

**Cultural heritage impact assessment for
THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON PORTION 11 OF THE FARM
AMSTERDAM 408IT, MKHONDO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY,
MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON PORTION 11 OF THE FARM AMSTERDAM 408IT, MKHONDO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE

Report No: 2016/JvS/077
Status: Final
Revision No: 0
Date: October 2016

Prepared for:
Lidwala Consulting Engineers

Representative: Ms M Mochesane
Postal Address: PO Box 32497, Waverley, Pretoria, 0135
Tel: 0861 543 9252
E-mail: MMochesane@lidwala.com

Prepared by:
J 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
Mobile: 076 790 6777
Fax: 086 611 3902
E-mail: jvschalkwyk@mweb.co.za

Copy Right:

This report is confidential and 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.

Declaration:

I, J.A. van Schalkwyk, declare that I do not have any financial or personal interest in the proposed development, nor its developers or any of their subsidiaries, apart from the provision of heritage assessment and management services, for which a fair numeration is charged.



J A van Schalkwyk (D Litt et Phil)
Heritage Consultant
October 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON PORTION 11 OF THE FARM AMSTERDAM 408IT, MKHONDO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE

It is proposed to develop a township on a section of land located west of the town of Amsterdam in the Mkhondo Local Municipality of Mpumalanga Province. For this purposes two sections of land was identified and are labelled Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

In accordance with Section 38 of the NHRA, an independent heritage consultant was appointed by Lidwala Consulting Engineers to conduct a cultural heritage assessment to determine if the proposed development would have an impact on any sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance.

The cultural landscape qualities of the region is made up of a pre-colonial element consisting of limited Stone Age and Iron Age occupation, as well as a much later colonial (farmer) component, which gave rise to an urban component.

Identified sites

Alternative Site 1

- (7.3.3.1) An informal church marked by white-washed stones occurs on the south western corner of the proposed site. It is typical of such sites used by Zionists and Apostolic Faith Church groups.
 - The significance of the identified site is rated as: **High on a local level – Grade III.**

Alternative Site 2

- (7.3.3.01) A number of rectangular cement slabs that probably formed the floors for structures that were erected on it. It is very similar to what is found on old construction camps (e.g. for road construction).
 - The significance of the identified site is rated as: **Low on a local level – Grade III.**
- (7.3.3.02 – 7.3.3.13) A number of circular stone walled structures that seems to conform to a pattern, consisting of a single large circle, with as smaller circular structure (sometimes two) near the opening of the larger structure. In a few cases a small pile of stones forms a platform inside the larger structure. At present it is impossible to date these features but it is proposed that they belong to the early historic period.
 - The significance of the identified site is rated as: **Medium on a regional level – Grade III.**

Impact assessment

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

The impacts of the proposed development could be direct or physical but will not be indirect and cumulative.

Alternative Site 1

- (7.3.3.1) An informal church marked by white-washed stones occurs on the south western corner of the proposed site. It is typical of such sites used by Zionists and Apostolic Faith Church groups.
 - The significance weighting for the impact on the identified site is rated as **low**.
 - Mitigation: As this feature is still in use by the local community, they should be consulted about the relocation of the site before development takes place.

Alternative Site 2

- (7.3.3.01) A number of rectangular cement slabs that probably formed the floors for structures that were erected on it. It is very similar to what is found on old construction camps (e.g. for road construction).
 - The significance weighting for the impact on the identified site is rated as **low**.
 - Mitigation: As very little of this structure remains, it is seen to be fully documented after inclusion in this report.
- (7.3.3.02 – 7.3.3.13) A number of circular stone walled structures that seems to conform to a pattern, consisting of a single large circle, with as smaller circular structure (sometimes two) near the opening of the larger structure. In a few cases a small pile of stones forms a platform inside the larger structure. At present it is impossible to date these features but it is proposed that they belong to the early historic period.
 - The significance weighting for the impact on the identified site is rated as **medium**.
 - Mitigation: It is recommended that these features are documented (mapped and photographed) if it is to be impacted on by the proposed housing development.

Comparative Alternative Site assessment

- Due to the large number of identified heritage sites identified on Alternative Site 2, Alternative Site 1 is seen to be the preferred site.

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

- From a heritage point of view it is recommended that the proposed development be allowed to continue on acceptance and implementation of the above mitigation measures.

Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation:

- 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J A van Schalkwyk'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of each word being capitalized and prominent.

J A van Schalkwyk
Heritage Consultant
October 2016

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Property details						
Province	Mpumalanga					
Magisterial district	Ermelo					
Local municipality	Mkhondo					
Topo-cadastral map	2630DA					
Farm name	Amsterdam 408IT					
Closest town	Amsterdam					
Coordinates	Centre point					
	No	Latitude	Longitude	No	Latitude	Longitude
	1	S 26.63283	E 30.64974			

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	Yes
Any other development category, public open space, squares, parks, recreation grounds	No

Development	
Description	Development of a township
Project name	-

Land use	
Previous land use	Farming
Current land use	Vacant/Farming

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	II
TECHNICAL SUMMARY	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VI
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	VII
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE	1
3. HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	2
4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	3
5. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSESSMENT	5
6. PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	7
7. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	8
8. MANAGEMENT MEASURES.....	16
9. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
10. REFERENCES.....	20
APPENDIX 1: INDEMNITY AND TERMS OF USE OF THIS REPORT	21
APPENDIX 2. SPECIALIST COMPETENCY.....	22
APPENDIX 3: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF IDENTIFIED HERITAGE RESOURCES	23
APPENDIX 4. RELEVANT LEGISLATION	24
APPENDIX 5. RELOCATION OF GRAVES	26
APPENDIX 6: INVENTORY OF IDENTIFIED CULTURAL HERITAGE SITES.....	27

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Fig. 1. Map indicating the track log of the field survey – Alternative 1.....	4
Fig. 2. Map indicating the track log of the field survey – Alternative 2.....	5
Fig. 3. Location of the two alternative study areas.	8
Fig. 4. Views over Alternative 1 study area.....	9
Fig. 5. Views over Alternative 2 area.	9
Fig. 6. Location of the identified sites: Alternative 1.	12
Fig. 7. Location of the identified sites: Alternative 2.	14

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

TERMS

Study area: Refers to the entire study area as indicated by the client in the accompanying Fig. 1 - 2.

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	2 000 000 - 150 000 Before Present
Middle Stone Age	150 000 - 30 000 BP
Later Stone Age	30 000 - until c. AD 200

Iron Age: 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 they herded cattle as well as 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
Late Iron Age	AD 1300 - AD 1830

Historical Period: Since the arrival of the white settlers - c. AD 1840 - in this part of the country.

ABBREVIATIONS

ADRC	Archaeological Data Recording Centre
ASAPA	Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists
CS-G	Chief Surveyor-General
EIA	Early Iron Age
ESA	Early Stone Age
LIA	Late Iron Age
LSA	Later Stone Age
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NASA	National Archives of South Africa
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Agency
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON PORTION 11 OF THE FARM AMSTERDAM 408IT, MKHONDO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE

1. INTRODUCTION

It is proposed to develop a township on a section of land located west of the town of Amsterdam in the Mkhondo Local Municipality of Mpumalanga Province. For this purposes two sections of land was identified and are labelled Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

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 (NHRA), No. 25 of 1999, 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 Lidwala Consulting Engineers to conduct a cultural heritage assessment to determine if the proposed development would have an impact on any sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance.

This report forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) 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).

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The aim of a full 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 heritage impact assessment 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 will receive permission to proceed with the proposed development, on condition of successful implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

2.1 Scope of work

The aim of this study is to determine if any sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance occur within the boundaries of the area where the development is to take place.

This includes:

- Conducting a desk-top investigation of the area;
- A visit to the proposed development site,

The objectives were to:

- Identify possible archaeological, cultural and historic sites within the proposed development areas;
- 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.

2.2 Limitations

The investigation has been influenced by the following factors:

- Access to the various properties could not be attained.
- It is assumed that the description of the proposed project, provided by the client, is accurate.
- No subsurface investigation (i.e. excavations or sampling) were undertaken, since a permit from SAHRA is required for such activities.
- It is assumed that the public consultation process undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is sufficient and that it does not have to be repeated as part of the heritage impact assessment.
- The unpredictability of buried archaeological remains.
- This report does not consider the palaeontological potential of the site.

3. HERITAGE RESOURCES

3.1 The National Estate

The NHRA (No. 25 of 1999) 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 was developed whereby the above criteria were applied for the determination of the significance of each identified site (see Appendix 1). This allowed some form of control over the application of similar values for similar identified sites.

4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Extent of the Study

This survey and impact assessment covers the area as presented in Section 6 below and illustrated in Figure 2.

4.2 Methodology

4.2.1.1 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 10.

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

4.2.1.2 Data bases

The *Heritage Atlas Database*, 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.

4.2.1.3 Other sources

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

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

4.2.2 Field survey

The field survey was done according to generally accepted archaeological practices, and was aimed at locating all possible sites, objects and structures. The area that had to be investigated was identified by Lidwala Consulting Engineers by means of maps and .kml files indicating the development area. This was loaded onto a Nexus 7 tablet and used in Google Earth during the field survey to access the areas. As the second Alternative was only identified after the first site visit, as second site visit was done a few months later.

The Alternative 1 study area was visited on 9 May 2016. The area was investigated by crossing it is a number of transects – see Fig. 1 below.




Fig. 1. Map indicating the track log of the field survey – Alternative 1.

The Alternative 2 study area was visited on 15 October 2016. The area was investigated by crossing it in a number of transects – see Fig. 2 below.




Fig. 2. Map indicating the track log of the field survey – Alternative 2.

The following is relevant to the field survey:

- *During the site visit the archaeological visibility was slightly limited by the vegetation encountered.*

4.2.3 Documentation

All sites, objects and structures that are 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 in order to facilitate the identification of each locality.

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.

Map datum used: Hartebeeshoek 94 (WGS84).

5. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSESSMENT

5.1 Heritage assessment criteria and grading

The National Heritage Resources Act, Act no. 25 of 1999, stipulates the assessment criteria and grading of heritage sites. The following grading categories are distinguished in Section 7 of the Act:

- **Grade I:** Heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance;
- **Grade II:** Heritage resources which, although forming part of the national estate, can be considered to have special qualities which make them significant within the context of a province or a region; and
- **Grade III:** Other heritage resources worthy of conservation on a local authority level.

A matrix was developed whereby the criteria, as set out in Sections 3(3) and 7 of the NHRA, were applied for each identified site (see Appendix 1). This allowed some form of control over the application of similar values for similar sites.

The occurrence of sites with a Grade I significance will demand that the development activities be drastically altered in order to retain these sites in their original state. For Grade II and Grade III sites, the applicable of mitigation measures would allow the development activities to continue.

5.2 Methodology for the assessment of potential impacts

All impacts identified during the EIA stage of the study will be classified in terms of their significance. Issues were assessed in terms of the following criteria:

- The **nature**, a description of what causes the effect, what will be affected and how it will be affected;
- The physical **extent**, wherein it is indicated whether:
 - 1 - the impact will be limited to the site;
 - 2 - the impact will be limited to the local area;
 - 3 - the impact will be limited to the region;
 - 4 - the impact will be national; or
 - 5 - the impact will be international;
- The **duration**, wherein it is indicated whether the lifetime of the impact will be:
 - 1 - of a very short duration (0–1 years);
 - 2 - of a short duration (2-5 years);
 - 3 - medium-term (5–15 years);
 - 4 - long term (> 15 years); or
 - 5 - permanent;
- The **magnitude** of impact, quantified on a scale from 0-10, where a score is assigned:
 - 0 - small and will have no effect;
 - 2 - minor and will not result in an impact;
 - 4 - low and will cause a slight impact;
 - 6 - moderate and will result in processes continuing but in a modified way;
 - 8 – high, (processes are altered to the extent that they temporarily cease); or
 - 10 - very high and results in complete destruction of patterns and permanent cessation of processes;
- The **probability** of occurrence, which describes the likelihood of the impact actually occurring and is estimated on a scale where:
 - 1 - very improbable (probably will not happen);
 - 2 - improbable (some possibility, but low likelihood);
 - 3 - probable (distinct possibility);
 - 4 - highly probable (most likely); or
 - 5 - definite (impact will occur regardless of any prevention measures);
- The **significance**, which is determined through a synthesis of the characteristics described above (refer formula below) and can be assessed as low, medium or high;
- The **status**, which is described as either positive, negative or neutral;
- The degree to which the impact can be reversed;
- The degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources; and
- The degree to which the impact can be mitigated.

The **significance** is determined by combining the criteria in the following formula:

$$S = (E+D+M) \times P; \text{ where}$$

S = Significance weighting

E = Extent

D = Duration

M = Magnitude

P = Probability

The **significance weightings** for each potential impact are calculated as follows:

Table 1: Significance ranking

Significance of impact					
Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance	Weight
-	-	-	-	-	-

Points	Significant Weighting	Discussion
< 30 points	Low	where this impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area
31-60 points	Medium	where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area unless it is effectively mitigated
> 60 points	High	where the impact must have an influence on the decision process to develop in the area

6. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

6.1 Site location

The survey sites are located on the western outskirts of the town of Amsterdam in the Mkhondo Local Municipality of Mpumalanga Province. For more information, please see the Technical Summary presented above (p. iii).




Fig. 3. Location of the two alternative study areas.
(Map 2630DA: Chief Surveyor-General)

6.2 Development proposal

It is proposed to develop a township on a section of Council Owned Land. The total area to be developed is 100 ha. For this purposes two sections of land was identified and are labelled Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Based on the findings of the EIA, the most suitable alternative will be selected for the development.

7. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

7.1 Site description

The geology is made up of arenite, changing to tuff to the north of the study area. The original vegetation is classified as North-eastern Mountain Grassland. However, most of the area was used for agricultural activities, which would have had an impact on any heritage features that might have occurred here in the past.



Fig. 4. Views over Alternative 1 study area.



Fig. 5. Views over Alternative 2 area.

7.2 Overview of the region

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 study area, within the context of their historic, aesthetic, scientific and social value, rarity and representivity – see Section 3.2 and Appendix 1 for more information.

The cultural landscape qualities of the region is made up of a pre-colonial element consisting of limited Stone Age and Iron Age occupation, as well as a much later colonial (farmer) component, which gave rise to an urban component.

7.2.1 Stone Age

The larger region has been inhabited by humans since at least Middle Stone Age (MSA) times. During Middle Stone Age (MSA) times (c. 150 000 – 30 000 BP), people became more mobile, occupying areas formerly avoided. Open sites were 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.

Late Stone Age (LSA) people had even more advanced technology than the MSA people and therefore succeeded in occupying even more diverse habitats. Also, for the first time we now get evidence of people's activities derived from material other than stone tools. Ostrich eggshell beads, ground bone arrowheads, small bored stones and wood fragments with incised markings are traditionally linked with the LSA.

LSA people preferred, though not exclusively, to occupy rock shelters and caves 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. A number of sites with rock art are known from the Chrissiesmeer region.

7.2.2 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. Having only had cereals (sorghum, millet) that need summer rainfall, Early Iron Age (EIA) people did not move outside this rainfall zone, and neither did they occupy the central interior highveld area. Because of their specific technology and economy, Iron Age people preferred to settle on the alluvial soils near rivers for agricultural purposes, but also for firewood and water.

The occupation of the larger geographical area (including the study 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, windswept plains of the Free State and the Mpumalanga highveld.

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.

This wet period came to a sudden end sometime between 1800 and 1820 by a major drought lasting 3 to 5 years. The drought must have caused an agricultural collapse on a large, subcontinent scale.

This was also a period of great military tension. Armed Griqua and Korana raiders on horseback were active in the northern Cape and Orange Free State by about 1790. The Xhosa were raiding across the Orange River about 1805. Military pressure from Zululand spilled onto the highveld by at least 1821. Various marauding groups of displaced Sotho-Tswana moved across the plateau in the 1820s. Mzilikazi raided the plateau extensively between 1825 and 1837. The Boers trekked into this area in the 1830s.

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.

A number of stone-walled archaeological sites, which are dated to the Late Iron Age (c. AD 1640 - AD 1830s), were identified west of the study area, and some of them have been excavated (Pelsner et al 2007). These sites are conventionally associated with Tswana-speaking people.

Whereas it is impossible to correlate any living group of people to Early Iron Age communities, it is possible, by using ethnographic evidence, to identify some of the groups of people that entered the region in pre-colonial times (i.e. the Later Iron Age) and are currently settled in the larger region. The Tswana-speakers were located to the south and west in the study area, with the Ndzundza Ndebele (Nguni-speakers) to the north. The eastern section of the study area was occupied by Swazi-speakers, also of Nguni origin.

7.2.3 Historic period

Things were set to change drastically during the early part of the 19th century. Not only was it a time of population movement resulting from events to the south and east, but it was also the arrival of the first white settlers in the area.

Currently, a number of towns exist in the area, with Volksrus and Piet Retief the larger ones. All of these date to the latter half of the 19th century and each has its own history as each developed for a particular reason. As they were small and largely served farming communities, they did not expand rapidly. Consequently, all of them retained many buildings (shops, houses, churches, schools) and other features (cemeteries) of heritage significance.

The various battles and skirmishes resulting from the conflict during the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) had a huge impact on heritage resources in the area, as many farms were burned down. Conversely, it also left a legacy of heritage sites scattered across the veld: fortifications and war cemeteries occur all over.

However, the area remained up till today, a largely farming orientated community. Much of the heritage potential of the study area is therefore located within the many farmsteads in the area. Farmhouses and related structures (e.g. barns, sheds, etc.), as well as cemeteries, dot the landscape. Equally important, are the homesteads, related structures and cemeteries of the farm labourers living on these farms.

Industrial and mining activities also took place in the region, on an ever increasing scale. Coal mining date to the beginning of the 20th century, although there is written evidence that it was exploited by farmers prior to that. Forestry also became a big operation, going back as far as the early 1900s.

7.3 Identified sites

The following sites, features and objects of cultural significance were identified in the study area – see Appendix 5 for a discussion of each individual site.

In terms of Section 7 of the NHRA, all the sites currently known or which are expected to occur in the study area are evaluated to have a grading as identified in the table below.

Alternative site 1

7.3.1 Stone Age

- No sites, features or objects dating to the Stone Age were identified in the study area.

7.3.2 Iron Age

- No sites, features or objects dating to the Iron Age were identified in the study area.

7.3.3 Historic period

- (7.3.3.1) An informal church marked by white-washed stones occurs on the south western corner of the proposed site. It is typical of such sites used by Zionists and Apostolic Faith Church groups.
 - The significance of the identified site is rated as: **High on a local level – Grade III.**

Table 2. Summary of identified heritage resources in Alternative study area 1.

IDENTIFIED HERITAGE RESOURCES			
NHRA category	Number	Coordinates	Impact rating
Formal protections (NHRA)			
National heritage site (Section 27)	None	-	-
Provincial heritage site (Section 27)	None	-	-
Provisional protection (Section 29)	None	-	-
Listed in heritage register (Section 30)	None	-	-
General protections (NHRA)			
Structures older than 60 years (Section 34)			
Archaeological site or material (Section 35)			
Palaeontological site or material (Section 35)	None	-	-
Graves or burial grounds (Section 36)	None	-	-
Public monuments or memorials (Section 37)	None	-	-
Other			
Any other heritage resources (describe)	7.3.3.1	S26.64137 E30.65456	Low




Fig. 6. Location of the identified sites: Alternative 1. (Map 2630DA: Chief Surveyor-General)

Alternative site 2

7.3.1 Stone Age

- No sites, features or objects dating to the Stone Age were identified in the study area.

7.3.2 Iron Age

- No sites, features or objects dating to the Iron Age were identified in the study area.

7.3.3 Historic period

- (7.3.3.01) A number of rectangular cement slabs that probably formed the floors for structures that were erected on it. It is very similar to what is found on old construction camps (e.g. for road construction). No reference could be found to the origin and function of this site and it is not indicated on any of the topocadastral maps.
 - The significance of the identified site is rated as: **Low on a local level – Grade III.**
- (7.3.3.02 – 7.3.3.13) A number of circular stone walled structures that seems to conform to a pattern, consisting of a single large circle, with as smaller circular structure (sometimes two) near the opening of the larger structure. In a few cases a small pile of stones forms a platform inside the larger structure. At present it is impossible to date these features but it is proposed that they belong to the early historic period.
 - The significance of the identified site is rated as: **Medium on a regional level – Grade III.**

Table 3. Summary of identified heritage resources in Alternative study area 2.

IDENTIFIED HERITAGE RESOURCES			
<i>NHRA category</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Coordinates</i>	<i>Impact rating</i>
Formal protections (NHRA)			
National heritage site (Section 27)	None	-	-
Provincial heritage site (Section 27)	None	-	-
Provisional protection (Section 29)	None	-	-
Listed in heritage register (Section 30)	None	-	-
General protections (NHRA)			
Structures older than 60 years (Section 34)	7.3.3.01	S26.62326 E30.63088	Low
Archaeological site or material (Section 35)	7.3.3.02	S26.62701 E30.63363	Medium
	7.3.3.03	S26.62884 E30.63247	Medium
	7.3.3.04	S26.63041 E30.62778	Medium
	7.3.3.05	S26.63064 E30.62728	Medium
	7.3.3.06	S26.63235 E30.63297	Medium
	7.3.3.07	S26.63298 E30.63240	Medium
	7.3.3.08	S26.63373 E30.63382	Medium
	7.3.3.09	S26.63296 E30.63620	Medium
	7.3.3.10	S26.63258 E30.63706	Medium
	7.3.3.11	S26.63197 E30.63757	Medium
	7.3.3.12	S26.63127 E30.63819	Medium
7.3.3.13	S26.63063 E30.63838	Medium	
Palaeontological site or material (Section 35)	None	-	-
Graves or burial grounds (Section 36)	None	-	-
Public monuments or memorials (Section 37)	None	-	-
Other			

Any other heritage resources (describe)	None	-	-
---	------	---	---




Fig. 7. Location of the identified sites: Alternative 2.
(Map 2630DA: Chief Surveyor-General)

7.4 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 impacts of the proposed development could be direct or physical but will not be indirect and cumulative.

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

- Mitigation
- Avoidance
- Compensation
- Enhancement (positive impacts)
- Rehabilitation
- Interpretation
- Memorialisation

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

Alternative site 1

- (7.3.3.1) An informal church marked by white-washed stones occurs on the south western corner of the proposed site. It is typical of such sites used by Zionists and Apostolic Faith Church groups.
 - The significance weighting for the impact on the identified site is rated as **low**.
 - **Mitigation:** As this feature is still in use by the local community, they should be consulted about the relocation of the site before development takes place.

Amsterdam Alternative Site 1		
Archaeological sites and other heritage features		
Nature: Loss and disturbance of heritage sites and features		
No-Go Option		
No applicable		
Construction Phase		
Ratings of Impacts	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	1	1
Duration	5	5
Magnitude	1	1
Probability	2	2
Significance	14	14
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Low
Reversibility	Low	Low
Irreplaceable loss of heritage	Low	Low
Can impacts be mitigated	Yes	
Operational Phase		
Not applicable		
Mitigation:		
Cumulative impacts: Expected to be low		
Residual risks: Low risk anticipated provided that the mitigation measures are implemented correctly		

Alternative site 2

- (7.3.3.01) A number of rectangular cement slabs that probably formed the floors for structures that were erected on it. It is very similar to what is found on old construction camps (e.g. for road construction).
 - The significance weighting for the impact on the identified site is rated as **low**.
 - **Mitigation:** As very little of this structure remains, it is seen to be fully documented after inclusion in this report.
- (7.3.3.02 – 7.3.3.13) A number of circular stone walled structures that seems to conform to a pattern, consisting of a single large circle, with as smaller circular structure (sometimes two) near the opening of the larger structure. In a few cases a small pile of stones forms a platform inside the larger structure. At present it is impossible to date these features but it is proposed that they belong to the early historic period.
 - The significance weighting for the impact on the identified site is rated as **medium**.

- **Mitigation:** It is recommended that these features are documented (mapped and photographed) if it is to be impacted on by the proposed housing development.

Amsterdam Alternative Site 2		
Archaeological sites and other heritage features		
Nature: Loss and disturbance of heritage sites and features		
No-Go Option		
No applicable		
Construction Phase		
Ratings of Impacts	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	1	1
Duration	5	5
Magnitude	6	4
Probability	5	5
Significance	60	50
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Positive
Reversibility	Low	Low
Irreplaceable loss of heritage	Low	Low
Can impacts be mitigated	Yes	
Operational Phase		
Not applicable		
Mitigation: Excavation and documentation of heritage sites		
Cumulative impacts: Expected to be low		
Residual risks: Low risk anticipated provided that the mitigation measures are implemented correctly		

7.5 Site preference

Based on a comparative analysis (Table 3),

- Alternative 1 would be best suitable for development.

Table 4: Comparative Assessment of Alternatives

ALTERNATIVE	PREFERENCE	MOTIVATION
<i>Development Alternatives</i>		
Alternative Site 1	This will result in no impact and is therefore preferred for development	No heritage sites occur in the study area
Alternative Site 2	This will result in an impact and is therefore not preferred for development	A number of heritage sites occur in the study area

8. 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 that 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.

8.1 Objectives

- Protection of archaeological, historical and any other site or land considered being of cultural value within the project boundary 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 in order 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 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 Environmental Control Officer 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 National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 51. (1).

8.2 Control

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

- A person or entity, e.g. the Environmental Control Officer, should be tasked to take responsibility for the heritage sites and should be held accountable for any damage.
- Known sites should be located and isolated, e.g. by fencing them off. All construction workers should be informed that these are no-go areas, unless accompanied by the individual or persons representing the Environmental Control Officer as identified above.
- 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.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

The cultural landscape qualities of the region is made up of a pre-colonial element consisting of limited Stone Age and Iron Age occupation, as well as a much later colonial (farmer) component, which gave rise to an urban component.

The aim of the survey was to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural significance found within the area in which the development is proposed.

Identified sites

Alternative Site 1

- (7.3.3.1) An informal church marked by white-washed stones occurs on the south western corner of the proposed site. It is typical of such sites used by Zionists and Apostolic Faith Church groups.
 - The significance of the identified site is rated as: **High on a local level – Grade III.**

Alternative Site 2

- (7.3.3.01) A number of rectangular cement slabs that probably formed the floors for structures that were erected on it. It is very similar to what is found on old construction camps (e.g. for road construction).
 - The significance of the identified site is rated as: **Low on a local level – Grade III.**
- (7.3.3.02 – 7.3.3.13) A number of circular stone walled structures that seems to conform to a pattern, consisting of a single large circle, with as smaller circular structure (sometimes two) near the opening of the larger structure. In a few cases a small pile of stones forms a platform inside the larger structure. At present it is impossible to date these features but it is proposed that they belong to the early historic period.
 - The significance of the identified site is rated as: **Medium on a regional level – Grade III.**

Impact assessment

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

The impacts of the proposed development could be direct or physical but will not be indirect and cumulative.

Alternative Site 1

- (7.3.3.1) An informal church marked by white-washed stones occurs on the south western corner of the proposed site. It is typical of such sites used by Zionists and Apostolic Faith Church groups.
 - The significance weighting for the impact on the identified site is rated as **low**.
 - **Mitigation:** As this feature is still in use by the local community, they should be consulted about the relocation of the site before development takes place.

Alternative Site 2

- (7.3.3.01) A number of rectangular cement slabs that probably formed the floors for structures that were erected on it. It is very similar to what is found on old construction camps (e.g. for road construction).

- The significance weighting for the impact on the identified site is rated as **low**.
 - **Mitigation:** As very little of this structure remains, it is seen to be fully documented after inclusion in this report.
- (7.3.3.02 – 7.3.3.13) A number of circular stone walled structures that seems to conform to a pattern, consisting of a single large circle, with as smaller circular structure (sometimes two) near the opening of the larger structure. In a few cases a small pile of stones forms a platform inside the larger structure. At present it is impossible to date these features but it is proposed that they belong to the early historic period.
 - The significance weighting for the impact on the identified site is rated as **medium**.
 - **Mitigation:** It is recommended that these features are documented (mapped and photographed) if it is to be impacted on by the proposed housing development.

Comparative Alternative Site assessment

- Due to the large number of identified heritage sites identified on Alternative Site 2, Alternative Site 1 is seen to be the preferred site.

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

- From a heritage point of view it is recommended that the proposed development be allowed to continue on acceptance and implementation of the above mitigation measures.

Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation:

- 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.

10. REFERENCES

10.1 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)

10.2 Literature

Acocks, J.P.H. 1975. *Veld Types of South Africa*. Memoirs of the Botanical Survey of South Africa, No. 40. Pretoria: Botanical Research Institute.

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

Makhura, T. 2006. The pre-colonial history of Mpumalanga society until the 19th century. In Delius, P. (ed.). *Mpumalanga history and heritage. Reclaiming the past, defining the future*. Scottsville: University of Kwazulu Natal Press.

Pelser, A.J., Van Schalkwyk, J.A., Teichert, F. & Masiteng, I. 2007. *The archaeological investigation of an Iron Age site on the farm Rietfontein 1011S, Emahlaleni district, Mpumalanga Province*. NCHM Research Journal 2:1-24.

Praagh, L.V. (ed.) 1906. *The Transvaal and its mines*. London: Praagh & Lloyd.

Richardson, D. 2001. *Historic sites of South Africa*. Cape Town: Struik Publishers.

Taylor, M.O.V. 1979. Wildebeestfontein: a Late Iron Age site in the southeastern Transvaal. In Van der Merwe, N.J. & Huffman, T.N. (eds.) 1979. *Iron Age studies in Southern Africa. Goodwin Series No. 3*. Cape Town: South African Archaeological Society.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2009. *Cultural heritage resources review of four of the 7 local municipalities of the Gert Sibande district municipality, Mpumalanga Province*. Unpublished report 2009/JvS/025.

Van Vollenhoven, A. 2012. *A report on a pre-feasibility heritage study for the proposed Yzermyn Coal Mine close to Dirkiesdorp, Mpumalanga Province*. Unpublished report: Archaetnos.

10.3 Maps and aerial photographs

1: 50 000 Topocadastral maps
Google Earth

APPENDIX 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.

APPENDIX 2. SPECIALIST COMPETENCYJohan (Johnny) van Schalkwyk

J A van Schalkwyk, D Litt et Phil, heritage consultant, has been working in the field of heritage management for more than 30 years. 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, Northern Cape, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Lesotho and Swaziland. Based on this work, he has curated various exhibitions at different museums and has published more than 60 papers, many 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, road-, pipeline-, and power line developments, dams, mining, water purification works, historical landscapes, refuse dumps and urban developments.

APPENDIX 3: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF IDENTIFIED HERITAGE RESOURCES

Significance

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. 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				
2. Aesthetic value				
It is important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group				
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				
4. Social value				
Does it have strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons				
5. Rarity				
Does it possess uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage				
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.				
7. Sphere of Significance		High	Medium	Low
International				
National				
Provincial				
Regional				
Local				
Specific community				
8. Significance rating of feature				
1.	Low			
2.	Medium			
3.	High			

APPENDIX 4. RELEVANT LEGISLATION

All archaeological and palaeontological sites, and meteorites are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act (Act no 25 of 1999) as stated in Section 35:

(1) Subject to the provisions of section 8, the protection of archaeological and palaeontological sites and material and meteorites is the responsibility of a provincial heritage resources authority: Provided that the protection of any wreck in the territorial waters and the maritime cultural zone shall be the responsibility of SAHRA.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (8)(a), all archaeological objects, palaeontological material and meteorites are the property of the State. The responsible heritage authority must, on behalf of the State, at its discretion ensure that such objects are lodged with a museum or other public institution that has a collection policy acceptable to the heritage resources authority and may in so doing establish such terms and conditions as it sees fit for the conservation of such objects.

(3) Any person who discovers archaeological or palaeontological objects or material or a meteorite in the course of development or agricultural activity must immediately report the find to the responsible heritage resources authority, or to the nearest local authority offices or museum, which must immediately notify such heritage resources authority.

(4) No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority-

- (a) destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;
- (b) destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological material or object or any meteorite;
- (c) trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or palaeontological material or object, or any meteorite; or
- (d) bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.

In terms of cemeteries and graves the following (Section 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 such arrangements for their conservation as it sees fit.

(2) SAHRA must identify and record the graves of victims of conflict and any other graves which it deems to be of cultural significance and may erect memorials associated with the grave referred to in subsection (1), and must maintain such memorials.

(3) No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority-

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

(4) SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for the destruction or damage of any burial ground or grave referred to in subsection (3)(a) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has made satisfactory arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the contents of such graves, at the cost of the applicant and in accordance with any regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority.

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act no 25 of 1999) stipulates the assessment criteria and grading of archaeological sites. The following categories are distinguished in Section 7 of the Act:

- **Grade I:** Heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance;
- **Grade II:** Heritage resources which, although forming part of the national estate, can be considered to have special qualities which make them significant within the context of a province or a region; and
- **Grade III:** Other heritage resources worthy of conservation, and which prescribes heritage resources assessment criteria, consistent with the criteria set out in section 3(3), which must be used by a heritage resources authority or a local authority to assess the intrinsic, comparative and contextual significance of a heritage resource and the relative benefits and costs of its protection, so that the appropriate level of grading of the resource and the consequent responsibility for its management may be allocated in terms of section 8.

Presenting archaeological sites as part of tourism attraction requires, in terms 44 of the Act, a Conservation Management Plan as well as a permit from SAHRA.

(1) Heritage resources authorities and local authorities must, wherever appropriate, co-ordinate and promote the presentation and use of places of cultural significance and heritage resources which form part of the national estate and for which they are responsible in terms of section 5 for public enjoyment, education, research and tourism, including-

- (a) the erection of explanatory plaques and interpretive facilities, including interpretive centres and visitor facilities;
- (b) the training and provision of guides;
- (c) the mounting of exhibitions;
- (d) the erection of memorials; and
- (e) any other means necessary for the effective presentation of the national estate.

(2) Where a heritage resource which is formally protected in terms of Part I of this Chapter is to be presented, the person wishing to undertake such presentation must, at least 60 days prior to the institution of interpretive measures or manufacture of associated material, consult with the heritage resources authority which is responsible for the protection of such heritage resource regarding the contents of interpretive material or programmes.

(3) A person may only erect a plaque or other permanent display or structure associated with such presentation in the vicinity of a place protected in terms of this Act in consultation with the heritage resources authority responsible for the protection of the place.

APPENDIX 5. RELOCATION OF GRAVES

If the graves are younger than 60 years, an undertaker can be contracted to deal with the exhumation and reburial. This will include public participation, organising cemeteries, coffins, etc. They need permits and have their own requirements that must be adhered to.

If the graves are older than 60 years old or of undetermined age, an archaeologist must be in attendance to assist with the exhumation and documentation of the graves. This is a requirement by law.

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.

APPENDIX 6: INVENTORY OF IDENTIFIED CULTURAL HERITAGE SITES

Alternative Study site 1

NHRA Category	Archaeological sites and material
Protection status	
General Protection – Living heritage	

Location	7.3.3.1	Amsterdam 408IT	S 26.64136, E 30.65455
-----------------	---------	-----------------	------------------------

Description
An informal church marked by white-washed stones occurs on the south western corner of the proposed site. It is typical of such sites used by Zionists and Apostolic Faith Church groups.

Significance of site/feature	High on a local level – Grade III
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Impact assessment
It is anticipated that the site will be impacted on by the proposed development, and would in all probability be destroyed.

Significance of impact					
Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance	Weight
1	5	2	2	16	Low

Mitigation
As this feature is still in use by the local community, they should be consulted about the relocation of the site before development takes place.

Requirements
Community consent

References
1: 50 000 topocadastral map: 2630DA



Alternative Study site 2

NHRA Category	Archaeological sites and material
Protection status	General Protection - Structures older than 60 years (Section 34)

Location	7.3.3.01	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.62326 E30.63088
Description			
A number of rectangular cement slabs that probably formed the floors for structures that were erected on in. It is very similar to what is found on old construction camps (e.g. for road construction). No reference could be found to the origin and function of this site and it is not indicated on any of the topocadastral maps.			

Significance of site/feature	Low on a regional level – Grade III
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Impact assessment
It is anticipated that the site will be impacted on by the proposed development, and would in all probability be destroyed.

Significance of impact					
Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance	Weight
1	5	2	2	16	Low

Mitigation
As very little of this feature remains, it is seen to be fully documented after inclusion in this report.

Requirements
None

References
1: 50 000 topocadastral map: 2630DA



NHRA Category	Archaeological sites and material
Protection status	General Protection - Archaeological site or material (Section 35)

Location	7.3.3.02	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.62701 E30.63363
	7.3.3.03	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.62884 E30.63247
	7.3.3.04	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63041 E30.62778
	7.3.3.05	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63064 E30.62728
	7.3.3.06	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63235 E30.63297
	7.3.3.07	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63298 E30.63240
	7.3.3.08	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63373 E30.63382
	7.3.3.09	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63296 E30.63620
	7.3.3.10	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63258 E30.63706
	7.3.3.11	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63197 E30.63757
	7.3.3.12	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63127 E30.63819
	7.3.3.13	Amsterdam 408IT	S26.63063 E30.63838

Description

A number of circular stone walled structures that seems to conform to a pattern, consisting of a single large circle, with as smaller circular structure (sometimes two) near the opening of the larger structure. In a few cases a small pile of stones forms a platform inside the larger structure.

Significance of site/feature

Medium on a regional level – Grade III

Impact assessment

It is anticipated that the sites will be impacted on by the proposed development, and would in all probability be destroyed.

Significance of impact

Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance	Weight
2	5	4	4	44	Medium

Mitigation

It is recommended that these features are documented (mapped and photographed) if it is to be impacted on by the proposed housing development.

Requirements

SAHRA permit

References

1: 50 000 topocadastral map: 2630DA



7.3.3.02



7.3.3.03



7.3.3.04



7.3.3.05



7.3.3.06



7.3.3.07



7.3.3.08



7.3.3.09



7.3.3.10



7.3.3.11



7.3.3.12



7.3.3.13