

---

**Archaeological Scoping Report For The Proposed Establishment Of The Transalloys  
Coal-Fired Power Plant Near Witbank, Mpumalanga Province**

---

Prepared For

**Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd**

By



**HERITAGE**

Contracts and Archaeological Consulting

**POSTNET SUITE# 426  
PRIVATE BAG X4  
WIERDA PARK  
0149**

**VERSION 1.0**  
1 NOVEMBER 2013

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT**

**CLIENT:** Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd

**CONTACT PERSON:** **Steven Ingle**  
Tel: 072 386 9815  
E – mail: [steven@savannahsa.com](mailto:steven@savannahsa.com)

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

**LEADING CONSULTANT:** Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC  
**CONTACT PERSON:** Jaco van der Walt  
Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting  
Professional Member of the Association of Southern  
African Professional Archaeologist (#159)

I, Jaco van der Walt as duly authorised representative of Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC, hereby confirm my independence as a specialist and declare that neither I nor the Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC have any interest, be it business, financial, personal or other, in any proposed activity, application or appeal in respect of which Savannah Environmental was appointed as Environmental Assessment practitioner, other than fair remuneration for work performed on this project.



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

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Site name and location:** Transalloys is located approximately 8km west of Emalahleni, south of the N4 highway and north of Clewer, Mpumalanga Province

**1: 50 000 Topographic Map:** 2529CC

**EIA Consultant:** Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd.

**Developer** Transalloys

**Heritage Consultant:** Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC (HCAC).

Contact person: Jaco van der Walt Tel: +27 82 373 8491 E-mail jaco.heritage@gmail.com.

**Date of Report:** 1 November 2013

### Findings of the Assessment:

This scoping study revealed that a range of various heritage sites can occur in the greater area. A cemetery was identified by a previous study on the farm Elandsfontein 309 JS (Van Vollenhoven 2013). It is recommended that an archaeological impact assessment should be conducted prior to the development to determine whether the development footprint will impact on heritage significant sites and to recommend suitable mitigation measures if this is the case.

A Palaeontological desktop study by Dr Barry Millstead also indicated that the development can commence if the mitigation measures and recommendations in his report are adhered to.

**Disclaimer:** *Although all possible care is taken to identify 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. Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC and its personnel will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result of such oversights.*

**Copyright:** Copyright in all documents, drawings and records whether manually or electronically produced, which form part of the submission and any subsequent report or project document shall vest in Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC. None of the documents, drawings or records may be used or applied in any manner, nor may they be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means whatsoever for or to any other person, without the prior written consent of Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC. The Client, on acceptance of any submission by Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC and on condition that the Client pays to Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit and for the specified project only:

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

## Contents

ABBREVIATIONS .....	7
GLOSSARY .....	7
1. INTRODUCTION.....	8
1.2 Terms of Reference.....	10
1.3 Nature of the development .....	10
1.4 The receiving environment.....	12
2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY .....	13
2.1 Literature search .....	13
2.2 Information collection.....	13
2.3 Public consultation .....	13
2.4 Google Earth and mapping survey .....	13
2.5 Genealogical Society of South Africa .....	13
3. LEGISLATION .....	14
3.1 Heritage Site Significance and Mitigation Measures .....	15
4. REGIONAL OVERVIEW .....	16
4.1 General Information.....	16
4.1.1. Literature search .....	16
4.1.2. Information collection.....	16
4.1.3. Public consultation .....	16
4.1.4. Google Earth and mapping survey.....	16
4.1.5. Genealogical Society of South Africa.....	16
4.2. Palaeontology.....	16
4.2 Archaeological and Historical Information Available on the Study Area.....	17
4.2.1. <i>Historiography And Methodology</i> .....	17
4.2.2. <i>Maps Of The Area Under Investigation</i> .....	17
4.2.3. <i>A Brief History Of Human Settlement And Black And White Interaction In The Farm Area</i> .....	18
6 PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE OF SITES.....	21
7. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS .....	22
8. FINDINGS .....	22
8.1. Palaeontological.....	22
8.2. Archaeology .....	22
8.2.1 <i>Archaeological finds</i> .....	22
8.2.2 <i>Nature of Impact</i> .....	22
8.2.3 <i>Extent of impact</i> .....	22
8.3. Historical period .....	22
8.3.1 <i>Historical finds: I</i> .....	22
8.3.2 <i>Nature of Impact</i> .....	22
8.3.3 <i>Extent of impact</i> .....	22
8.4. Burials and Cemeteries.....	23
8.4.1 Burials and Cemeteries.....	23
8.4.2 Nature of Impact .....	23
8.4.3 Extent of impact .....	23
9. POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE RESOURCES .....	23
10. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	24
11. PLAN OF STUDY.....	24

12. LIST OF PREPARERS..... 25  
13. STATEMENT OF COMPETENCY ..... 25  
14. REFERENCES ..... 26

**Figures**

Figure 1: Location Map of the proposed Transalloys Power plant. ....9  
Figure 2: Google image of the study area. ....12

**Annexure A – Paleontological Desktop Study**

**ABBREVIATIONS**

AIA: Archaeological Impact Assessment
ASAPA: Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
BIA: Basic Impact Assessment
CRM: Cultural Resource Management
ECO: Environmental Control Officer
EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment*
EIA: Early Iron Age*
EIA Practitioner: Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner
EMP: Environmental Management Plan
ESA: Early Stone Age
GPS: Global Positioning System
HIA: Heritage Impact Assessment
LIA: Late Iron Age
LSA: Late Stone Age
MEC: Member of the Executive Council
MIA: Middle Iron Age
MPRDA: Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act
MSA: Middle Stone Age
NEMA: National Environmental Management Act
PRHA: Provincial Heritage Resource Agency
SADC: Southern African Development Community
SAHRA: South African Heritage Resources Agency

*\*Although EIA refers to both Environmental Impact Assessment and the Early Iron Age both are internationally accepted abbreviations and must be read and interpreted in the context it is used.*

**GLOSSARY**

Archaeological site (remains of human activity over 100 years old)

Early Stone Age (2 million to 300 000 years ago)

Middle Stone Age (300 000 to 30 000 years ago)

Late Stone Age (30 000 years ago until recent)

Historic (approximately AD 1840 to 1950)

Historic building (over 60 years old)

Lithics: Stone Age artefacts

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC was contracted by Savannah (Pty) Ltd to conduct a Heritage Scoping report for the proposed Transalloys Power Ptation Development.

Transalloys, a producer of export grade Siliconmanganese, as an energy intensive electricity user, proposes to develop a Coal Fired Power Plant adjacent to its smelter complex near Witbank, Mpumalanga Province.

The heritage scoping report forms part of the EIA for the proposed project.

The aim of the scoping report is to conduct a desktop study to identify possible heritage resources within the project area and to assess their importance within a Local, Provincial and National context. The study furthermore aims to assess the impact of the proposed project on non - renewable heritage resources and to submit appropriate recommendations with regards to the responsible cultural resources management measures that might be required to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, in order to protect, preserve and develop them within the framework provided by Heritage legislation.

The report outlines the approach and methodology utilized for the Scoping phase of the project. The report includes information collected from various sources and consultations. Possible impacts are identified and mitigation measures are proposed in the following report. It is important to note that no field work was conducted as part of the scoping phase but will be conducted as part of the Impact Assessment phase of the EIA.






Figure 1: Location Map of the proposed Transalloys Power plant.

## 1.2 Terms of Reference

The main aim of this scoping report is to determine if any known heritage resources occur within the study area and to predict the occurrence of any possible heritage significant sites that might present a fatal flaw to the proposed project. The objectives of the scoping report were to:

- » Conduct a desktop study:
  - \* Review available literature, previous heritage studies and other relevant information sources to obtain a thorough understanding of the archaeological and cultural heritage conditions of the area;
  - \* Gather data and compile a background history of the area;
  - \* Identify known and recorded archaeological and cultural sites;
  - \* Determine whether the area is renowned for any cultural and heritage resources, such as Stone Age sites, Iron Age sites, informal graveyards or historical homesteads.
  
- » Report

The reporting of the scoping component is based on the results and findings of the desk-top study, wherein potential issues associated with the proposed project will be identified, and those issues requiring further investigation through the IA Phase highlighted. Reporting will aim to identify the anticipated impacts, as well as cumulative impacts, of the operational units of the proposed project activity on the identified heritage resources for all 3 development stages of the project, i.e. construction, operation and decommissioning. Reporting will also consider alternatives should any significant sites be impacted on by the proposed project. This is done to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, in order to protect, preserve and develop them within the framework provided by Heritage Legislation.

## 1.3 Nature of the development

Only one site will ultimately be identified for the construction of the power plant. The following infrastructure is associated with the proposed project:

### **Power station (footprint of approximately 10ha)**

Main Plant House for one 150MW unit

Auxiliary plant buildings, including administration building and warehouse

Other operational support buildings

Maintenance workshops and storage facilities including electrical and instrument workshops and stores, and machine shop

Laboratory area for both routine testing and specialised analysis and investigation

Access roads

High voltage yard

### **Associated infrastructure (footprint of approximately 30ha)**

In-plant coal stock yard and storage

Lime storage area

250 meter high stack

Overland coal conveyors – from coal discard dumps in the area

Water supply pipeline

Amenities including potable water, sanitary and sewer utilities

Electrical utility interconnection and telephone utilities

Sewage treatment plant

Access road and internal roads

Ash dump

Ash dump runoff ponds

Water storage reservoir for raw water supply

Raw water treatment plant

Zero effluent/evaporation ponds

Recycling pond

**Technology alternatives** to be investigated during the EIA include:

Coal Fired Power Plant making use of Circulating Fluidised Bed (CFB) boiler technology. It has been established that several discard coal dumps exist within the area

Gas-fired power plant (single or open gas cycle).

Coal is to be sourced from various nearby coal mines located in close proximity to the proposed power station. Coal mines from which coal can be sourced include the discard coal dumps of the Landau, Kleinkoppie and Goedehoop Collieries. It is currently proposed that coal be fed directly to the power plant via an overland conveyor belt system however road transport (trucks) may also be necessitated for the supply of coal from the other collieries in the area. The estimated coal consumption will be between 800 to 1 000 kilotons per annum. The surrounding mines produce a surplus of water in the area. Raw water is proposed to be conveyed from the Anglo American Water Treatment Plant approximately 9km from the site. The required volumes for the power plant are anticipated to be relatively small compared to the available mine water surplus (BID 2013).

## 1.4 The receiving environment

The proposed power station is located adjacent to the existing Transalloys Complex which is located within 1km south-east of Evraz Highveld Steel and. Five potential alternatives (refer to Figure 1), located within or directly adjacent to the Transalloys complex have been identified for the potential siting of the power plant and include the following farm portions:

Portions 25, 26, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37 of the Farm Elandsfontein 309 JS

Portions 20, 24 and 38 of the Farm Schoongezicht 308 JS

The topography of the area is relatively flat and extensively altered by large scale industrial and mining development that would have obliterated any surface indicators of heritage sites.

The study area falls within the Mesic Highveld Grassland Bioregion as described by Mucina et al (2006) with the vegetation described as Rand Highveld Grassland. Land use in the general area is characterized by extensive mining. The study area is characterised by deep sandy to loamy soils.



Figure 2: Google image of the study area.

## **2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

The assessment is to be undertaken in two phases, a desktop study as part of the Scoping phase and an Archaeological Impact Assessment as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment phase. This report concerns the scoping phase. The aim of the scoping phase is to cover archaeological and cultural heritage data available to compile a background history of the study area. In order to identify possible heritage issues or fatal flaws that should be avoided during development.

This was accomplished by means of the following phases (the results are represented in section 4 of this report):

### **2.1 Literature search**

Utilising data for information gathering stored in the archaeological database at Wits University, published articles on the archaeology and history of the area. The aim of this is to extract data and information on the area in question, looking at archaeological sites, historical sites and graves of the area.

### **2.2 Information collection**

The SAHRA report mapping project (Version 1.0) and SAHRIS was consulted to further collect data from CRM practitioners who undertook work in the area to provide the most comprehensive account of the history of the area where possible.

### **2.3 Public consultation**

No public consultation was conducted during this phase.

### **2.4 Google Earth and mapping survey**

Google Earth and 1:50 000 maps of the area were utilised to identify possible places where archaeological sites might be located.

### **2.5 Genealogical Society of South Africa**

The database of the genealogical society was consulted to collect data on any known graves in the area.

### 3. LEGISLATION

For this project the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) is of importance and the following sites and features are protected:

- a. Archaeological artefacts, structures and sites older than 100 years
- b. Ethnographic art objects (e.g. prehistoric rock art) and ethnography
- c. Objects of decorative and visual arts
- d. Military objects, structures and sites older than 75 years
- e. Historical objects, structures and sites older than 60 years
- f. Proclaimed heritage sites
- g. Grave yards and graves older than 60 years
- h. Meteorites and fossils
- i. Objects, structures and sites of scientific or technological value.

The national estate that includes the following:

- a. Places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance
- b. Places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage
- c. Historical settlements and townscapes
- d. Landscapes and features of cultural significance
- e. Geological sites of scientific or cultural importance
- f. Archaeological and palaeontological importance
- g. Graves and burial grounds
- h. Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery
- i. Movable objects (e.g. archaeological, palaeontological, meteorites, geological specimens, military, ethnographic, books etc.)

Section 34 (1) of the act deals with structures which is older than 60 years. Section 35(4) of this act deals with archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites. Section 36(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act, deals with human remains older than 60 years. Unidentified/unknown graves are also handled as older than 60 until proven otherwise.

### 3.1 Heritage Site Significance and Mitigation Measures

The presence and distribution of heritage resources define a Heritage Landscape. In this landscape, every site is relevant. In addition, because heritage resources are non-renewable, heritage surveys need to investigate an entire project area. In all initial investigations, however, the specialists are responsible only for the identification of resources visible on the surface.

This section describes the evaluation criteria used for determining the significance of archaeological and heritage sites. National and Provincial Monuments are recognised for conservation purposes. The following interrelated criteria were used to establish site significance:

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

The criteria above will be used to place identified sites with in SAHRA's (2006) system of grading of places and objects which form part of the national estate. This system is approved by ASAPA for the SADC region. The recommendations for each site should be read in conjunction with section 11 of this report.

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

(GP.C)			
--------	--	--	--

## 4. REGIONAL OVERVIEW

### 4.1 General Information

#### 4.1.1. Literature search

Two previously recorded sites are on record with the Archaeological databases at Wits University (referenced 2009) for the 2529 CC Topographical map. None of these sites are in close proximity to the study area and consists of Stone Age flakes dating to the MSA on the farm Blesboklaagte and Naupoort.

#### 4.1.2. Information collection

Previous heritage studies were conducted in the immediate vicinity of the study area (SAHRA report mapping project V1.0 and SAHRIS) by Van Vollenhoven (2013), van der Walt (2013), Murimbika 2008 and Huffman 1999.

#### 4.1 3. Public consultation

No public consultation was conducted during the scoping phase.

#### 4.1.4. Google Earth and mapping survey

Google Earth and 1:50 000 maps of the area was utilised to identify possible places where archaeological sites might be located.

#### 4.1.5. Genealogical Society of South Africa

No grave sites are indicated within the study area.

### 4.2. Palaeontology

The palaeontology of the area has been assessed at a desktop level by Dr Barry Millstead. He concluded and recommended the following:

*"A thorough field investigation by a palaeontologist as part of a Full Palaeontological Heritage Impact Assessment of any of the five Site Alternative areas that remain viable alternatives following the completion of the Scoping Environmental Impact Assessment Phase would allow a meaningful evaluation of the presence of potentially fossil-bearing strata within the target areas. This process would make it possible that scientifically and/or culturally significant fossils, present within the area may be discovered that would be otherwise damaged, destroyed or inadvertently moved and appropriate damage mitigation processes could be determined. A secondary advantage of such an investigation would be that any fossil materials located could prove to have a positive effect on the understanding of the fossil record of South Africa and positively affect the palaeontological heritage of the country. Similarly, thorough examinations should be made of all excavations as they are being performed. Should any fossil materials be identified during the construction phase, the excavations should be halted and SAHRA informed of the discovery. A potential positive outcome of these mitigation protocols could be that fossil materials become available for scientific study that would otherwise have been hidden within or beneath the regolith. Should such new palaeontological material be located as a result of this site investigation this could prove to have a positive effect on the understanding of the fossil record of South Africa and positively affect the palaeontological heritage of the country. The social benefits of the project have been classified as beneficial, herein, as the project aims to provide*



*employment opportunities within the power station. As such this desktop study has not identified any palaeontological reason to prejudice the progression of this project, subject to adequate mitigation programs being put in place” (Millstead 2013)*

## **4.2 Archaeological and Historical Information Available on the Study Area**

The following report will endeavour to give an account of the history of the greater area of the proposed development and also a brief overview of the history of the district in which it is located. The report has been divided into several sections that will focus on the following aspects:

- General history of human settlement in the area
- The history of black and white interaction in the farm area
- A history of specific land ownership and development of the farm, where this could be traced

### **4.2.1. Historiography And Methodology**

It was necessary to use a range of sources in order to give an accurate account of the history of the area in which the farms are located. Sources included secondary source material, maps, online sources and archival documents. This study is by no means all-inclusive, and there are doubtlessly still sources to be found on the history of the properties and areas researched in this study. Owing to the constraints in time and resources, this study should be viewed as an introduction to the history of the Witbank area and the specific farms under investigation.

The following sources may be of interest if a further study of the Witbank Dam area is pursued:

- Witbank Stadsraad. 1993. *Witbank: Grootstadstatus: Kommissiesitting 20 Augustus 1993*. Witbank: Witbank Stadsraad.
- Witbank Stadsraad. 1993. *Struktuurplan Witbank en omgewing: Werksdokument*. Witbank: Witbank Stadsraad.
- Anon. 1970. *Feesbrosjyre van die N.G. Kerk van Witbank, 50 jaar*. Pretoria: Middleton en Joubert.
- Anon. 1931. *The Coals of the Witbank district (Transvaal)*. Johannesburg: Transvaal Chamber of Mines.

### **4.4.2. Maps Of The Area Under Investigation**

Since the mid 1800's up until the present, South Africa had been subdivided into various different districts. Since 1945, the area where the modern-day Witbank area is located formed part of the Lydenburg district. As of 1872, the farm area was located within the Middelburg district. The Witbank district was however proclaimed in 1925, and the farms were located in this area. As of 1977 the farm fell under the jurisdiction of the Witbank Magisterial Area. This was still the case by 1994. *Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 17, 20-27*).

### **4.2.3. A Brief History Of Human Settlement And Black And White Interaction In The Farm Area**

When writing about the Mpumalanga Province, it is perhaps best to briefly glance back to prehistoric times, when coals formed in vast swamps from rotting forests between 200 and 300 million years ago. Massive seams of vast coal fields have been discovered and extracted in the southern areas in the province. The areas surrounding the towns of Witbank, Middelburg, Bethal, Hendrina, Ermelo and Carolina had long provided South Africa with an abundant source of cheap energy. This discovery has also had unfortunate effects on these areas, since the toxic by-products of burning coal in such quantities had severely polluted the ground and atmosphere in this area. (*Mpumalanga* 2007: 36-37)

J. S. Bergh's historical atlas of the four northern provinces of South Africa is a very useful source for the writing of local and regional histories. According to this source no signs of major Stone Age or Iron Age terrains are present in the vicinity of the farm area. (*Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika* 1999: 4-5, 7). However Huffman (199) recorded MSA sites to the north of the current study area. According to Van Vollenhoven (2013) the closest recorded Stone Age site was rock art close to the Olifants River to the south of Witbank (Bergh 1999: 5) and the closest Iron Age sites to the proposed development is Late Iron Age sites that have been identified to the west of Bronkhorstspuit and in the vicinity of Bethal (Bergh 1999: 7-8). Late Iron Age sites were however identified during a previous survey on the farm Middelburg Town and Townlands 287 JS (Van Vollenhoven 2013).

No major black tribes seem to have settled very close to the area where Witbank is located today by the start of the nineteenth century, but the Phuthing Tribe was prominent in the area to the north thereof. (*Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika* 1999: 10)

In a few decades, the sociographic nature of the then Transvaal province would change forever. The Difaqane (Sotho), or Mfekane ("the crushing" in Nguni) was a time of bloody upheavals in Natal and on the Highveld, which occurred around the early 1820's until the late 1830's. (*Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika* 1999: 109-115) It came about in response to heightened competition for land and trade, and caused population groups like gun-carrying Griquas and Shaka's Zulus to attack other tribes. (*Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika* 1999: 14; 116-119) Mzilikazi and his raiders had moved from the Northern Nguni area to the area north of the Vaal River by 1821. It has been recorded that the Ndebeles first attacked the Phuthing tribe, which in turn migrated to the south of the Vaal River and joined groups of Southern Sotho speakers. The Phuthing and Southern Sotho tribes moved westward and northward and started raiding Tswana communities in the surrounding area. The Phuthing were commanded first by Chief Tshane, and later Ratsebe. As the Phuthing under Ratsebe moved eastwards along the Vaal River, they collided with Mzilikazi's Ndebele once more. The Phuthing and other raiding groups were finally taken captive in 1823 by Mzilikazi's men. (*Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika* 1999: 110-111) It is unlikely that these events would have had a great influence on the area where the farms under investigation are located today, but it is still important to understand the social dynamics of the larger area.

During the time of the Difaqane, a northwards migration of white settlers from the Cape was also taking place. Some travellers, missionaries and adventurers had gone on expeditions to the northern areas in South Africa – some as early as in the 1720's. One such an adventurer was Robert Scoon, who formed part of a group of Scottish travellers and traders who had travelled the northern provinces of South Africa in the late 1820s and early 1830s. Scoon had gone on two long expeditions in the late 1820s and once again ventured eastward and northward of Pretoria in 1836. During the latter journey, he passed by the area where Witbank is located today. (*Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika* 1999: 13, 116-121)

By the late 1820's, a mass-movement of Dutch speaking people in the Cape Colony started advancing into the northern areas. This was due to feelings of mounting dissatisfaction caused by economical and other circumstances in the Cape. This movement later became known as the Great Trek. This migration resulted in a massive increase in the extent of that proportion of modern South Africa dominated by people of European descent. (Ross 2002: 39) As can be expected, the movement of whites into the northern provinces would have a significant impact on the black people who populated the land. By 1860, the population of whites in the central Transvaal was already very dense and the administrative machinery of their leaders was firmly in place. Many of the policies that would later be entrenched as legislation during the period of apartheid had already been developed. (Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 170)

Much can be said about the systematic oppression of black people in South Africa. In 1904 about a half of the black population in the Transvaal was living on private land, owned by whites or companies. According to the Squatters' Law of 1895, no more than five families of "natives" could live on any farm or divided portion of a farm, without special permission of the Government in the Transvaal. (Massie 1905: 97)

Black and white relations were however at times also interdependent in nature. After the Great Trek, when white farmers had settled at various areas in the northern provinces, wealthier farmers were often willing to lodge needy white families on their property in exchange for odd jobs and commando service. This bywoner often arrived with a family and a few cows. He would till the soil and pay a minimal rent to the farmer from the crops he grew. The farmer did not consider him a laborer, but mostly kept black workers for hard labour on the farm. After the Anglo-Boer War, many families were left destitute. Post war years of severe droughts and locust plagues did not ameliorate this state of affairs. All of these factors resulted in what became known as the 'poor white problem'. On the advent of commercial farming in South Africa, white landowners soon found bywoners to be a financial burden, and many were evicted from farms. In many cases, wealthier landlords found it far more profitable to rent their land to blacks than to bywoners. This enabled them to create reservoirs of black labour (for which mine recruiting agencies were prepared to pay handsome commissions), while it was also possible to draw more rent from their black tenants. This practice was outlawed by the 1913 Natives Land Act, which forbade more than five black families from living on white farms as peasant squatters. (Readers Digest 1992: 329-332)

The discovery of diamonds and gold in the northern provinces had very important consequences for South Africa. After the discovery of these resources, the British, who at the time had colonized the Cape and Natal, had intentions of expanding their territory into the northern Boer republics. This eventually led to the Anglo-Boer War, which took place between 1899 and 1902 in South Africa, and which was one of the most turbulent times in South Africa's history. Even before the outbreak of war in October 1899 British politicians, including Sir Alfred Milner and Mr. Chamberlain, had declared that should Britain's differences with the Z.A.R. result in violence, it would mean the end of republican independence. This decision was not immediately publicized, and as a consequence republican leaders based their assessment of British intentions on the more moderate public utterances of British leaders. Consequently, in March 1900, they asked Lord Salisbury to agree to peace on the basis of the status quo ante bellum. Salisbury's reply was, however, a clear statement of British war aims. (Du Preez 1977)

During the British march into the Transvaal between February and September 1900, several troop passed by the area where Witbank is situated today. The battalions of Lieutenant

Generals J. French, R. Pole-Carew and F. Roberts all travelled close by the Witbank area and through Middelburg. A railway line ran along this route at the time. (Geschiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 51)

During the Anglo-Boer War, two railway stations were located in the vicinity of the Witbank area, and close to each a black concentration camp had been established. At Middelburg, about 20 kilometres to the east of Witbank, one white and one black concentration camp was also set up. No skirmishes took place in the direct vicinity of the farm area. (Geschiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 54).

An Anglo Boer war battle took place on the farm Donkerhoek, only a few kilometers to the west of where the development is to take place. The battle lasted between 11 and 12 June 1900. Other skirmishes also took place here during this war (Bergh 1999: 52-53). Blockhouses were also erected in the vicinity by the British (Van Vollenhoven & Van den Bos 1997: 42-46). One may therefore expect to find farm buildings and objects as well as artifacts related to the Anglo-Boer War during construction activities (Van Vollenhoven 2013)

Van Vollenhoven recorded 2 sites on the farm Elandsfontein 309 JS, an old homestead with little historical value and a cemetery with high social value (Van Vollenhoven 2013).

## 6 PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE OF SITES

Based on the above information, it is possible to determine the probability of finding archaeological and cultural heritage sites within the study area to a certain degree. For the purposes of this section of the report the following terms are used – low, medium and high probability. Low indicates that no known occurrences of sites have been found previously in the general study area, medium probability indicates some known occurrences in the general study area are documented and can therefore be expected in the study area and a high probability indicates that occurrences have been documented close to or in the study area and that the environment of the study area has a high degree of probability having sites.

### » Palaeontological landscape

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

### » Archaeological And Cultural Heritage Landscape

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

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

#### » Stone Age finds

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

#### » Iron Age finds

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

#### » Historical finds

Historical period: *Low-Medium Probability*  
Historical dumps: *Low-Medium Probability*  
Structural remains: *Low-Medium Probability*  
Cultural Landscape: *low probability*

#### » Living Heritage

For example rainmaking sites: *Low Probability*

#### » Burial/Cemeteries

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

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

## **7. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

The study area was not subjected to a field survey as this will be done in the EIA phase. It is assumed that information obtained for the wider area is applicable to the study area.

## **8. FINDINGS**

The heritage scoping study revealed that the following heritage sites, features and objects that can be expected within the study area.

### **8.1. Palaeontological**

Any mining, construction or servitude operations for this site would not impact on the fossil record of South Africa.

### **8.2. Archaeology**

#### ***8.2.1 Archaeological finds***

There is a low - medium likelihood of finding MSA sites scattered over the study area similar to finds made to the north (Huffman 1999).

Due to the disturbed character of the area it is not anticipated that any Iron Age sites will be found, in addition to this no known Iron Age sites are on record for the study area.

#### ***8.2.2 Nature of Impact***

The construction phase of the project could directly impact on surface and subsurface archaeological sites.

#### ***8.2.3 Extent of impact***

The project could have a low to medium impact on a local scale.

### **8.3. Historical period**

#### ***8.3.1 Historical finds: I***

Historical finds include middens, structural remains and cultural landscape. There is a medium likelihood of finding sites relating to the Anglo Boer War as indicated by Van Vollenhoven 2013.

#### ***8.3.2 Nature of Impact***

The construction of the project can directly impact on both the visual context and sense of place of historical sites. Several structures occur in the study area.

#### ***8.3.3 Extent of impact***

The construction of the project could have a low – medium impact on a local scale.

## **8.4. Burials and Cemeteries**

### **8.4.1 Burials and Cemeteries**

Graves and informal cemeteries can be expected anywhere on the landscape. There are recorded graves on the farm Elandsfontein 309 JS.

### **8.4.2 Nature of Impact**

The construction and operation of the proposed project could directly impact on marked and unmarked graves.

### **8.4.3 Extent of impact**

The project could have a low to medium impact on a local scale.

## **9. POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE RESOURCES**

Based on the current information obtained for the area at a desktop level it is anticipated that any archaeological sites that occur within the proposed development area will have a Generally Protected B (GP.B) field rating and all sites should be mitigatable and no red flags are identified. Graves are of high social significance and can be expected anywhere in the landscape.

## **10. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This scoping study revealed that a range of heritage sites occur in the larger region and similar sites can be expected within the study area. Every site is relevant to the Heritage Landscape, but it is anticipated that no site in the study area could have conservation value. The following conclusions are applicable to the following sites:

» Archaeological sites

All sites could be mitigated either in the form of conservation of the sites with in the development or by a Phase 2 study where the sites will be recorded and sampled before the client can apply for a destruction permit for these sites prior to development.

» Historical finds and Cultural landscape

It is not anticipated that the built environment will be severely impacted upon as structures in the area relate to recent mining activities and are probably younger than 60 years and not protected by legislation or of low heritage significance as indicated by Van Vollenhoven (2013). This assumption will however have to be verified in the field.

» Burials and cemeteries

Formal and informal cemeteries as well as pre-colonial graves occur widely across Southern Africa. It is generally recommended that these sites are preserved with in a development. These sites can how ever be relocated if conservation is not possible, but this option must be seen as a last resort and is not advisable. The presence of any grave sites must be confirmed during the field survey and the public consultation process.

» General

It is recommended that as part of the public consultation process the presence of graves, archaeological and historical sites should be determined.

## **11. PLAN OF STUDY**

This scoping study highlighted the fact that a range of heritage resources occur in the area and some are known to occur in the farm area. Therefor in order to comply with the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) a Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment must be undertaken. During this study sites of archaeological, historical or places of cultural interest must be located, identified, recorded, photographed and described. During this study the levels of significance of recorded heritage resources must be determined and mitigation proposed should any significant sites be impacted upon, ensuring that all the requirements of SAHRA are met.

Dr Barry Millsteed completed a desktop paleontological assessment of the area and did not record any reasons why the development cannot continue if the recommendations in his report are adhered to. His letter is included as Annexure A. It is incumbent upon the developer to ensure that these recommendations are implemented before construction starts.



**12. LIST OF PREPARERS**

Jaco van der Walt (Archaeologist and project manager)

Dr Barry Millstead (Palaeontology Specialist)

Liesl Bester (Archival Specialist)

**13. STATEMENT OF COMPETENCY**

The author of the report is a member of the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists and is also accredited in the following fields of the Cultural Resource Management (CRM) Section, member number 159: Iron Age Archaeology, Colonial Period Archaeology, Stone Age Archaeology and Grave Relocation. Jaco is also an accredited CRM Archaeologist with SAHRA and AMAFA.

Jaco has been involved in research and contract work in South Africa, Botswana, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Tanzania and the DRC and conducted well over 300 AIAs since he started his career in CRM in 2000. This involved several mining operations, Eskom transmission and distribution projects and infrastructure developments. The results of several of these projects were presented at international and local conferences.

## 14. REFERENCES

Archaeological Database Wits University 2009

Du Preez, S. J. 1977. Peace attempts during the Anglo Boer War until March 1901. Magister Artium thesis in History. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

*Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.* Edited by J. S. Bergh. 1999. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik Uitgewers.

Huffman, T.N. 1999. *Archaeological Survey of Blesboklaagte, Witbank.* An unpublished report by Archaeological Resources Management on file at SAHRA as: 1999-SAHRA-0064.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. Handbook to the Iron Age. The archaeology of pre-colonial farming societies in Southern Africa. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Massie, R. H. 1905. *The Native tribes of Transvaal. Prepared for the General Staff War Office.* London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

Millstead, B. 2013. Desktop Palaeontological Heritage Impact Assessment Report On The Site Of The Proposed Transalloys (Pty) Ltd's Power Station To Be Located Within Portions 25, 26, 33, 34, 35, 36 And 37 Of The Farm Elandsfontein 309 Js And Portions 20, 24 And 38 Of The Farm Schoongezicht 308 Js, Mpumalanga Province. Unpublished Report.

Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. The vegetation map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. SANBI, Pretoria.

Murimbika, M. 2008. *Proposed Construction of New 132 kV Powerline from Wilge Substation to Bravo Substation, Telecommunications Tower and Wilge Substation in Emalahleni Local Municipality, Nkangala District, Mpumalanga Province.* An unpublished report by Nzumbululo Heritage Solutions on file at SAHRA as: 2008-SAHRA-0204

National Heritage Resources Act NHRA of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999)

Readers Digest. 1992. Illustrated history of South Africa. The Real Story. Expanded second edition: completely updated. Cape Town: Readers Digest Association.

Ross, R. 2002. *A concise history of South Africa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SAHRA Report Mapping Project Version 1.0, 2009

South African Heritage Information System (SAHRIS)

Van der Walt, J. 2013. Heritage Feasibility study for the Proposed Witbank Dam Development on portions of the farm Rhenosterfontein 318 JS and Naauwpoort 335 JS. Unpublished report.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2003. Eskom Transmission Line Duvha (Witbank) to Janus (Mecklenburg) : Cultural Heritage Scoping Report. An unpublished report by the National Cultural History Museum

Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 2013. A Report On A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment For A Proposed Prospecting Rights Application On The Farm Elandsfontein 309 Js, Close To Emalahleni, Mpumalanga Province. Unpublished report.