
| Local Municipality   | Moqhaka  |            |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
| Topo-cadastral map   | 2827BA   |            |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
| Farm name            | Rietfontein 173  |            |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
| Closest town         | Steynsrus  |            |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
| Coordinates          | Centre point (approximate)   |            |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
|                      | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>No</th> <th>Latitude</th> <th>Longitude</th> <th>No</th> <th>Latitude</th> <th>Longitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>S 28,02081</td> <td>E 27,60774</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | No         | Latitude | Longitude | No        | Latitude | Longitude | 1 | S 28,02081 | E 27,60774 |  |  |  |
| No                   | Latitude   | Longitude  | No       | Latitude  | Longitude |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
| 1                    | S 28,02081   | E 27,60774 |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |
|                      | .kml files <sup>1</sup>   |            |          |           |           |          |           |   |            |            |  |  |  |

| Development criteria in terms of Section 38(1) of the NHR Act   | Yes/No |
|---|--------|
| Construction of road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other linear form of development or barrier exceeding 300m in length | No     |
| Construction of bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length   | No     |
| Development exceeding 5000 sq m   | Yes    |
| Development involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions  | No     |
| Development involving three or more erven or divisions that have been consolidated within past five years                       | No     |
| Rezoning of site exceeding 10 000 sq m  | No     |
| Any other development category, public open space, squares, parks, recreation grounds   | No     |

| Land use          |                               |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| Previous land use | Farming                       |
| Current land use  | Farming / Agricultural fields |

<sup>1</sup> Left click on the coloured icon to open the file in Google Earth, if installed on the computer. Alternatively, right click on the icon. In dialog box, select "Save Embedded File to Disk" and save to folder of choice.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| SPECIALIST DECLARATION .....  | II   |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....   | III  |
| TECHNICAL SUMMARY .....   | V    |
| GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....   | VII  |
| COMPLIANCE WITH APPENDIX 6 OF THE 2014 EIA REGULATIONS (AS AMENDED) .....                     | IX   |
| 1. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1    |
| 2. LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK .....  | 2    |
| 3. HERITAGE RESOURCES .....   | 3    |
| 4. PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....  | 4    |
| 5. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY .....   | 7    |
| 6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT .....  | 9    |
| 7. SURVEY RESULTS .....   | 17   |
| 8. IMPACT ASSESSMENT RATINGS AND MITIGATION MEASURES .....                                    | 18   |
| 9. MANAGEMENT MEASURES .....  | 19   |
| 10. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....   | 21   |
| 11. REFERENCES .....  | 23   |
| 12. ADDENDUM .....  | 25   |
| 1. Indemnity and terms of use of this report .....  | 25   |
| 2. Assessing the significance of heritage resources .....                                     | 26   |
| 3. Method of Environmental Assessment .....   | 28   |
| 4. Mitigation measures .....  | 31   |
| 5. Management Plan: Burial Grounds and Graves, with reference to general heritage sites ..... | 33   |
| 6. Chance find procedures .....   | 37   |
| 7. Curriculum vitae .....   | 39   |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Figure 1. Location of the project area in regional context .....                              | 5    |
| Figure 2. Layout of the proposed development .....  | 6    |
| Figure 3. The property on which the development will be located .....                         | 6    |
| Figure 4. Location of known heritage sites and features in relation to the project area ..... | 8    |
| Figure 5. Map indicating the track log of the field survey .....                              | 9    |
| Figure 6. Views over the project area – note the grass cover .....                            | 10   |
| Figure 7. The Palaeontological sensitivity of the project area .....                          | 11   |
| Figure 8. Typical complex stone walled site dating to the Late Iron age .....                 | 13   |
| Figure 9. The old 'Louis Triegaardt' road bridge near Steynsrus .....                         | 14   |
| Figure 10. Copy of the Deed of Grant for the farm Rietfontein 173 (original no. 657) .....    | 15   |
| Figure 11. Aerial image of the project area, dating to 1957 .....                             | 16   |
| Figure 12. The project area on the 1987 version of the 1:50 000 topographic map .....         | 16   |
| Figure 13. Aerial view of the project area dating to 2022 .....                               | 17   |
| Figure 14. Location of heritage sites in the project area .....                               | 18   |

## LIST OF TABLES

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Table 1: Pre-Feasibility Assessment .....  | 8    |
| Table 2: Impact assessment .....   | 18   |
| Table 3A: Construction Phase: Environmental Management Programme for the project ..... | 20   |
| Table 3B: Operation Phase: Environmental Management Programme for the project .....    | 20   |

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

---

### TERMS

**Bioturbation:** The burrowing by small mammals, insects and termites that disturb archaeological deposits.

**Cumulative impacts:** In relation to an activity, means the past, current and reasonably foreseeable future impact of an activity, considered together with the impact of activities associated with that activity, that in itself may not be significant, but may become significant when added to existing and reasonably foreseeable impacts eventuating from similar or diverse activities.

**Debitage:** Stone chips discarded during the manufacture of stone tools.

**Factory site:** A specialised archaeological site where a specific set of technological activities has taken place – usually used to describe a place where stone tools were made.

**Historic Period:** Since the arrival of the white settlers - c. AD 1830 - in this part of the country.

**Holocene:** The most recent time period, which commenced c. 10 000 years ago.

**Iron Age** (also referred to as **Early Farming Communities**): Period covering the last 1800 years, when new people brought a new way of life to southern Africa. They established settled villages, cultivated domestic crops such as sorghum, millet and beans, and herded cattle, sheep and goats. As they produced their own iron tools, archaeologists call this the Iron Age.

|                 |                   |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Early Iron Age  | AD 200 - AD 900   |
| Middle Iron Age | AD 900 - AD 1300  |
| Later Iron Age  | AD 1300 - AD 1830 |

**Midden:** The accumulated debris resulting from human occupation of a site.

**Mitigation,** means to anticipate and prevent negative impacts and risks, then to minimise them, rehabilitate or repair impacts to the extent feasible.

**National Estate:** The collective heritage assets of the Nation.

**Pleistocene:** Geological time period of 3 000 000 to 20 000 years ago.

**Stone Age:** The first and longest part of human history is the Stone Age, which began with the appearance of early humans between 3-2 million years ago. Stone Age people were hunters, gatherers and scavengers who did not live in permanently settled communities. Their stone tools preserve well and are found in most places in South Africa and elsewhere.

|                  |                                    |
|------------------|------------------------------------|
| Early Stone Age  | 2 500 000 - 250 000 Before Present |
| Middle Stone Age | 250 000 - 40-25 000 BP             |
| Later Stone Age  | 40-25 000 - until c. AD 200        |

**Tradition:** As used in archaeology, it is a seriated sequence of artefact assemblages, particularly ceramics.

### ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| AD    | Anno Domini (the year 0)                                    |
| ASAPA | Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists |



---

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| BA       | Basic Assessment   |
| BC       | Before the Birth of Christ (the year 0)  |
| BCE      | Before the Common Era (the year 0)   |
| BP       | Before Present (calculated from 1950 when radio-carbon dating was established) |
| CE       | Common Era (the year 0)  |
| CRM      | Cultural Resources Management  |
| CS-G     | Chief Surveyor-General   |
| DMRE     | Department of Mineral Resources and Energy                                     |
| EAP      | Environmental Assessment Practitioner  |
| ECO      | Environmental Control Officer  |
| EIA      | Early Iron Age   |
| EIA      | Environmental Impact Assessment  |
| EMPr     | Environmental Management Programme   |
| ESA      | Early Stone Age  |
| HIA      | Heritage Impact Assessment   |
| I & AP's | Interested and Affected Parties  |
| ICOMOS   | International Council on Monuments and Sites                                   |
| LIA      | Late Iron Age  |
| LSA      | Later Stone Age  |
| MIA      | Middle Iron Age  |
| MSA      | Middle Stone Age   |
| NASA     | National Archives of South Africa  |
| NEMA     | National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998                              |
| NHRA     | National Heritage Resources Act  |
| PHRA     | Provincial Heritage Resources Agency   |
| SAHRA    | South African Heritage Resources Agency  |
| SAHRIS   | South African Heritage Resources Information System                            |
| WUL      | Water Use Licence  |

**COMPLIANCE WITH APPENDIX 6 OF THE 2014 EIA REGULATIONS (AS AMENDED)**

| <b>Requirements of Appendix 6 – GN R982</b>   | <b>Addressed in the Specialist Report</b> |
|---|---|
| 1. (1) A specialist report prepared in terms of these Regulations must contain-   |   |
| a) details of-  |   |
| i. the specialist who prepared the report; and  | Front page                                |
| ii. the expertise of that specialist to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae;   | Page i<br>Addendum Section 7              |
| b) a declaration that the specialist is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority;   | Page ii                                   |
| c) an indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared;   | Section 1                                 |
| (cA) an indication of the quality and age of base data used for the specialist report;  | Section 4                                 |
| (cB) a description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change;   | Section 8                                 |
| d) the duration, date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment;  | Section 4                                 |
| e) a description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process inclusive of equipment and modelling used;  | Section 4                                 |
| f) details of an assessment of the specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the proposed activity or activities and its associated structures and infrastructure, inclusive of a site plan identifying site alternatives; | Section 7;<br>Figure 14                   |
| g) an identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers;   | Section 8                                 |
| h) a map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers;   | Figure 14<br>Section 7 & 8                |
| i) a description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;  | Section 2                                 |
| j) a description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity or activities;  | Section 7                                 |
| k) any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr;   | Section 8 & 11                            |
| l) any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation;   | Section 11                                |
| m) any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation;  | Section 9                                 |
| n) a reasoned opinion-  |   |
| i. whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised;  | Section 11                                |
| (iiA) regarding the acceptability of the proposed activity or activities; and   |   |
| ii. if the opinion is that the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan;   | Section 8, 9 & 10                         |
| o) a description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of preparing the specialist report;  | -   |
| p) a summary and copies of any comments received during any consultation process and where applicable all responses thereto; and  | -   |
| q) any other information requested by the competent authority.  | -   |
| (2) Where a government notice by the Minister provides for any protocol or minimum information requirement to be applied to a specialist report, the requirements as indicated in such notice will apply.                               | -   |

**Phase 1 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment:  
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TILIOS SHEEP FEEDING LOT ON A PORTION OF THE FARM  
RIETFONTEIN 173, STEYNSRUS REGION, MOQHAKA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY,  
FREE STATE PROVINCE**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Background**

*Environamics* was appointed by *Smit Boerderye* to conduct the Environmental Impact Assessment process for the development of the Tilios Sheep Feeding Lot on a Portion of the Rietfontein 173, south of Steynsrus in the Moqhaka Local Municipality of Free State Province.

South Africa's heritage resources, also described as the 'national estate', comprise a wide range of sites, features, objects and beliefs. However, according to Section 27(18) of the National Heritage Resources Act, No. 25 of 1999 (NHRA), no person may destroy, damage, deface, excavate, alter, remove from its original position, subdivide or change the planning status of any heritage site without a permit issued by the heritage resources authority responsible for the protection of such site.

In accordance with Section 38 of the NHRA, an independent heritage consultant was appointed by *Environamics* to conduct a cultural heritage assessment to determine if the development of the sheep feeding lot and associated infrastructure would have an impact on any sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance.

This report forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment as required by the EIA Regulations in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) as amended and is intended for submission to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).

### **1.2 Terms and references**

*The aim of a full heritage impact assessment (HIA) investigation is to provide an informed heritage-related opinion about the proposed development by an appropriate heritage specialist. The objectives are to identify heritage resources (involving site inspections, existing heritage data and additional heritage specialists if necessary); assess their significances; assess alternatives in order to promote heritage conservation issues; and to assess the acceptability of the proposed development from a heritage perspective.*

*The result of this investigation is a HIA report indicating the presence / absence of heritage resources and how to manage them in the context of the proposed development.*

*Depending on SAHRA's acceptance of this report, the developer may receive permission to proceed with the proposed development, on condition of successful implementation of proposed mitigation measures.*

#### **1.2.1 Scope of work**

The aim of this study is to determine the cultural heritage significance of the area where the sheep feeding lot and associated infrastructure will be located, is to take place. This included:

- Conducting a desk-top investigation of the project area; and
- A visit to the proposed project area.

The objectives were to:

- 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; and
- Provide guideline measures to manage any impacts that might occur during the proposed project's construction and implementation phases.

### 1.2.2 Assumptions and Limitations

The investigation has been influenced by the following:

- It is assumed that the description of the proposed project, provided by the client, is accurate;
- It is assumed that the public consultation process undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment is sufficient and that it does not have to be repeated as part of the HIA;
- It is assumed that the information contained in existing databases, reports and publications is correct;
- The unpredictability of buried archaeological remains;
- No subsurface investigation (i.e. excavations or sampling) were undertaken, since a permit from SAHRA is required for such activities;
- The vegetation cover encountered during a site visit can have serious limitations on ground visibility, obscuring features (artefacts, structures) that might be an indication of human settlement.

## 2. LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

---

### 2.1 Background

HIAs are governed by national legislation and standards and International Best Practise. These include:

- South African Legislation
  - National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA);
  - Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, 2002 (Act No. 22 of 2002) (MPRDA);
  - National Environmental Management Act 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA); and
  - National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) (NWA).
- Standards and Regulations
  - South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) Minimum Standards;
  - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) Constitution and Code of Ethics;
  - Anthropological Association of Southern Africa Constitution and Code of Ethics.
- International Best Practise and Guidelines
  - ICOMOS Standards (Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties); and
  - The UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972).

### 2.2 Heritage Impact Assessment Studies

South Africa's unique and non-renewable archaeological and palaeontological heritage sites are 'generally' protected in terms of the NHRA (Section 35) and may not be disturbed at all without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority, subject to the provisions of Section 38(8) of the NHRA.

The NHRA, Section 38, contains requirements for Cultural Resources Management and prospective developments:

*“38 (1) Subject to the provisions of subsections (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development categorised as:*

- (a) the construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;*
- (b) the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length;*
- (c) any development or other activity which will change the character of a site:*
  - (i) exceeding 5 000 m<sup>2</sup> in extent; or*
  - (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or*
  - (iii) involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or*
  - (iv) the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;*
- (d) the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m<sup>2</sup> in extent; or*
- (e) any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority, must at the very earliest stages of initiating such a development, notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.”*

And:

*“38 (3) The responsible heritage resources authority must specify the information to be provided in a report required in terms of subsection (2)(a): Provided that the following must be included:*

- (a) The identification and mapping of all heritage resources in the area affected;*
- (b) an assessment of the significance of such resources in terms of the heritage assessment criteria set out in section 6(2) or prescribed under section 7;*
- (c) an assessment of the impact of the development on such heritage resources;*
- (d) an evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the sustainable social and economic benefits to be derived from the development;*
- (e) the results of consultation with communities affected by the proposed development and other interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources;*
- (f) if heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the consideration of alternatives; and*
- (g) plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after the completion of the proposed development.”*

### **3. HERITAGE RESOURCES**

---

#### **3.1 The National Estate**

The NHRA defines the heritage resources of South Africa which are of cultural significance or other special value for the present community and for future generations that must be considered part of the national estate to include:

- places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance;
- places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
- historical settlements and townscapes;
- landscapes and natural features of cultural significance;
- geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;
- archaeological and palaeontological sites;
- graves and burial grounds, including-
  - ancestral graves;

- royal graves and graves of traditional leaders;
- graves of victims of conflict;
- graves of individuals designated by the Minister by notice in the Gazette;
- historical graves and cemeteries; and
- other human remains which are not covered in terms of the Human Tissue Act, 1983 (Act No. 65 of 1983);
- sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa;
- movable objects, including-
  - objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens;
  - objects to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
  - ethnographic art and objects;
  - military objects;
  - objects of decorative or fine art;
  - objects of scientific or technological interest; and
  - books, records, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic, film or video material or sound recordings, excluding those that are public records as defined in section 1(xiv) of the National Archives of South Africa Act, 1996 (Act No. 43 of 1996).

### 3.2 Cultural significance

In the NHRA, Section 2 (vi), it is stated that “cultural significance” means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance. This is determined in relation to a site or feature’s uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential.

According to Section 3(3) of the NHRA, a place or object is to be considered part of the national estate if it has cultural significance or other special value because of

- its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects;
- its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa; and
- sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

A matrix (see Section 2 of Addendum) was developed whereby the above criteria were applied for the determination of the significance of each identified site. This allowed some form of control over the application of similar values for similar identified sites.

## 4. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

### 4.1 Site location

The development of the sheep feedlot is located approximately 10km southeast of the town of Steynsrus in the Free State Province (Fig. 1).




Figure 1. Location of the project area in regional context

#### 4.2 Development proposal

The development will consist of approximately 20 camps, which will house in total approximately 20 000 sheep. This operation will be supported by administration office, 'hospital', wool shearing facilities and silos for feed for the sheep (Fig. 2 below).



Figure 2. Layout of the proposed development (Map supplied by Smit Rietfontein Boerdery)




Figure 3. The property on which the development will be located (Map: <https://csg.esri-southafrica.com>)



## 5. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

---

### 5.1 Extent of the Study

This survey and impact assessment cover all facets of cultural heritage located in the project area, including the power line corridors, as presented in Section 4 above and illustrated in Figures 1 & 2.

### 5.2 Methodology

#### 5.2.1 Pre-feasibility assessment

The objectives of this review were to:

- Gain an understanding of the cultural landscape within which the project is located;
- Inform the field survey.

##### 5.2.1.1 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 list of references in Section 12.

- Information on events, sites and features in the larger region were obtained from these sources.

##### 5.2.1.2 Survey of heritage impact assessments (HIAs)

A survey of HIAs done for projects in the region by various heritage consultants was conducted with the aim of determining the heritage potential of the area – see list of references in Section 12.

- Information on sites and features in the larger region were obtained from these sources.

##### 5.2.1.3 Data bases

The *Heritage Atlas Database*, various SAHRA databases, the *Environmental Potential Atlas*, the *Chief Surveyor General* and the *National Archives of South Africa* were consulted.

- Database surveys produced a number of sites located in the larger region of the proposed development.

##### 5.2.1.4 Other sources

Aerial photographs, topographic and other maps were also studied - see the list of references below.

- Information of a very general nature were obtained from these sources.

##### 5.2.1.5 Results

The results of the above investigation are presented in Table 1 and Figure 3 below – see list of references in Section 12 – and can be summarised as follows:

- Stone tools dating the Middle Stone Age occur to the southwest and southeast of the project area;
- Stone walled sites dating to the Late Iron Age occur well to the northwest of the project area;
- Historic structures, inclusive of buildings and bridges, occur in a sporadic manner across the larger landscape as well as in the various urban centres;
- Formal and informal burial sites occur in a number of places in towns and across the countryside.

*Based on the above assessment, the probability of cultural heritage sites, features and objects occurring in the project area is considered to be low.*

**Table 1: Pre-Feasibility Assessment**

| Category        | Period                        | Probability | Reference   |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Natural         |                               |             |   |
| Landscapes      |                               | Low         | Historic maps/aerial photographs                      |
| Early hominin   | Pliocene – Lower Pleistocene  |             |   |
|                 | Early hominin                 | None        | -   |
| Stone Age       | Lower Pleistocene – Holocene  |             |   |
|                 | Early Stone Age               | None        | -   |
|                 | Middle Stone Age              | Low         | Heritage Atlas Database                               |
|                 | Later Stone Age               | None        | -   |
|                 | Rock Art                      | None        |   |
| Iron age        | Holocene                      |             |   |
|                 | Early Iron Age                | None        | -   |
|                 | Middle Iron Age               | None        | -   |
|                 | Late Iron Age                 | Low         | Heritage Atlas Database; Huffman (2007); Maggs (1976) |
| Colonial period | Holocene                      |             |   |
|                 | Contact period/Early historic | Possible    | Dreyer (2001)   |
|                 | Recent history                | Possible    | SESA (1974)   |
|                 | Industrial heritage           | Low         | Heritage Atlas Database                               |




Figure 4. Location of known heritage sites and features in relation to the project area (Circles spaced at 2km: heritage sites = coded green dots)

### 5.2.2 Field survey

The field survey was done according to generally accepted archaeological practices, and was aimed at locating all possible heritage sites, objects and structures. The area that had to be investigated was identified by *Environamics* by means of maps and *.kml* files indicating the project area, including the power line corridor. This was loaded onto a Samsung digital device and used in Google Earth during the field survey to access the project area.

The project area was visited on 3 August 2022 and was investigated by walking transects across it (Fig. 5).

Mr Abrie Smit, owner of the farm, was interviewed during the site visit. He confirmed that there were no graves and known archaeological sites (rock engravings) on this portion of the farm.

- During the site visit, the total project area was covered by a dense grass cover, limiting the ground visibility seriously – see Figure 6 below. It was also found that construction work for some of the sheep lots has already started on a section of the site.




Figure 5. Map indicating the track log of the field survey (Site = purple polygon; track log = blue line)

### 5.2.3 Documentation

All sites, objects and structures that were 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) and plotted on a map. This information is added to the description to facilitate the identification of each locality. Map datum used: Hartebeeshoek 94 (WGS84).

The track log and identified sites were recorded by means of a Garmin Oregon 550 handheld GPS device. Photographic recording was done by means of a Canon EOS 550D digital camera. Geo-rectifying of the aerial photographs and historic maps was done by means of a professional software package: ExpertGPS.

## 6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

### 6.1 Natural Environment

The original vegetation of the larger project area is classified as Vaal-Vet Sandy Grassveld, a grassland biome falling the Dry Highveld Grassland Bioregion (Muncina & Rutherford 2006). However, all of this has been impacted on by former and current agricultural activities on the site (Fig. 6).

The geology of the larger region is made up of mudrock and subordinate sandstone, belonging to the Adelaide Subgroup of the Beaufort Group of the Karoo Supergroup. The topography of the project area is very flat, although some dolerite outcrops occur to the north and northeast.




Figure 6. Views over the project area – note the grass cover

The Palaeontological Sensitivity Map (<http://www.sahra.org.za/sahris/map/palaeo>) indicate that the project area (Fig. 7) has a very high sensitivity of fossil remains to be found and therefore a palaeontological assessment would be required.




Figure 7. The Palaeontological sensitivity of the project area  
(Please note that on this map the farm is incorrectly identified as Danielskuil)

## 6.2 Cultural Landscape

*The aim of this section is to present an overview of the history of the larger region in order to eventually determine the significance of heritage sites identified in the project area, within the context of their historic, aesthetic, scientific and social value, rarity and representivity.*

The cultural landscape qualities of the region essentially consist of two components. The first is a rural area in which the human occupation is made up of a very limited pre-colonial Stone Age and Iron Age occupation. The second and much later component is a colonial farmer one, with a very limited urban component consisting of a number of smaller towns, most of which developed during the last 120 to 150 years.

### 6.2.1 Stone Age

The larger region has probably been inhabited by humans since Early Stone Age (ESA) times, although evidence of this is very limited. Tools dating to this period are mostly, although not exclusively, found in the vicinity of watercourses. The oldest of these tools are known as choppers, crudely produced from large pebbles found in the river. Later, *Homo erectus* and early *Homo sapiens* people made tools shaped on both sides, called bifaces.

During Middle Stone Age (MSA) times (c. 150 000 – 30 000 BP), people became more mobile, occupying areas formerly avoided. Open sites were still preferred near watercourses. These people were adept at exploiting the huge herds of animals that passed through the area, on their seasonal migration. As a result, tools belonging to this period also mostly occur in the open or in erosion dongas. Similar to the ESA material, artefacts from these surface collections are viewed not to be in a primary context and have little or no significance.

Later Stone Age (LSA) people had even more advanced technology than the MSA people and therefore succeeded in occupying even more diverse habitats. The stone artefacts they produced are much smaller than those of the Middle Stone Age and consist of a great variety of functional types. LSA people preferred, though not exclusively, to occupy rock shelters and caves (e.g. Schaapplaats) and it is this type of sealed context that make it possible for us to learn much more about them than is the case with earlier periods.

At present, no stratified, sealed site dating to the Stone Age is known for the immediate region. However, it is quite feasible that it would exist in the area, and that detailed surveys would reveal such sites.

### 6.2.2 Iron Age

Iron Age people started to settle in southern Africa c. AD 300, with one of the oldest known site at Silver Leaves south east of Tzaneen dating to AD 270. The oldest local EIA site is located at Broederstroom south of Hartebeestpoort Dam and has a radio-carbon date of AD 470.

The occupation of the larger geographical area (including the project area) did not start much before the 1500s. To understand all of this, we have to take a look at the broader picture. Towards the end of the first millennium AD, Early Iron Age communities underwent a drastic change, brought on by increasing trade on the East African coast. This led to the rise of powerful ruling elites, for example at Mapungubwe. The abandonment of Mapungubwe (c. AD 1270) and other contemporaneous settlements show that widespread drought conditions led to the decline and eventual disintegration of this state Huffman (2005).

By the 16th century things changed again, with the climate becoming warmer and wetter, creating condition that allowed Late Iron Age (LIA) farmers to occupy areas previously unsuitable, for example the Witwatersrand and the treeless, wind-swept plains of the Free State and the Mpumalanga escarpment.

This period of consistently high rainfall started in about AD 1780. At the same time, maize was introduced from Maputo and grown extensively. Given good rains, maize crops yield far more than sorghum and millets. This increase in food production probably led to increased populations in coastal area as well as the central highveld interior by the beginning of the 19th century. Due to their specific settlement requirements, Late Iron Age people preferred to settle on the steep slope of a mountain, possibly for protection, or for cultural considerations such as grazing for their enormous cattle herds. Because of the lack of trees, they built their settlements in stone.

During the first part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the two travellers/missionaries, Thomas Arbousset and Francois Daumas, passed through the larger region, leaving behind in their writings a wealth of information regarding the population and settlements in the region (Dreyer 2001). The complexity of these communities, as is reflected in their settlement layout, has been demonstrated for example by the extensive archaeological excavations done on some of these sites by Tim Maggs (Maggs 1976).



Figure 8. Typical complex stone walled site dating to the Late Iron age

### 6.2.3 Historic period

European hunting parties allegedly crossed the Orange River in the first two decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, exploring as far as the current Wepener district. On the heels of these explorers, cattle farmers from the Cape Colony started moving out of the northern Cape Colony borders from 1821 for seasonal grazing, but did not encounter any Bantu tribes. Driven by droughts in the Cape, loss of livestock during the seasonal travels and the uninhabited district of the Transgariep led to numerous farmers settling themselves permanently in the area after 1824.

Between 1825 and 1841 European settlers started to occupy the area of the Modder River between the Orange and Caledon Rivers, west of Langeberg. In 1829 Rudolph van Wyk settled on the farm Rietpoort, where the town of Smithfield was founded in 1848, and P.E. Wepener claimed the farm Zuurbult, which would become Rouxville in 1863. Roughly at the same time fifteen families occupied the farm Zevenfontein which eventually became the Beersheba Mission Station. The town of Zastron was founded on the farm named Verliesfontein, which was settled between 1836 and 1840, and by that time nearly 300 families had settled in the area currently known as the Eastern Free State. During the beginnings of the 1830's a new, organised group of European settlers, the forerunners of the Groot Trek, saw a large but temporary influx of settlers. During this time A.H. Potgieter also bought land from the Bataung captain Makwana in 1836.

It was only after the annexation of Natal in 1843 that many Trekkers returned to the Transgariep as well as to the northern parts of the Eastern Free State's Borderbelt. Notable amongst these settlers were J.I.J. Fick, after whom Ficksburg was named, W. van de Venter - founder of Fouriesburg and P.R. Botha who settled in Rietvlei. French missionaries were the last to settle in the area, and in 1833 E. Casalis and T. Arbusset opened the Missionary Station at Morija after a request from Moshoeshoe. North of Smithfield hon. S. Rolland, accepting the jurisdiction of Moshoeshoe without any reservation, founded the Beersheba Mission Station in 1835. This meant that a part of the southeast Transgariep immediately became declared as a Basotho region and ensured that Moshoeshoe received ownership over a region where no Basotho lived. French missionaries also founded mission stations Carmel (near Smithfield), Hebron (near Zastron) and Mequatling (in the Ladybrand district) and their influence would

play a crucial role in the relationship between European settlers and the Basotho in the Transgariep future.

The town of Steynsrus, originally named Steynsrust, was named after former Free State President M.T. Steyn. It was established in 1910 and attained municipal status in 1912.



Figure 9. The old 'Louis Triegaardt' road bridge near Steynsrus

### 6.3 Site specific review

*Although landscapes with cultural significance are not explicitly described in the NHRA, they are protected under the broad definition of the National Estate (Section 3): Section 3(2)(c) and (d) list "historical settlements and townscapes" and "landscapes and natural features of cultural significance" as part of the National Estate.*

*The examination of historical maps and aerial photographs help us to reconstruct how the cultural landscape has changed over time as is show how humans have used the land.*

The Deed of Grant to the Farm Rietfontein 173 (original no. 657) was made in July 1909 in favour of a number of individuals who owned different portions of the farm (Fig. 10).

From the early aerial photographs and topographic maps (Fig. 11 – 14), the development to be seen on the farm and the project area specifically are agricultural fields, access roads and some structures. Significantly, the structures that can be seen in the earlier maps and photographs disappear over time as the area was developed as agricultural fields.






Figure 10. Copy of the Deed of Grant for the farm Rietfontein 173 (original no. 657) (Image: CS-G 161F190A)




Figure 11. Aerial image of the project area, dating to 1957 (CS-G: 397\_014\_05595)




Figure 12. The project area on the 1987 version of the 1:50 000 topographic map



Figure 13. Aerial view of the project area dating to 2022  
(Image: Google Earth)

## 7. SURVEY RESULTS

---

During the survey, the following sites, features and objects of cultural significance were identified in the project area (Fig. 14).

### 7.1 Stone Age

- No sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the Stone Age were identified in the project area.

### 7.2 Iron Age

- No sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the Iron Age were identified in the project area.

### 7.3 Historic period

- No sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the historic period were identified in the project area.




Figure 14. Location of heritage sites in the project area  
(Please note, as no sites of cultural significance were found, nothing is indicated on the map)

## 8. IMPACT ASSESSMENT RATINGS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### 8.1 Impact assessment

Heritage impacts are categorised as:

- Direct or physical impacts, implying alteration or destruction of heritage features within the project boundaries;
  - Indirect impacts, e.g. restriction of access or visual intrusion concerning the broader environment;
  - Cumulative impacts that are combinations of the above.
- The potential impact that the proposed development might have, has been calculated and is presented for each individual site in Table 3 below (this also include the cumulative impact assessment).

**Table 2: Impact assessment**

| Tilios Sheep Feedlot   |                    |                 |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Impact assessment:</b> As no sites, features or objects of cultural historic significance have been identified in the project area, there would be no impact as a result of the proposed development. |                    |                 |
|  | Without mitigation | With mitigation |
| Geographical Extent  | Site (1)           | Site (1)        |
| Probability  | Unlikely (1)       | Unlikely (1)    |
| Duration   | Short term (1)     | Short term (1)  |

|                                  |                           |                           |   |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Intensity/Magnitude              | Low (1)                   | Low (1)                   |   |
| Reversibility                    | Completely reversible (1) | Completely reversible (1) |   |
| Irreplaceable loss of resources? | No loss of resources (1)  | No loss of resources (1)  |   |
| Cumulative Effect                | Negligible (1)            | Negligible (1)            |   |
| <b>Significance</b>              |                           |                           |   |
| <b>Site type</b>                 | <b>NHRA category</b>      | <b>Field rating</b>       | <b>Impact rating:<br/>Before/After mitigation</b> |
| n/a                              | n/a                       | n/a                       | Positive Low (6)                                  |
|                                  |                           |                           | Positive Low (6)                                  |

## 8.2 Mitigation measures

*Mitigation: means to anticipate and prevent negative impacts and risks, then to minimise them, rehabilitate or repair impacts to the extent feasible.*

- For the current study, as no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified, no mitigation measures are proposed.

## 9. MANAGEMENT MEASURES

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 are directly impacted by the proposed development can be excavated/recorded and a management plan can be developed for future action. Those sites that are not impacted on can be written into the management plan, whence they can be avoided or cared for in the future.

Sources of risk were considered with regards to development activities defined in Section 2(viii) of the NHRA that may be triggered and are summarised in Table 3A and 3B below. These issues formed the basis of the impact assessment described. The potential risks are discussed according to the various phases of the project below.

### 9.1 Objectives

- Protection of archaeological, historical and any other site or land considered being of cultural value within the Project Area against vandalism, destruction and theft.
- The preservation and appropriate management of new discoveries in accordance with the NHRA, should these be discovered during construction activities.

The following shall apply:

- Known sites should be clearly marked, so that they can be avoided during construction activities;
- The contractors and workers should be notified that archaeological sites might be exposed during the construction activities;
- Should any heritage artefacts be exposed during excavation, work on the area where the artefacts were discovered, shall cease immediately and the Environmental Control Officer (ECO) shall be notified as soon as possible;
- All discoveries shall be reported immediately to a heritage practitioner so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made. Acting upon advice from these specialists, the ECO will advise the necessary actions to be taken;
- Under no circumstances shall any artefacts be removed, destroyed or interfered with by anyone on the site; and

- Contractors and workers shall be advised of the penalties associated with the unlawful removal of cultural, historical, archaeological or palaeontological artefacts, as set out in the NHRA, Section 51(1).

## 9.2 Control

In order to achieve this, the following should be in place:

- A person or entity, e.g. the ECO, should be tasked to take responsibility for the maintenance heritage sites.
- In areas where the vegetation is threatening the heritage sites, e.g. growing trees pushing walls over, it should be removed, but only after permission for the methods proposed has been granted by SAHRA. A heritage official should be part of the team executing these measures.

**Table 3A: Construction Phase: Environmental Management Programme for the project**

|  |   |  |                          |
|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| <b>Action required</b>   | Protection of heritage sites, features and objects  |  |                          |
| <b>Potential Impact</b>  | The identified risk is damage or changes to resources that are generally protected in terms of Sections 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36 and 37 of the NHRA that may occur in the Project Area. |  |                          |
| <b>Risk if impact is not mitigated</b>   | Loss or damage to sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance  |  |                          |
| <b>Activity / issue</b>  | <b>Mitigation: Action/control</b>   | <b>Responsibility</b>                          | <b>Timeframe</b>         |
| 1. Removal of Vegetation<br>2. Construction of required infrastructure, e.g. access roads, water pipelines | See discussion in Section 9.1 above   | Environmental Control Officer & the Contractor | During construction only |
| <b>Monitoring</b>  | See discussion in Section 9.2 above   |  |                          |

**Table 3B: Operation Phase: Environmental Management Programme for the project**

|   |  |                               |                          |
|---|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Action required</b>  | Protection of heritage sites, features and objects   |                               |                          |
| <b>Potential Impact</b>   | It is unlikely that the negative impacts identified for pre-mitigation will occur if the recommendations are followed. |                               |                          |
| <b>Risk if impact is not mitigated</b>  | Loss or damage to sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance   |                               |                          |
| <b>Activity / issue</b>   | <b>Mitigation: Action/control</b>  | <b>Responsibility</b>         | <b>Timeframe</b>         |
| 1. Additional construction / development of required infrastructure, e.g. access roads, water pipelines | See discussion in Section 9.1 above  | Environmental Control Officer | During construction only |
| <b>Monitoring</b>   | See discussion in Section 9.2 above  |                               |                          |

## 9.3 Legal requirements

The legal requirements related to heritage specifically are specified in Section 3 of this report. For this proposed project, the assessment has determined that sites, features or objects of heritage significance occur in the project area. Therefore, permits are required from SAHRA or the PHRA.

- For this proposed project, the assessment has determined that no sites, features or objects of heritage significance occur in the project area. Therefore, no permits are required from SAHRA or the PHRA.
- If heritage features are identified during construction, as stated in the management recommendations, these finds would have to be assessed by a specialist, after which a decision will be made regarding the application for relevant permits.

## **10. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

*Environamics* was appointed by *Smit Boerderye* to conduct the Environmental Impact Assessment process for the development of the Tilios Sheep Feeding Lot on a Portion of the Rietfontein 173, south of Steynsrus in the Moqhaka Local Municipality of Free State Province.

This report describes the methodology used, the limitations encountered, the heritage features that were identified and the recommendations and mitigation measures proposed relevant to this. The investigation consisted of a desktop study (archival sources, database survey, maps and aerial imagery) and a physical survey that also included the interviewing of relevant people. It should be noted that the implementation of the mitigation measures is subject to SAHRA/PHRA's approval.

The cultural landscape qualities of the region essentially consist of two components. The first is a rural area in which the human occupation is made up of a very limited pre-colonial Stone Age and Iron Age occupation. The second and much later component is a colonial farmer one, with a very limited urban component consisting of a number of smaller towns, most of which developed during the last 120 to 150 years.

### Identified sites

During the survey no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified.

### Limitations encountered

- During the site visit, the high and dense vegetation that covered the project area limited ground visibility very much.

### Impact assessment and proposed mitigation measures

Impact analysis of cultural heritage resources under threat of the proposed development, is based on the present understanding of the development:

- For the current study, as no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified, no mitigation measures are proposed.

### Legal requirements

The legal requirements related to heritage specifically are specified in Section 3 of this report.

- For this proposed project, the assessment has determined that no sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance occur in the project area, therefore no permits are required from SAHRA or the PHRA.
- If heritage features are identified during construction, as stated in the management recommendation, these finds would have to be assessed by a specialist, after which a decision will be made regarding the application for relevant permits.

Reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity should be authorised:

- From a heritage point of view, it is recommended that the Proposed Project be allowed to continue on acceptance of the conditions proposed below.

Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation:

- The Palaeontological Sensitivity Map (<http://www.sahra.org.za/sahris/map/palaeo>) indicate that the project area has a very high sensitivity of fossil remains to be found and therefore a palaeontological assessment would be required.
- Should archaeological sites or graves be exposed during construction work, it must immediately be reported to a heritage practitioner so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made. The appropriate steps to take are indicated in Section 9 of the report, as well as in the **Management Plan: Burial Grounds and Graves, with reference to general heritage sites**, in the Addendum, Section 13.5.



## 11. REFERENCES

---

### 11.1 Data bases

Chief Surveyor General  
Environmental Potential Atlas, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism.  
Heritage Atlas Database, Pretoria  
National Archives of South Africa  
SAHRA Archaeology and Palaeontology Report Mapping Project (2009)  
SAHRIS Database

### 11.2 Literature

Cloete, P.G. 2000. *The Anglo-Boer War: a Chronology*. Pretoria: JP van der Walt

Dreyer, J. 1992. The Iron Age of the Doornpoort, Winburg, Orange Free State. *Navorsing van die Nasionale Museum, Bloemfontein* 8(7): 261-390.

Dreyer, J. 2001. Thomas Arbousset and Francois Daumas in the Free State: tracing the exploratory tour of 1836. *South African Humanities* 13:61-96.

Dreyer, J. 2005a. *Archaeological assessment of the proposed upgrading of the R57 road (P9/2) between Reitz & Petrus Steyn, Free State*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished report.

Dreyer, J. 2005b. *Archaeological and culture history assessment of the proposed oxidation dam site at Arlington, Free State*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished report.

Dreyer, J. 2006a. *First phase archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of the proposed residential developments at Arlington, Free State*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished report.

Dreyer, J. 2006b. *First phase archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of the proposed oxidation dam installation at Arlington, Free State*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished report.

Dreyer, J. 2006c. *First phase archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of the proposed residential developments at Ntha, Lindley, Free State*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished report.

Dreyer, J. 2006d. *First phase archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of the proposed residential developments at Vriendschap 772, Petrus Steyn, Free State*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished report.

Dreyer, J. 2007a. *Archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of the proposed reservoir dam developments at Lindley, Free State*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished report.

Dreyer, J. 2007b. *Archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of the proposed residential developments at Reitz, Free State*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished report.

Dreyer, J. 2007c. *Archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of the proposed residential developments at Petrus Steyn, Free State*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished report.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Kruger, R. 1977. *Good-bye Dolly Gray: the story of the Boer War*. London: Pan Books.

Maggs, T.M.O'C. 1976. *Iron Age communities of the southern Highveld*. Pietermaritzburg: Natal Museum.

Muncina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. *The Vegetation Map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland*. Pretoria: SANBI.

Nienaber, P.J. & le Roux, C.J.P. 1982. *Vrystaat-fokus*. Roodepoort: Cum-Boeke.

Raper, P.E. 2004. *South African place names*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball Publishers.

SESA, 1974. *Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa*. Cape Town: Nasou Limited.

Watt, S. 2011. The Lindley Affair. The Capture of the 13th Battalion Imperial Yeomanry by the Boer forces. *Military History Journal* 15(3). Downloaded 01/06/2020 - <http://samilitaryhistory.org/vol153sw.html>

### **11.3 Archival sources, maps and aerial photographs**

1: 50 000 Topographic maps

Google Earth

Aerial Photographs: Chief Surveyor-General

<http://artefacts.co.za>

<http://vmus.adu.org.za>

<http://www.sahra.org.za/sahris/map/palaeo>

---

## **12. ADDENDUM**

---

### **1. Indemnity and terms of use of this report**

The findings, results, conclusions and recommendations given in this report are based on the author's best scientific and professional knowledge as well as available information. The report is based on survey and assessment techniques which are limited by time and budgetary constraints relevant to the type and level of investigation undertaken and the author reserve the right to modify aspects of the report including the recommendations if and when new information may become available from ongoing research or further work in this field, or pertaining to this investigation.

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 could be overlooked during the study. The author of this report will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result of such oversights.

Although the author exercises due care and diligence in rendering services and preparing documents, he accepts no liability and the client, by receiving this document, indemnifies the author against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, directly or indirectly by the author and by the use of the information contained in this document.

This report must not be altered or added to without the prior written consent of the author. This also refers to electronic copies of this report which are supplied for the purposes of inclusion as part of other reports, including main reports. Similarly, any recommendations, statements or conclusions drawn from or based on this report must make reference to this report. If these form part of a main report relating to this investigation or report, this report must be included in its entirety as an appendix or separate section to the main report.

## 2. Assessing the significance of heritage resources

A system for site grading was established by the NHRA and further developed by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA 2007) and has been approved by ASAPA for use in southern Africa and was utilised during this assessment.

### 2.1 Significance of the identified heritage resources

According to the NHRA, Section 2(vi) the **significance** of a heritage sites and artefacts is determined by it aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technical 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.

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

| 1. SITE EVALUATION  |   |      |        |     |
|---|---|------|--------|-----|
| 1.1 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  |   |      |        |     |
| 1.2 Aesthetic value   |   |      |        |     |
| It is important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group  |   |      |        |     |
| 1.3 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  |   |      |        |     |
| 1.4 Social value  |   |      |        |     |
| Does it have strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons  |   |      |        |     |
| 1.5 Rarity  |   |      |        |     |
| Does it possess uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage  |   |      |        |     |
| 1.6 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. |   |      |        |     |
| 2. Sphere of Significance   |   | High | Medium | Low |
| International   |   |      |        |     |
| National  |   |      |        |     |
| Provincial  |   |      |        |     |
| Regional  |   |      |        |     |
| Local   |   |      |        |     |
| Specific community  |   |      |        |     |
| 3. Field Register Rating  |   |      |        |     |
| 1.  | National/Grade 1: High significance - No alteration whatsoever without permit from SAHRA                            |      |        |     |
| 2.  | Provincial/Grade 2: High significance - No alteration whatsoever without permit from provincial heritage authority. |      |        |     |
| 3.  | Local/Grade 3A: High significance - Mitigation as part of development process not advised.                          |      |        |     |

---

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 4. | Local/Grade 3B: High significance - Could be mitigated and (part) retained as heritage register site |  |
| 5. | Generally protected 4A: High/medium significance - Should be mitigated before destruction            |  |
| 6. | Generally protected 4B: Medium significance - Should be recorded before destruction                  |  |
| 7. | Generally protected 4C: Low significance - Requires no further recording before destruction          |  |

### 3. Method of Environmental Assessment

The environmental assessment aims to identify the various possible environmental impacts that could result from the proposed activity. Different impacts need to be evaluated in terms of its significance and in doing so highlight the most critical issues to be addressed.

Significance is determined through a synthesis of impact characteristics which include context and intensity of an impact. Context refers to the geographical scale i.e. site, local, national or global whereas intensity is defined by the severity of the impact e.g. the magnitude of deviation from background conditions, the size of the area affected, the duration of the impact and the overall probability of occurrence. Significance is calculated as shown in the Table below.

Significance is an indication of the importance of the impact in terms of both physical extent and time scale, and therefore indicates the level of mitigation required. The total number of points scored for each impact indicates the level of significance of the impact.

#### Impact Rating System

Impact assessment must take account of the nature, scale and duration of impacts on the environment whether such impacts are positive or negative. Each impact is also assessed according to the project phases:

- planning
- construction
- operation
- decommissioning

Where necessary, the proposal for mitigation or optimisation of an impact should be detailed. A brief discussion of the impact and the rationale behind the assessment of its significance should also be included. The rating system is applied to the potential impacts on the receiving environment and includes an objective evaluation of the mitigation of the impact. In assessing the significance of each impact the following criteria is used:

**Table 1:** The rating system

| <b>NATURE</b>  |                            |   |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| Include a brief description of the impact of environmental parameter being assessed in the context of the project. This criterion includes a brief written statement of the environmental aspect being impacted upon by a particular action or activity. |                            |   |
| <b>GEOGRAPHICAL EXTENT</b>   |                            |   |
| This is defined as the area over which the impact will be experienced.   |                            |   |
| 1  | Site                       | The impact will only affect the site.   |
| 2  | Local/district             | Will affect the local area or district.   |
| 3  | Province/region            | Will affect the entire province or region.  |
| 4  | International and National | Will affect the entire country.   |
| <b>PROBABILITY</b>   |                            |   |
| This describes the chance of occurrence of an impact.  |                            |   |
| 1  | Unlikely                   | The chance of the impact occurring is extremely low (Less than a 25% chance of occurrence). |
| 2  | Possible                   | The impact may occur (Between a 25% to 50% chance of occurrence).                           |
| 3  | Probable                   | The impact will likely occur (Between a 50% to 75% chance of occurrence).                   |
| 4  | Definite                   | Impact will certainly occur (Greater than a 75% chance of occurrence).                      |
| <b>DURATION</b>  |                            |   |

|   |                       |  |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| This describes the duration of the impacts. Duration indicates the lifetime of the impact as a result of the proposed activity. |                       |  |
| 1   | Short term            | The impact will either disappear with mitigation or will be mitigated through natural processes in a span shorter than the construction phase (0 – 1 years), or the impact will last for the period of a relatively short construction period and a limited recovery time after construction, thereafter it will be entirely negated (0 – 2 years).                      |
| 2   | Medium term           | The impact will continue or last for some time after the construction phase but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter (2 – 10 years).  |
| 3   | Long term             | The impact and its effects will continue or last for the entire operational life of the development, but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter (10 – 30 years).  |
| 4   | Permanent             | The only class of impact that will be non-transitory. Mitigation either by man or natural process will not occur in such a way or such a time span that the impact can be considered indefinite.   |
| <b>INTENSITY/ MAGNITUDE</b>   |                       |  |
| Describes the severity of an impact.  |                       |  |
| 1   | Low                   | Impact affects the quality, use and integrity of the system/component in a way that is barely perceptible.   |
| 2   | Medium                | Impact alters the quality, use and integrity of the system/component but system/component still continues to function in a moderately modified way and maintains general integrity (some impact on integrity).   |
| 3   | High                  | Impact affects the continued viability of the system/component and the quality, use, integrity and functionality of the system or component is severely impaired and may temporarily cease. High costs of rehabilitation and remediation.  |
| 4   | Very high             | Impact affects the continued viability of the system/component and the quality, use, integrity and functionality of the system or component permanently ceases and is irreversibly impaired. Rehabilitation and remediation often impossible. If possible rehabilitation and remediation often unfeasible due to extremely high costs of rehabilitation and remediation. |
| <b>REVERSIBILITY</b>  |                       |  |
| This describes the degree to which an impact can be successfully reversed upon completion of the proposed activity.             |                       |  |
| 1   | Completely reversible | The impact is reversible with implementation of minor mitigation measures.   |
| 2   | Partly reversible     | The impact is partly reversible but more intense mitigation measures are required.   |
| 3   | Barely reversible     | The impact is unlikely to be reversed even with intense mitigation measures.   |
| 4   | Irreversible          | The impact is irreversible and no mitigation measures exist.   |
| <b>IRREPLACEABLE LOSS OF RESOURCES</b>  |                       |  |
| This describes the degree to which resources will be irreplaceably lost as a result of a proposed activity.                     |                       |  |
| 1   | No loss of resource   | The impact will not result in the loss of any resources.   |

|  |                               |  |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| 2  | Marginal loss of resource     | The impact will result in marginal loss of resources.  |
| 3  | Significant loss of resources | The impact will result in significant loss of resources.   |
| 4  | Complete loss of resources    | The impact is result in a complete loss of all resources.  |
| <b>CUMULATIVE EFFECT</b>   |                               |  |
| This describes the cumulative effect of the impacts. A cumulative impact is an effect which in itself may not be significant but may become significant if added to other existing or potential impacts emanating from other similar or diverse activities as a result of the project activity in question.  |                               |  |
| 1  | Negligible cumulative impact  | The impact would result in negligible to no cumulative effects.  |
| 2  | Low cumulative impact         | The impact would result in insignificant cumulative effects.   |
| 3  | Medium cumulative impact      | The impact would result in minor cumulative effects.   |
| 4  | High cumulative impact        | The impact would result in significant cumulative effects  |
| <b>SIGNIFICANCE</b>  |                               |  |
| Significance is determined through a synthesis of impact characteristics. Significance is an indication of the importance of the impact in terms of both physical extent and time scale, and therefore indicates the level of mitigation required. The calculation of the significance of an impact uses the following formula: (Extent + probability + reversibility + irreplaceability + duration + cumulative effect) x magnitude/intensity.<br>The summation of the different criteria will produce a non-weighted value. By multiplying this value with the magnitude/intensity, the resultant value acquires a weighted characteristic which can be measured and assigned a significance rating. |                               |  |
| Points   | Impact significance rating    | Description  |
| 6 to 28  | Negative low impact           | The anticipated impact will have negligible negative effects and will require little to no mitigation.   |
| 6 to 28  | Positive low impact           | The anticipated impact will have minor positive effects.   |
| 29 to 50   | Negative medium impact        | The anticipated impact will have moderate negative effects and will require moderate mitigation measures.  |
| 29 to 50   | Positive medium impact        | The anticipated impact will have moderate positive effects.  |
| 51 to 73   | Negative high impact          | The anticipated impact will have significant effects and will require significant mitigation measures to achieve an acceptable level of impact.                      |
| 51 to 73   | Positive high impact          | The anticipated impact will have significant positive effects.   |
| 74 to 96   | Negative very high impact     | The anticipated impact will have highly significant effects and are unlikely to be able to be mitigated adequately. These impacts could be considered "fatal flaws". |
| 74 to 96   | Positive very high impact     | The anticipated impact will have highly significant positive effects.  |



#### 4. Mitigation measures

- *Mitigation: means to anticipate and prevent negative impacts and risks, then to minimise them, rehabilitate or repair impacts to the extent feasible.*

Impacts can be managed through one or a combination of the following mitigation measures:

- Avoidance
- Investigation (archaeological)
- Rehabilitation
- Interpretation
- Memorialisation
- Enhancement (positive impacts)

For the current study, the following mitigation measures are proposed, to be implemented only if any of the identified sites or features are to be impacted on by the proposed development activities:

- (1) Avoidance/Preserve: This is viewed to be the primary form of mitigation and applies where any type of development occurs within a formally protected or significant or sensitive heritage context and is likely to have a high negative impact. This measure often includes the change / alteration of development planning and therefore impact zones in order not to impact on resources. The site should be retained *in situ* and a buffer zone should be created around it, either temporary (by means of danger tape) or permanently (wire fence or built wall). Depending on the type of site, the buffer zone can vary from
  - 10 metres for a single grave, or a built structure, to
  - 50 metres where the boundaries are less obvious, e.g. a Late Iron Age site.
- (2) Archaeological investigation/Relocation of graves: This option can be implemented with additional design and construction inputs. This is appropriate where development occurs in a context of heritage significance and where the impact is such that it can be mitigated. Mitigation is to excavate the site by archaeological techniques, document the site (map and photograph) and analyse the recovered material to acceptable standards. This can only be done by a suitably qualified archaeologist.
  - This option should be implemented when it is impossible to avoid impacting on an identified site or feature.
  - This also applies for graves older than 60 years that are to be relocated. For graves younger than 60 years a permit from SAHRA is not required. However, all other legal requirements must be adhered to.
    - Impacts can be beneficial – e.g. mitigation contribute to knowledge
- (3) Rehabilitation: When features, e.g. buildings or other structures are to be re-used. Rehabilitation is considered in heritage management terms as an intervention typically involving the adding of a new heritage layer to enable a new sustainable use.
  - The heritage resource is degraded or in the process of degradation and would benefit from rehabilitation.
  - Where rehabilitation implies appropriate conservation interventions, i.e. adaptive reuse, repair and maintenance, consolidation and minimal loss of historical fabric.
    - Conservation measures would be to record the buildings/structures as they are (at a particular point in time). The records and recordings would then become the ‘artefacts’ to be preserved and managed as heritage features or (movable) objects.
    - This approach automatically also leads to the enhancement of the sites or features that are re-used.

- (4) Mitigation is also possible with additional design and construction inputs. Although linked to the previous measure (rehabilitation) a secondary though 'indirect' conservation measure would be to use the existing architectural 'vocabulary' of the structure as guideline for any new designs.
  - The following principle should be considered: **heritage informs design**.
    - This approach automatically also leads to the enhancement of the sites or features that are re-used.
- (5) No further action required: This is applicable only where sites or features have been rated to be of such low significance that it does not warrant further documentation, as it is viewed to be fully documented after inclusion in this report.
  - Site monitoring during development, by an ECO or the heritage specialist are often added to this recommendation to ensure that no undetected heritage/remains are destroyed.

## 5. Management Plan: Burial Grounds and Graves, with reference to general heritage sites

### 1. Background

Burial grounds and graves are viewed as having high emotional and sentimental value and accordingly always carry a high cultural heritage significance rating. Best practice principles dictate that they should preferably be preserved *in situ*. It is only when it is unavoidable and the site cannot be retained, that the graves should be exhumed and relocated after all due processes had been successfully implemented.

For retaining the burial sites and graves, the SAHRA Burial Grounds and Graves (BGG) unit requires a detailed Heritage Management Plan (HMP) clearly outlining a grave management plan that provides details of grave management and access protocols. In addition, the HMP should also provide detailed change finds protocol or procedures in the case of the identification human remains.

The primary aim of the Burial Grounds and Graves Management Plan therefore is to assist in the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce potential negative impacts through the modification of the proposed project development design.

### 2. Legal Implications

South Africa's unique and non-renewable archaeological and palaeontological heritage sites, inclusive of burial grounds and graves, are 'generally' protected in terms various laws and by-laws:

- Nationally: National Heritage Resources Act, No. 25 of 1999;

In addition, the following also refer specifically to burial grounds and graves:

- Human Tissue Act, No. 65 of 1983;
- Section 46 of the National Health Act, No. 61 of 2003;
- Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance (Ordinance No. 7 of 1925)
- By-laws:
  - R363 of 2013: Regulations Relating to the Management of Human Remains
  - Local Authorities Notice 34 of 2017, Cemeteries, Crematoria and Funeral Undertakers By-Laws as per Provincial Gazette of 7 April 2017 No. 2800.

In terms of the National Heritage Resources Act, No. 25 of 1999, graves and burial grounds are divided into the following categories:

- Ancestral graves;
- Royal graves and graves of traditional leaders;
- Graves of victims of conflict;
- Graves of individuals designated by the Minister by notice in the Gazette;
- Historical graves and cemeteries; and
- Other human remains which are not covered in terms of the Human Tissue Act, 1983 (Act No. 65 of 1983);

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:

- Destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;
- 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

- 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.

Marked graves younger than 60 years do not fall under the protection of the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999) with the result that exhumation, relocation and reburial can be conducted by a register undertaker. This will include logistical aspects such as social consultation, purchasing of plots in cemeteries, procurement of coffins, etc.

Marked graves older than 60 years are protected by the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999) as a result an archaeologist must be in attendance to assist with the exhumation and documentation of the graves. Unmarked graves are by default regarded as older than 60 years and therefore also falls under the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999, Section 36).

### 3. Management Plan

#### 3.1 Definitions

*Heritage Site Management:* Heritage site management is the control of the elements that make up physical and social environment of a site, its physical condition, land use, human visitors, interpretation, etc. Management may be aimed at preservation or, if necessary, at minimizing damage or destruction or at presentation of the site to the public. A site management plan is designed to retain the significance of the place. It ensures that the preservation, enhancement, presentation and maintenance of the place/site is deliberately and thoughtfully designed to protect the heritage values of the place (from: *SAHRA Site management plans: guidelines for the development of plans for the management of heritage sites or places*).

*Mitigation:* means to anticipate and prevent negative impacts and risks, then to minimise them, rehabilitate or repair impacts to the extent feasible.

#### 3.2 Heritage management plan (HMP)

##### 3.2.1 Phase 1: Site identification and verification

***This part of the process usually take place during the Phase 1 heritage impact assessment and is discussed in Section 7 of the main body of the HIA.***

Locality and identification:

- The location of the identified site (e.g. farm name, GPS coordinates) is given;
- Determination of the number of graves and the date range of the burials.

The physical condition of the site is also described in terms of:

- The condition of the burial grounds and graves, e.g. has the headstones been pushed over;
- The approximate number of graves and the date range of the graves;
- Is the site fenced off;
- Is there access to the site, in the case it is fenced off;
- Has the site recently been visited by next of kin or other individuals;
- The status of the vegetation cover on the site.

##### 3.2.2 Phase 2: Determination of the potential impact on the identified sites

**Identified impacts on the graves and burial sites are calculated and discussed in Section 8.1 of the main body of the HIA.**

The second phase consists of information that should be collected in order to develop the conservation management plan. This includes:

- The needs of the client;
- External needs, i.e. the next of kin;
- Requirements for the maintenance of the cultural significance.

From the above an evaluation is made of the impact of the proposed development project on the status of each of the identified burial grounds and graves.

### 3.2.3 Phase 3: Mitigation measures

**Proposed mitigation measures for each identified burial ground or graves are developed and is discussed in the main body of the HIA (Section 8.2).**

The main aim of the mitigation measures, as far as is feasible, is to remove any physical, direct impacts on the burial grounds and graves.

- A minimum buffer of 20m must be established around known burial grounds and graves for the duration of the mining/construction phase. This is relevant where the burial site has been static for a considerable period of time and has already been fenced off;
- In cases the burial site is still in use and might expand in the future and is not fenced off, a minimum buffer of 100m should be implemented;
- In the case where blasting takes place during mining activities, the buffers should increase correspondingly to 200m;
- The buffers must be clearly demarcated, and signage placed during the construction/mining period;
- Access to the graves should be allowed to the descendants. However, they should adhere to the managing authorities' conditions regarding permissions, appointments, health, environment and safety.
- The areas with graves should be kept clean and the grass short so that visitors may enter it without any concerns.
  - However, this might create problems as in many cases not all graves are well-marked, carrying the possibility that they might inadvertently be damaged and therefore contractors/land-owners might not be will to accept this responsibility. The descendants should therefore be held responsible for the maintenance of the site.
- Sites that are located close to access/haul roads might need additional mitigation. All personnel and especially drivers of heavy haul vehicles should be informed where these sites are, and they should keep to the speed limits (usually 30km/h on mining sites);
- Any change in the development layout, future development plans, condition of the grave sites and individual graves should immediately be reported to the heritage inspector/SAHRA for guidance;
- Relevant strategies should be put in place for the managing of the burial grounds and graves after the closure of the mine or the completion of the project. It needs to be stated that the land-owner or developer always will be responsible for the preservation of the site. Therefore, measures should be put in place to ensure that the site is handled appropriately after closure, which, in essence would entail the continuation measures already put in place;

### 3.3 Management strategy

**A general approach to this is set out in Section 9 of the main body of the HIA report and is equally applicable to general heritage sites and feature as well as to burial grounds and graves.**

A strategy for the implementation of the conservation plan is developed:

- A heritage practitioner should be appointed to develop a heritage induction program and conduct training for the ECO, as well as team leaders, in the identification of heritage resources and artefacts;
- Known sites must be demarcated and fenced off and signage placed during the construction/mining period;
- This management strategy should be applicable to the construction, operation as well as the post operation phases of the development/mining activities.
- Relevant strategies should be put in place for the managing of the burial grounds and graves after the closure of the mine or the completion of the project. It needs to be stated that the land-owner or developer always will be responsible for the preservation of the site. Therefore, measures should be put in place to ensure that the site is handled appropriately after closure, which, in essence would entail the continuation measures already put in place;
- The managing authority should be able to regularly inspect the sites in order to ensure that construction and other such activities do not damage the graves;
  - SAHRA and the relevant PHRA are the competent authorities responsible for the regulation of the HMP in terms of the national legislative framework. The NHRA states:
 

*36(1) Where it is not the responsibility of any other authority, SAHRA must conserve and generally care for burial grounds and graves protected in terms of this section, and it may make the necessary arrangement for their conservation as they see fit.*

#### 4. Relocation of graves

Once it has been decided to relocate particular graves, the following steps should be taken:

- Notices of the intention to relocate the graves need to be put up at the burial site for a period of 60 days. This should contain information where communities and family members can contact the developer/archaeologist/public-relations officer/undertaker. All information pertaining to the identification of the graves needs to be documented for the application of a SAHRA permit. The notices need to be in at least 3 languages, English, and two other languages. This is a requirement by law.
- Notices of the intention needs to be placed in at least two local newspapers and have the same information as the above point. This is a requirement by law.
- Local radio stations can also be used to try contact family members. This is not required by law, but is helpful in trying to contact family members.
- During this time (60 days) a suitable cemetery need to be identified close to the development area or otherwise one specified by the family of the deceased.
- An open day for family members should be arranged after the period of 60 days so that they can gather to discuss the way forward, and to sort out any problems. The developer needs to take the families requirements into account. This is a requirement by law.
- Once the 60 days has passed and all the information from the family members have been received, a permit can be requested from SAHRA. This is a requirement by law.
- Once the permit has been received, the graves may be exhumed and relocated.
- All headstones must be relocated with the graves as well as any items found in the grave.

Information needed for the SAHRA permit application:

- The permit application needs to be done by an archaeologist.
- A map of the area where the graves have been located.
- A survey report of the area prepared by an archaeologist.
- All the information on the families that have identified graves.

- If graves have not been identified and there are no headstones to indicate the grave, these are then unknown graves and should be handled as if they are older than 60 years. This information also needs to be given to SAHRA.
- A letter from the landowner giving permission to the developer to exhume and relocate the graves.
- A letter from the new cemetery confirming that the graves will be reburied there.
- Details of the farm name and number, magisterial district and GPS coordinates of the gravesite.

## 5. Defining next of kin

An extensive Burial Grounds and Graves Consultation process must be implemented in accordance with NHRA Regulations to identify bona fide next of kin and reach agreement regarding relocation of graves.

Anthropologically speaking three type of kin are distinguished: patrilineal (called *agnates*), maternal (*uterine* kin) and kin by marriage (*affines*). All three categories have their important part to play in social life.

In terminologies used in the west the close-knit group of family members is clearly marked off from other kin - family terms, such as 'father', 'mother', 'brother' and 'sister' are never used for aunts, uncles and cousins.

In many non-western societies this is not the case and the family is merged with the wider group of kin and the family terms are applied much more widely. Next of kin for the Southern Bantu-language speakers is based on a classificatory system where a man uses a term to refer to three significant relatives – his father, his father's brother and his mother's brother.

For example, a man (A) may call his father's brother (i.e. uncle) also a father. All of that latter person's children will then also be called his (A) brothers and sisters, prohibiting him from marrying any of them (however, *vide* preferred marriages). In Anthropology this system is referred to as the Iroquois system (with reference to the North American Indian tribe where it was first described). When a man calls his father's brother 'father' a suffix is usually added to indicate whether he is an elder or junior brother (e.g. *(ra)mogolo* = elder brother; *(ra)ngwane* = junior brother; also *(ra)kgadi* = younger sister; *(ma)lome* = mother's brother)(SePedi terminology is used).

Consultants having to relocate graves might find it confusing if they do not have insight into this complex system of kinship, where, for example a single individual can have more than one father or mother.

## 6. Chance find procedures

***A general approach to this is set out in Section 9 of the main body of the HIA report and is equally applicable to general heritage sites and features as to burial grounds and graves.***

- A heritage practitioner should be appointed to develop a heritage induction program and conduct training for the ECO, as well as team leaders, in the identification of heritage resources and artefacts;
- An appropriately qualified heritage consultant should be identified to be called upon if any possible heritage resources or artefacts are identified;
- Should an archaeological site or cultural material be discovered during construction (or operation), the area should be demarcated, and construction activities be halted;

- The qualified archaeologist will then need to come out to the site and evaluate the extent and importance of the heritage resources and make the necessary recommendations for mitigating the find and impact on the heritage resource;
- The contractor therefore should have some sort of contingency plan so that operations could move elsewhere temporarily while the material and data are recovered;
- Should the heritage consultant conclude that the find is a heritage resource protected in terms of the NHRA (1999) Sections 34, 35, 37 and NHRA (1999) Regulations (Regulation 38, 39, 40), he or she should notify SAHRA and/or the relevant PHRA;
- Based on the comments received from SAHRA and/or the PHRA, the heritage consultant would present the relevant terms of reference to the client for implementation;
- Construction/Operational activities can commence as soon as the site has been cleared and signed off by the archaeologist.



## 7. Curriculum vitae

### Johan Abraham van Schalkwyk

#### Personal particulars

Date of birth: 14 April 1952  
Identity number: 520414 5099 08 4  
Marital status: Married; one daughter  
Nationality: South African

#### Current address: home

62 Coetzer Ave, Monument Park, Pretoria, 0181  
Mobile: 076 790 6777; E-mail: jvschalkwyk@mweb.co.za

#### Qualifications

1995 DLitt et Phil (Anthropology), University of South Africa  
1985 MA (Anthropology), University of Pretoria  
1981 BA (Hons), Anthropology, University of Pretoria  
1979 Post Graduate Diploma in Museology, University of Pretoria  
1978 BA (Hons), Archaeology, University of Pretoria  
1976 BA, University of Pretoria

#### Non-academic qualifications

12th HSRC-School in Research Methodology - July 1990  
Dept. of Education and Training Management Course - June 1992  
Social Assessment Professional Development Course - 1994  
Integrated Environmental Management Course, UCT - 1994

#### Professional experience

Private Practice  
2017 - current: Professional Heritage Consultant

#### National Museum of Cultural History

1992 - 2017: Senior researcher: Head of Department of Research. Manage an average of seven researchers in this department and supervise them in their research projects. Did various projects relating to Anthropology and Archaeology in Limpopo Province, Mpumalanga, North West Province and Gauteng. Headed the Museum's Section for Heritage Impact Assessments.  
1978 - 1991: Curator of the Anthropological Department of the Museum. Carried out extensive fieldwork in both anthropology and archaeology

#### Department of Archaeology, University of Pretoria

1976 - 1977: Assistant researcher responsible for excavations at various sites in Limpopo Province and Mpumalanga.

#### Awards and grants

1. Hanisch Book Prize for the best final year Archaeology student, University of Pretoria - 1976.
2. Special merit award, National Cultural History Museum - 1986.
3. Special merit award, National Cultural History Museum - 1991.
4. Grant by the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, to visit the various African countries to study museums, sites and cultural programmes - 1993.
5. Grant by the USA National Parks Service, to visit the United States of America to study museums, sites, tourism development, cultural programmes and impact assessment programmes - 1998.
6. Grant by the USA embassy, Pretoria, under the Bi-national Commission Exchange Support Fund, to visit cultural institutions in the USA and to attend a conference in Charleston - 2000.
7. Grant by the National Research Foundation to develop a model for community-based tourism - 2001.

8. Grant by the National Research Foundation to develop a model for community-based tourism - 2013. In association with RARI, Wits University.

**Publications**

Published more than 70 papers, mostly in scientifically accredited journals, but also as chapters in books.

**Conference Contributions**

Regularly presented papers at conferences, locally as well as internationally, on various research topics, ranging in scope from archaeology, anthropological, historical, cultural historical and tourism development.

**Heritage Impact Assessments**

Since 1992, I have done more than 2000 Phase 1 and Phase 2 impact assessments (archaeological, anthropological, historical and social) for various government departments and developers. Projects include environmental management frameworks, roads, pipeline-, and power line developments, dams, mining, water purification works, historical landscapes, refuse dumps and urban developments.

**Latest publications**

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2020. A cognitive approach to ordering of the world: some case studies from the Sotho- and Tswana-speaking people of South Africa. In Whitley, D.S., Loubser, J.H.N. & Whitelaw, G. (eds.) *Cognitive Archaeology. Mind, Ethnography, and the Past in South African and Beyond*. London: Routledge. Pp. 184-200.

Namono, C. & Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2020. Appropriating colonial dress in the rock art of the Makgabeng plateau, South Africa. In Wingfield, C., Giblin, J. & King, R. (eds) *The pasts and presence of art in South Africa: Technologies, Ontologies and Agents*. University of Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research. Pp. 51-62.