

Phase 1 Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment on the farm
Bornmansdrift 639 JT, in respect of proposed agricultural development,
Umjindi Local Municipality, Barberton, Mpumalanga Province.

Compiled by:



For Henwood Environmental Solutions

Surveyor: Mr JP Celliers

23 October, 2017

I, Jean-Pierre Celliers as duly authorised representative of Kudzala Antiquity CC, hereby confirm my independence as a specialist and declare that neither I nor the Kudzala Antiquity CC have any interest, be it business, financial, personal or other, in any proposed activity, application or appeal in respect of which the client was appointed as Environmental Assessment practitioner, other than fair remuneration for work performed on this project.

SIGNATURE:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Celliers', written over a horizontal line.

4.2 The specialist appointed in terms of the Regulations_

I, JEAN-PIERRE CELLERS, declare that -

General declaration:

I act as the independent specialist in this application;
I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant;
I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this application, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
I will comply with the Act, Regulations and all other applicable legislation;
I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
all the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct; and
I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 48 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act.



Signature of the specialist:

Kudzoia Antiquity CC

Name of company (if applicable):

23/10/2017

Date:

Table of Contents

- Introduction 3
 - 1.1. Terms of reference 3
 - 1.1.1 Project overview 3
 - 1.1.2. Constraints and limitations..... 3
 - 1.2. Legislative Framework..... 3
 - 1.3. Approach and statutory requirements 5
- 2. Description of surveyed area 6
- 3. Methodology..... 7
 - 3.1. Archaeological and Archival background studies 7
 - 3.1.1. Previous archaeological studies in the area..... 8
 - 3.1.2. Historic maps..... 8
 - 3.2. Social Consultation 9
 - 3.3. Heritage site significance 9
- 4. History and Archaeology11
 - 4.1. Historic period11
 - 4.1.1. Early History11
 - 4.1.2. The Voortrekkers12
 - 4.1.3. History of the Anglo Boer War (1899-1902) in the area14
 - 4.1.4. Historic maps of the study area15
 - 4.1.5. Historical overview of the ownership and development of Bornmansdrift 639
JT.....22
 - 4.2. Archaeology26
 - 4.2.1. Stone Age26
 - 4.2.2. Early Iron Age.....29
 - 4.2.3. Late Iron Age.....31
- 5. Site descriptions, locations and impact significance assessment.....32
 - 5.1. Description of located sites33
 - 5.2. Cumulative impacts on the heritage landscape50
- 6. Summary of findings and recommendations51
 - 6.1. Recommended management measures51
- 7. Bibliography53
- Appendix A.....56
- Appendix B.....60

Appendix C.....63
Appendix D.....67

Executive summary

Site name and location: The farm Bornmansdrift 639 JT located northwest of Barberton, Umjindi, Mpumalanga Province.

Purpose of the study: An archaeological and heritage study in order to identify cultural heritage resources in respect of proposed agricultural development.

Topographical Maps: 1:50 000 2530 DB (1968,1984,1989).

EIA Consultant: Henwood Environmental Solutions

Client:

Heritage Consultant: Kudzala Antiquity CC.

Contact person: Jean-Pierre (JP) Celliers Tel: +27 82 779 3748

E-mail: kudzala@lantic.net

Report date: 23 October 2017

Description and findings:

An Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment was undertaken by Kudzala Antiquity CC in respect of the proposed development and expansion of agricultural activities on the farm Bornmansdrift 639 JT located within Umjindi Local Municipality in Mpumalanga Province. The study was done with the aim of identifying sites which are of heritage significance on the identified project area and assess their current preservation condition, significance and possible impact of the proposed action. This forms part of legislative requirements as appears in section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA, 17 of 1998).

The survey was conducted on foot and with the aid of a motor vehicle in an effort to locate archaeological remains and historic sites, structures and features. An archival study including scrutiny of previous heritage surveys of the area formed the baseline information against which the survey was conducted. It is not within the expertise of this report or the surveyor to comment on possible palaeontological remains which may be located in the study area.

A total of thirteen (13) sites were recorded during the survey. They were numbered BD1-13. In terms of the archaeological component of the Act (25 of 1999, section 35) no sites were identified.

In terms of the built environment (section 34 of the Act) two significant buildings were identified (Sites BD 2 and BD 3) they are however located outside of the proposed development area. The sites of this nature comprise of buildings and structures associated with previous farming activity

and residence. The buildings are considered to be of medium heritage significance and permitting before destruction is advised.

In terms of burial grounds and graves (section 36 of the Act) eight unmarked gravesites (Sites BD1, 4-10) were located. Of these only sites BD 1 and 9 are located inside the project area, the rest are not (Sites BD 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10) (see maps Appendix C). All these sites are considered to be of high heritage and social significance. All graves are usually graded as High Local Significance (LS 3A; table 5.1 & 5.2) those older than 60 years are protected in terms of the NHRA (25 of 1999) section 36. Therefore a permit needs to be obtained from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) if the graves were to be exhumed and re-interred. It is recommended that all gravesites be fenced to protect them and access be allowed to families of the deceased when needed.

A total of fourteen (14) survey orientation locations were documented (SO 1-14) which includes a GPS location and photographs of the landscape at that particular location.

It is not within the expertise of this report or the surveyor to comment on possible palaeontological remains which may be located in the study area.

Disclaimer: *Although all possible care is taken to identify all sites of cultural importance during the investigation of study areas, it is always possible that hidden or sub-surface sites could be overlooked during the study. Kudzala Antiquity CC 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 Kudzala Antiquity 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 Kudzala Antiquity CC. The client, on acceptance of any submission by Kudzala Antiquity CC and on condition that the client pays to Kudzala Antiquity 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; and
- Recommendations delivered to the client.

Introduction

1.1. Terms of reference

Kudzala Antiquity CC was commissioned to conduct an archaeological and heritage resources survey on approximately 133 hectares of the farm Bornmansdrift 639 JT located in Umjindi Local Municipality in Mpumalanga Province. The survey was conducted in respect of the potential impact of the proposed expansion of agricultural activities on archaeological and heritage resources. The survey was conducted for Henwood Environmental Solutions.

1.1.1 Project overview

The client is in the process of obtaining environmental authorization to establish macadamia nut orchards on a portion of the farm Bornmansdrift in the Umjindi Local Municipal area, Mpumalanga. The project footprint areas include areas of previous cultivation which is approximately 133 hectares in extent (see maps Appendix C).

1.1.2. Constraints and limitations

On most of the project area, surface visibility and access was reduced due to very dense bush and undergrowth which included Lantana (*Lantana camara*, *Verbenaceae*) and sickle bush (*Dichrostachys cinerea*) and dense thick grass cover. This limited exploration of certain areas especially where previous agricultural activity took place.

1.2. Legislative Framework

The National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) (Act No. 25, 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (Act No. 107 of 1998) require that individuals or institutions have specialist heritage impact assessment studies undertaken whenever development activities are planned and such activities trigger activities listed in the legislation. This report is the result of an archaeological and heritage study in accordance with the requirements as set out in Section 38 (3) of the NHRA in an effort to ensure that heritage features or sites that qualify as part of the national estate are properly managed and not damaged or destroyed.

The study aims to address the following objectives:

- Analysis of heritage issues;
- Assess the cultural significance of identified places including archaeological sites and features, buildings and structures, graves and burial grounds within a specific historic context;
- Identifying the need for more research;
- Surveying and mapping of identified places including archaeological sites and features, buildings and structures, graves and burial grounds;
- A preliminary assessment of the feasibility of the proposed development or construction from a heritage perspective;
- Identifying the need for alternatives when necessary; and
- Recommending mitigation measures to address any negative impacts on archaeological and heritage resources.

Heritage resources considered to be part of the national estate include those that are of archaeological, cultural or historical significance or have other special value to the present community or future generations.

The national estate may 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 paleontological sites;
- graves and burial grounds including:
 - (i) ancestral graves;
 - (ii) royal graves and graves of traditional leaders;
 - (iii) graves of victims of conflict;
 - (iv) graves of individuals designated by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette*;
 - (v) 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 slavery in South Africa;
- movable objects including:
 - (i) objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and paleontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens;

- (ii) objects to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage
- (iii) ethnographic art and objects;
- (iv) military objects
- (v) objects of decorative or fine art;
- (vi) objects of scientific or technological interest; and
- (vii) 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 of the National Archives of South Africa Act, 1996 (Act No. 43 of 1996).

Cultural resources are unique and non-renewable physical phenomena (of natural occurrence or made by humans) that can be associated with human (cultural) activities (Van Vollenhoven 1995:3). These would be any man-made structure, tool, object of art or waste that was left behind on or beneath the soil surface by historic or pre-historic communities. These remains, when studied in their original context by archaeologists, are interpreted in an attempt to understand, identify and reconstruct the activities and lifestyles of past communities. When these items are removed from their original context, any meaningful information they possess is lost, therefore it is important to locate and identify such remains before construction or development activities commence.

1.3. Approach and statutory requirements

The SAHRA Minimum standards of 2007 guideline document, forms the background against which the survey was planned and the report compiled. An Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) consists of three phases. This document deals with the first phase. This (phase 1) investigation is aimed at getting an overview of cultural resources in the project area, assigning significance to these resources, assessing the possible impact that the proposed activity may have on these resources, making recommendations pertaining to the management of heritage resources and putting forward mitigation measures where applicable.

When the archaeologist or heritage specialist encounters a situation where the planned project will lead to the destruction or alteration of an archaeological/ heritage site or feature, a second phase investigation is normally recommended. During a phase two investigation mitigation measures are put in place and detailed investigation into the nature of the cultural material is undertaken. Often at this stage, archaeological excavation and detailed mapping of a site is carried out in order to document and preserve the cultural heritage.

Phase three consists of the compiling of a management plan for the safeguarding, conservation, interpretation and utilization of cultural resources (Van Vollenhoven, 2002).

Continuous communication between the developer and heritage specialist after the initial assessment has been carried out may result in the modification of a planned route or development to incorporate or protect existing archaeological and heritage sites.

2. Description of surveyed area

The study area falls within the Umjindi Local Municipality, near the town Barberton, Mpumalanga Province. The survey was carried out in an area where the Legogote Sour Bushveld veld type predominates. The project area is located on the farm Bornmansdrift 639 JT and approximately 133 hectares in size. The proposed activity is the establishment of Macadamia nut orchards.

Veld type: The vegetation forms part of the Savanna Biome and classed as Legogote Sour Bushveld. This veld type occurs in Mpumalanga and Limpopo Provinces on the lower eastern slopes and hills or the northeastern escarpment from Mariepskop in the north through White River to the Nelspruit area and extending westwards up valleys of the Crocodile, Elands and Houtbosloop Rivers and terminating in the south in the Barberton area. Altitude is 600-1000 m and sometimes higher. The landscape is characterised by gently to moderately upper pediment slopes with dense woodland including many medium to large shrubs, short thicket occurs on less rocky sites (Mucina and Rutherford, 2009).

Geology and soils: The larger part of the area is underlain by gneiss and migmatite of the Nelspruit Suite but the southern part occurs on the potassium-poor rocks of the Kaap Valley Tonalite. Pretoria Group shale and quartzite occur in the westernmost areas. Archaean granite plains with granite inselbergs and large granite boulders also occur (Mucina and Rutherford, 2009).

Limiting factors: As mentioned under Constraints and Limitations above, in most parts of the project areas dense undergrowth and impenetrable thicket which limited the exploration of certain areas.

3. Methodology

This study consists of a detailed archival study in order to understand the study area in a historical timeframe, an archaeological background study which include scrutiny of previous archaeological reports of the area, obtained through the SAHRIS database, and published as well as unpublished written sources on the archaeology of the area, social consultation with people who live nearby and a lastly a physical survey of the affected and immediate area.

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and the relevant legislation (NHRA) require that the following components be included in an archaeological impact assessment:

- Archaeology;
- Shipwrecks;
- Battlefields;
- Graves;
- Structures older than 60 years;
- Living heritage;
- Historical settlements;
- Landscapes;
- Geological sites; and
- Paleontological sites and objects.

All the above-mentioned heritage components are addressed in this report, except shipwrecks, geological sites and paleontological sites and objects.

The **purpose** of the archaeological, archival and heritage study is to establish the whereabouts and nature of cultural heritage sites should they occur on project area. This includes settlements, structures and artefacts which have value for an individual or group of people in terms of historical, archaeological, architectural and human (cultural) development.

The **aim** of this study is to locate and identify such objects or places in order to assess and rate their significance and establish if further investigation is needed. Mitigation measures can then be suggested and put in place when necessary.

3.1. Archaeological and Archival background studies

The purpose of the desktop study is to compile as much information as possible on the heritage resources of the area. This helps to provide an historical context for located sites. Sources used for

this study include published and unpublished documents, archival material and maps. Information obtained from the following institutions or individuals were consulted:

- Lydenburg Museum, Lydenburg;
- Published and unpublished archaeological reports and articles;
- Published and unpublished historical reports and articles;
- Archival documents from the National Archives in Pretoria;
- Historical maps; and
- South African Heritage Resource Information System (SAHRIS) database.

3.1.1. Previous archaeological studies in the area

Some archaeological impact assessments (AIA's) and heritage impact assessments have been done in the vicinity of the proposed development area.

In 2002 Mr JA van Schalkwyk conducted an "Archaeological survey of a section of the Secunda-Mozambique Gas Pipeline, Barberton District, Mpumalanga". He identified five Late Iron Age stonewalled sites and four informal cemeteries.

In 2015 Adansonia Heritage Consultants conducted a "Phase 1 Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment of the stone walled settlements on Taurus Plantation, Barberton District, Mpumalanga Province". During the study twenty five LIA stone walled enclosures were identified together with five historical features and five burial sites.

3.1.2. Historic maps

Historical maps obtained during the archival study were scrutinized and features that were regarded as important in terms of heritage value were identified and if they were located within the boundaries of the project area they were physically visited in an effort to determine:

- (i) whether they still exist;
- (ii) their current condition; and
- (iii) significance.

3.2. Social Consultation

Social consultation forms an important part of identifying sites which may be of heritage significance. Previous owner of the farm Mrs Lalie Smith, showed the graveyard (Site BD 1) where her parents are buried near the farmstead (Site BD 2 and 3). She also provided information regarding the age of the farmstead and estimate the age to be more than 100 years as she was raised there. Farm worker Mr Bheki Maseko was a valuable informant regarding the location of unmarked graves on the property, he grew up on the farm and has good knowledge of the land. He pointed out all the unmarked gravesites (Sites BD 4-10). Many of these sites are however not located in the proposed development area (Sites BD2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11).

3.3. Heritage site significance

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) formulated guidelines for the conservation of all cultural resources and therefore also divided such sites into three main categories. These categories might be seen as guidelines that suggest the extent of protection a given site might receive. They include sites or features of local (Grade 3) provincial (Grade 2) national (Grade 1) significance, grades of *local significance* and *generally protected* sites with a variety of degrees of significance.

For practical purposes the surveyor uses his own classification for sites or features and divides them into three groups, those of low or no significance, those of medium significance and those of high significance (***Also see table 5.2. Significance rating guidelines for sites.***)

Values used to assign significance and impact characteristics to a site include:

- **Types of significance**

The site's scientific, aesthetic and historic significance or a combination of these is established.

- **Degrees of significance**

The archaeological or historic site's rarity and representative value is considered. The condition of the site is also an important consideration.

- **Spheres of significance**

Sites are categorized as being significant in the international, national, provincial, regional or local context. Significance of a site for a specific community is also taken into consideration.

To arrive at the specific allocation of significance of a site or feature, the specialist considers the following:

- Historic context;
- Archaeological context or scientific value;
- Social value;
- Aesthetic value; and
- Research value.

More specific criteria used by the specialist in order to allocate value or significance to a site include:

- The unique nature of a site;
- The integrity of the archaeological deposit;
- The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site;
- The location of the site in relation to other similar sites or features;
- The depth of the archaeological deposit (when it can be determined or is known);
- The preservation condition of the site;
- Quality of the archaeological or historic material of the site; and
- Quantity of sites and site features.

Archaeological and historic sites containing data, which may significantly enhance the knowledge that archaeologists currently have about our cultural heritage, should be considered highly valuable. In all instances these sites should be preserved and not damaged during construction activities. However, when development activities jeopardize the future of such a site, a second and third phase in the Cultural Resource Management (CRM) process is normally advised. This entails the excavation or rescue excavation of cultural material, along with a management plan to be drafted for the preservation of the site or sites.

Graves are considered very sensitive sites and should never under any circumstances be jeopardized by development activities. Graves and burial grounds are incorporated in the NHRA under section 36 and in all instances where graves are found by the surveyor, the recommendation would be to steer clear of these areas. If this is not possible or if construction activities have for some reason damaged graves, specialized consultants are normally contacted to aid in the process of exhumation and re-interment of the human remains.

4. History and Archaeology

4.1. Historic period

4.1.1. Early History

In Southern Africa the domestication of the environment began only a couple of thousands of years ago, when agriculture and herding were introduced. At some time during the last half of the first millennium BC, people living in the region where Botswana, Zambia and Angola are today, started moving southward, until they reached the Highveld and the Cape in the area of modern South Africa. As time passed and the sub-continent became fully settled, these agro-pastoralists, who spoke Bantu languages, started dominating all those areas which were ecologically suitable for their way of life. This included roughly the eastern half of modern South Africa, the eastern fringe of Botswana and the north of Namibia. Historians agree that the earliest Africans to inhabit in the Lowveld in Mpumalanga were of Sotho, or more particularly Koni-origin.

Up until the 1930s, malaria would have occurred sporadically in the study area during the rainy season. During the first half of the nineteenth century, Tsetse flies also thrived in this area. Pastoralists would have avoided the moist low-lying valleys and thickly wooded regions where these insects preferred to congregate. It is unlikely that populations would be dense in areas where malaria and the “sleeping sickness” transferred by Tsetse flies was a constant threat to humans and their stock (Bergh 1999: 3; Shillington 1995: 32). Therefore the elevated location of the stone-walled sites on Bruitjieslaagte was probably purposeful to avoid these pests. It also points to the ancient origin of the sites.

In a few decades, the course of history in the old 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 1820s until the late 1830s. 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.

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 the 1720’s. One such an adventurer was Robert Schoon, 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. Schoon had gone on two long expeditions in the late 1820s and once again ventured eastward and northward of Pretoria in 1836 (Bergh, 1999: 13, 116-121).

By the late 1820s, 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 numbers of people of European descent. As can be expected, the movement of whites into the Northern provinces would have a significant impact on the local farmer – herders who populated the land.

By 1860, the population of Europeans 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 (Ross 2002: 39; Bergh, 1999: 170).

However, relations were at times also interdependent in nature. After the Great Trek, when European farmers had settled at various areas in the northern provinces, wealthier individuals were often willing to lodge needy white families on their property in exchange for odd jobs and commando service. These “bywoners” 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 labourer, but mostly kept native workers for hard labour on the farm.

The discovery of gold in South Africa had a major impact in the region. In 1873 gold was discovered in Pilgrims Rest, 80 kilometres north of Nelspruit. This drew scores of prospectors into the region. The establishment of Barberton in 1884, after the discovery of the Sheba gold reef, also brought about greater activity in the area. The Nelspruit settlement first received official recognition in August 1884 (South African History Online 2013).

A large Homeland was located a small distance to the east of Barberton, and later became known as Kangwane. This area was proclaimed by the Land Act of 1936. In the Surplus People Project Report, the forced removal of people to the Kangwane area, or homeland, is discussed. According to this source the area could be regarded as a “dumping ground” allocated to South Africa's Swazis, consisting of two blocks of land. The first of these, the Nsikazi reserve, was a finger of land stretching along the western boundary of the Kruger National Park, and had been under black occupation for over 50 years. The second block was adjacent to the western and northern boundaries of Swaziland, and consisted of the Nkomazi and Mswati/Mlondozi reserves released under the 1935 Land Act. (Bergh 1999: 42; Surplus people project 1983: 59)

4.1.2. The Voortrekkers

The Groot Trek of the Voortrekkers started with the Tregardt- van Rensburg trek in 1835. The two men met where Tregardt and his followers crossed the Orange River at Buffelsvlei (Aliwal North). Here van Rensburg joined the trek northwards. On August 23, 1837 the Tregardt trek left for Delagoabay from the Soutpansberg. They travelled eastwards alongside the Olifants River to the eastern foothills of the Drakensberg. From here they travelled through the Lowveld and the current

Kruger National Park where they eventually crossed the Lebombo mountains in March 1838. They reached the Fortification at Lourenço Marques on 13 April 1838 (Bergh, 1998:124-125).

Permanent European (Voortrekker) settlement of the eastern areas of Mpumalanga can be traced back to a commission under the leadership of A.H. (Hendrik) Potgieter who negotiated with the Portuguese Governor at Delagoabaai in 1844 for land. It was agreed that these settlers could settle in an area that was four days journey from the east coast of Africa between the 10° and 26° south latitudes. Voortrekkers started migrating into the area in 1845. Andries-Ohrigstad was the first town established in this area in July 1845 after the Voortrekkers successfully negotiated for land with the Pedi Chief Sekwati. Farms were given out as far west as the Olifants River. The western boundary was not officially defined but at a Volksraad meeting in 1849 it was decided that the Elands River would be the boundary between the districts of Potchefstroom and Lydenburg as this eastern portion of the Transvaal was then known (Bergh, 1998).

Due to internal strife and differences between the various Voortrekker groups that settled in the broader Transvaal region, the settlers in the Ohrigstad area now governed from the town of Lydenburg decided to secede from the Transvaal Republic in 1856. The Republic of Lydenburg laid claim to a large area that included not only the land originally obtained from the Pedi Chief Sekwati in 1849 but also other areas of land negotiated for from the Swazis. The Republic of Lydenburg was a vast area and stretched from the northern Strydpoort mountains to Wakkerstroom in the south and Bronkhortsspruit in the west to the Swazi border and the Lebombo mountains east.

As can be expected, the migration of Europeans into the north would have a significant impact on the indigenous people who populated the land. This was also the case in Mpumalanga. In 1839 Mswati succeeded Sobhuza (also known as Somhlomo) as king of the Swazi. Threatened by the ambitions of his half brothers, including Malambule, who had support from the Zulu king Mpande, he turned to the Ohrigstad Boers for protection. He claimed that the land that the Boers had settled on was Swazi property. The Commandant General of the Ohrigstad settlement, Andries Hendrik Potgieter, responded that the land was ceded to him by the Pedi leader Sekwati, in return for protection of the Pedi from Swazi attacks (Giliomee, 2003).

However, in reaction to the increasingly authoritarian way in which Potgieter conducted affairs at Ohrigstad, the Volksraad of Ohrigstad saw Mswati's offer as a means to obtain more respectable title deeds for the property (Bonner, 1978). According to a sales contract set up between the Afrikaners and the Swazi people on 25 July 1846, the whites were the rightful owners of the land that had its southern border at the Crocodile River, which stretched out in a westerly direction up to Elandspruit; of which the eastern border was where the Crocodile and Komati rivers joined and then extended up

to Delagoa bay in the north (Van Rooyen, 1951). The Europeans bought the land for a 100 heads of cattle (Huysen).

4.1.3. History of the Anglo Boer War (1899-1902) in the area

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 publicised, 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 advance between February to September 1900, Lord Roberts replaced Genl. Buller as the supreme commander and applied a different tactic in confronting the Boer forces instead of a frontal attack approach he opted to encircle the enemy. This proved successful and resulted for instance in the surrender of Genl. Piet Cronje and 4000 burghers at Paardeberg on 27 February 1900.

This was the start of a number of victories for the British and shortly after they occupied Pretoria on 5 June 1900, a skirmish at Diamond Hill resulted in the Boer forces under command of Louis Botha, retreated alongside the Delagoa Bay railway to the east. Between the 21-27 August, Botha and 5000 burghers defended their line at Bergendal but were overwhelmed by superior numbers and artillery. This resulted in the Boer forces retreating even further east and three weeks later the British reached Komatipoort and thus the whole of the Eastern Transvaal south of the Delagoa Bay railway line was now occupied by British Forces. General Louis Botha, with his Boer forces, marched through Nelspruit on 11 September 1900. A week later, on 18 September 1900, the British battalion of Lieutenant General F. Roberts arrived in Nelspruit. No major skirmishes in the war took place near Nelspruit, but a concentration camp for black people was established a small distance to the north of the town. Another event of import in the area was the arrival of the President of the Transvaal, Paul Kruger, in Nelspruit on 29 May 1900, where he received a message saying Lord Roberts had annexed the Transvaal. Kruger declared the annexation illegitimate on 3 September 1900, the same

day that Nelspruit was proclaimed as the administrative capital of the Transvaal Republic. Kruger left Nelspruit in June of that year in order to board a ship to Swaziland (Bergh, 1999: 51; 54).

No major skirmishes in the war took place near Barberton, but a white concentration camp was established a small distance to the west of the town (Bergh, 1999: 54).

4.1.4. Historic maps of the study area

Since the mid-1800s up until the present, South Africa has been divided and re-divided into various districts. Since 1845, Barberton and the farms to the north west thereof, including the property under investigation, formed part of the Lydenburg district. This remained the case up until 1902, when the Barberton district was proclaimed. By 1994 the property under investigation was still located in the Barberton district (Bergh, 1999: 17, 20-27).

By the early 1900s the property was known as Bornmans Drift / Bornmansdrift 245. This remained the case up until the 1950s, when the property was renamed Bornmans Drift / Bornmansdrift 642 JT. By the 1980s the farm had however been renamed Bornmansdrift 639 JT, as it is still known today.



Fig. 4.1. The Major Jackson Map of the Barberton district in 1902. The approximate location of Bornmansdrift is indicated with a yellow border. The town of Barberton is visible to the south east. The South Kaap River formed the southern boundary of the study area, and two of its tributaries passes through. A main road went through the area. One can also see a footpath, as well as an ordinary road branching from the main road (Major Jackson 1902) (Major Jackson 1902).




Fig. 4.2. Map of the Barberton District in 1917. The yellow border shows the location of Bornmans Drift 245. This map is not very detailed, but serves to show the property under investigation in relation to the neighbouring farms, as well as the Barberton town lands. The farm was located in Section C of the Kaap Block of farms (Surveyor-General 1917).




Fig. 4.3. Map of the Kruger National Park, dating approximately to the 1930s. The location of Bormmans Drift 245 is indicated with a yellow border. (NASA Maps: 3/1254)




Fig.4.4. A Topographical map of the area in 1942, scale 1:250 000. The study area on Bornmansdrift is indicated with a yellow border. The red circle shows the old farmstead (site BD2). The red lines represent roads that went through the area. One can also see a river and its tributaries going through this area. There are no signs of agriculture in the study area, and it seems that natural bush was still the predominant vegetation (Topographical Map 1942).




Fig. 4.5. Topographical map of Bornmans Drift 642 JT in 1968 (this farm later became known as Bornmansdrift 639 JT). The yellow border indicates the approximate project area. A main road forms the eastern border of the property and a secondary road goes through the farm. Two farm roads branch from the latter. A river forms the southern boundary of the property, and one can see some tributaries of the stream running through the farm. A large part of the surface area of the farm was under cultivation. A few buildings can be seen spread out in various parts of the farm. Round dots represent huts and squares indicate European buildings. Only the farmstead is still intact (Topographical Map 1968).




Fig.4.6. A Topographical map of the area in the year 1974. The approximate location of the study area is indicated with a yellow border. A main road forms the eastern border of the study area and a secondary road goes through the property. One can see a shop near the eastern border (Topographical Map 1974).

4.1.5. Historical overview of the ownership and development of Bornmansdrift 639 JT.

A number of sources were consulted in the National Archives of South Africa, and together with historical maps it is possible to learn how the landscape changed over time. Firstly, a record of historical landowners for the Remaining Extent of the property will be provided. Thereafter follows a discussion of who lived on Bornmansdrift and for what purpose the land was historically used. Unfortunately, there is not much information available at the National Archives of South Africa specifically dealing with the history of this property.

Record of historical landowners

No information could be found regarding the earliest landowners of Bornmansdrift. It could however be ascertained that one Myndert Jacobus Bornman was the owner of the property by 1895 (NASA TAB, OD: OR3882/95).

The following information could be obtained regarding present day landowners of the Remaining Extent of Bornmansdrift 639 JR on the Windeed Search Engine:

Portion	Owner	Title Deed	Registration Date
RE	Cornelus Bornman	T24767/1975	1975
RE	Land- & Landbank	B35585/1995	1995

(Windeed Search Engine 2017)

The Remaining Extent of Bornmansdrift 639 JT is currently owned by Margaretha Rachel Smith, to whom this property was transferred in 1995 as part of an estate (Windeed Search Engine 2017).

History of land use

By 1895 M. J. Bornman was the owner of the farm Bornmansdrift, district Barberton. There was a small farm school on the property by 1895, and accommodation was provided to the teacher on the farm (NASA TAB, OD: OR3882/95). By 1903 M. J. Bornman was the owner of Lots 42, 43, 47, 112 and 113 of Bornmansdrift 245. By February of this year 35 head of cattle died had on his farm due to the Redwater disease. Two more were sick and four head of cattle had been in contact with the disease. The Department of Agriculture of the Transvaal recommended that the remaining cattle would be placed in quarantine and dipped, and that the sick cattle would be given quinine injections. Cattle had apparently been dying off on the farm since August 1902 (NASA TAB, TAD: 1016 W46).




Fig. 4.7. Surveyor-General diagram showing dated 1911 which shows the Remainder of the holding Castle kop 197, the farm Ons Tuinen 252, as well as the location of Portion D of Bornmansdrift 245. Portion 1 of Portion D (the figure lettered GC mid river DEF) of Bornmansdrift 245 was transferred in favour of Cornelus Johannes Bornman on 30 July 1924 (NASA TAB, WAT: 630/1968).




Fig. 4.8. Surveyor-General Diagram of the holding Bornman's Drift 245, in 1911, which measured 694 morgen 170 square roods at the time. The farms Castlekop 197, Ons Tuinen 252, Edgbaston 221 and Coppice 147 adjoined Bornman's Drift. This holding comprised of Lots 42, 43, 47, 112 and 113 of Section C of the Kaap Block in the district of Barberton in the Transvaal (NASA TAB, WAT: 630/1968).

Myndert Jacobus Bornman and Cornelus Johannes Bornman were furnished with a Crown Grant for the following properties in June 1916: Portion A (Previously Lot 42 of Section C, Kaap Block) of Bornmansdrift 245; Portion B (Previously Lot 43 of Section C, Kaap Block) of Bornmansdrift 245; Portion C (Previously Lot 47 of Section C, Kaap Block) of Bornmansdrift 245; Portion D (Previously Lot 112 of Section C, Kaap Block) of Bornmansdrift 245; Portion E (Previously Lot 113 of Section C, Kaap Block) of Bornmansdrift 245 (NASA TAB, WAT: 630/1968).




Fig. 4.9. A Map, dated 1970, showing a number of farms including Bornman's Drift 642 JT (NASA SAB, CDB: 1722 PB3/2/3/111/12).

4.2. Archaeology

4.2.1. Stone Age

In Mpumalanga Province the Drakensberg separates the interior plateau also known as the Highveld from the low-lying subtropical Lowveld, which stretches to the Indian Ocean. A number of rivers amalgamate into two main river systems, the Olifants River and the Komati River. This fertile landscape has provided resources for humans and their predecessors for more than 1.7 million years (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

The initial attraction of abundant foods in the form of animals and plants eventually also led to the discovery of and utilisation of various minerals including ochre, iron and copper. People also obtained foreign resources by means of trade from the coast. From 900 AD this included objects brought across the ocean from foreign shores.

The Early Stone Age (ESA)

In South Africa the ESA dates from about 2 million to 250 000 years ago, in other words from the early to middle Pleistocene. The archaeological record shows that as the early ancestors progressed physically, mentally and socially, bone and stone tools were developed. One of the most influential advances was their control of fire and diversifying their diet by exploitation of the natural environment (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

The earliest stone tools used date to around 2.5 million years ago from the site of Gona in Ethiopia. Stone tools from this site shows that early hominids had to cognitive ability to select raw material and shape it for a specific application. Many bones found in association with stone tools like these have cut marks which lead scientists to believe that early hominids purposefully chipped cobblestones to produce flakes with a sharp edge capable of cutting and butchering animal carcasses. This supplementary diet of higher protein quantities ensured that brain development of hominids took place more rapidly.

Mary Leaky discovered stone tools like these in the Olduvai Gorge in Tanzania during the 1960s. The stone tools are named after this gorge and are known as relics from the Oldowan industry. These tools, only found in Africa, are mainly simple flakes, which were struck from cobbles. This method of manufacture remained for about 1.5 million years. Although there is continuing debate about who made these tools, two hominids may have been responsible. The first of these was an early form of *Homo* and the second was *Paranthropus robustus*, which became extinct about 1 million years ago (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

Some time later, around 1.7 million years ago, more specialised tools known as Acheulean tools, appeared. These are named after tools from a site in France by the name of Saint Acheul, where they were first discovered in the 1800s. It is argued that these tools had their origin in Africa and then

spread towards Europe and Asia with the movement of hominids out of Africa. These tools had longer and sharper edges and shapes, which suggest that they could be used for a larger range of activities, including the butchering of animals, chopping of wood, digging roots and cracking bone. *Homo ergaster* was probably responsible for the manufacture of Acheulean tools in South Africa. This physical type was arguably physically similar to modern humans, had a larger brain and modern face, body height and proportion very similar to modern humans. *Homo ergaster* was able to flourish in a variety of habitats in part because they were dependent on tools. They adapted to drier, more open grassland settings. Because these early people were often associated with water sources such as rivers and lakes, sites where they left evidence of their occupation are very rare. Most tools of these people have been washed into caves, eroded out of riverbanks and washed downriver. An example in Mpumalanga is Maleoskop on the farm Rietkloof where Early Stone Age (ESA) tools have been found. This is one of only a handful such sites in Mpumalanga.

Middle Stone Age (MSA)

A greater variety of tools with diverse sizes and shapes appeared by 250 000 before present (BP). These replaced the large hand axes and cleavers of the ESA. This technological advancement introduces the Middle Stone Age (MSA). This period is characterised by tools that are smaller in size but different in manufacturing technique (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

In contrast to the ESA technology of removing flakes from a core, MSA tools were flakes to start with. They were of a predetermined size and shape and were made by preparing a core of suitable material and striking off the flake so that it was flaked according to a shape which the toolmaker desired. Elongated, parallel-sided blades, as well as triangular flakes are common finds in these assemblages. Mounting of stone tools onto wood or bone to produce spears, knives and axes became popular during the MSA. These early humans not only settled close to water sources but also occupied caves and shelters. The MSA represents the transition of more archaic physical type (*Homo*) to anatomically modern humans, *Homo sapiens*.

The MSA has not been extensively studied in Mpumalanga but evidence of this period has been excavated at Bushman Rock Shelter, a well-known site on the farm Klipfonteinhoek in the Ohrigstad district. This cave was excavated twice in the 1960s by Louw and later by Eloff. The MSA layers show that the cave was repeatedly visited over a long period. Lower layers have been dated to over 40 000 BP while the top layers date to approximately 27 000 BP (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

Later Stone Age (LSA)

Early hunter gatherer societies were responsible for a number of technological innovations and social transformations during this period starting at around 20 000 years BP. Hunting of animals proved

more successful with the innovation of the bow and link-shaft arrow. These arrows were made up of a bone tip which was poisoned and loosely linked to the main shaft of the arrow. Upon impact, the tip and shaft separated leaving the poisoned arrow-tip imbedded in the prey animal. Additional innovations include bored stones used as digging stick weights to uproot tubers and roots; small stone tools, mostly less than 25mm long, used for cutting of meat and scraping of hides; polished bone tools such as needles; twine made from plant fibres and leather; tortoiseshell bowls; ostrich eggshell beads; as well as other ornaments and artwork (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

At Bushman Rock Shelter the MSA is also represented and starts at around 12 000 BP but only lasted for some 3 000 years. The LSA is of importance in geological terms as it marks the transition from the Pleistocene to the Holocene, which was accompanied by a gradual shift from cooler to warmer temperatures. This change had its greatest influence on the higher-lying areas of South Africa. Both Bushman Rock Shelter and a nearby site, Heuningneskrans, have revealed a greater use in plant foods and fruit during this period (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

Faunal evidence suggests that LSA hunter-gatherers trapped and hunted zebra, warthog and bovids of various sizes. They also diversified their protein diet by gathering tortoises and land snails (*Achatina*) in large quantities.

Ostrich eggshell beads were found in most of the levels at these two sites. It appears that there is a gap of approximately 4 000 years in the Mpumalanga LSA record between 9 000 BP and 5 000 BP. This may be a result of generally little Stone Age research being conducted in the province. It is, however, also a period known for rapid warming and major climate fluctuation, which may have led people to seek out protected environments in this area. The Mpumalanga Stone Age sequence is visible again during the mid-Holocene at the farm Honingklip near Badplaas in the Carolina district (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

At this location, two LSA sites were located on opposite sides of the Nhlazatshe River, about one kilometre west of its confluence with the Teespruit. These two sites are located on the foothills of the Drakensberg, where the climate is warmer than the Highveld but also cooler than the Lowveld (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

Nearby the sites, dated to between 4 870 BP and 200 BP are four panels, which contain rock art. Colouring material is present in all the excavated layers of the site, which makes it difficult to determine whether the rock art was painted during the mid- or later Holocene. Stone walls at both sites date from the last 250 years of hunter gatherer occupation and they may have served as protection from predators and intruders (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

4.2.2. Early Iron Age

The period referred to as the Early Iron Age (AD 200-1500 approx.) started when presumably Karanga (north-east African) herder groups moved into the north eastern parts of South Africa. It is believed that these people may have been responsible for making of the famous Lydenburg Heads, ceramic masks dating to approximately 600AD.

Ludwig von Bezing was a boy of more or less 10 years of age when he first saw pieces of the now famous Lydenburg heads in 1957 while playing in the veld on his father's farm near Lydenburg. Five years later von Bezing developed an interest in archaeology and went back to where he first saw the shards. Between 1962 and 1966 he frequently visited the Sterkspruit valley to collect pieces of the seven clay heads. Von Bezing joined the archaeological club of the University of Cape Town when he studied medicine at this institution.

He took his finds to the university at the insistence of the club. He had not only found the heads, but potsherds, iron beads, copper beads, ostrich eggshell beads, pieces of bones and millstones. Archaeologists of the University of Cape Town and WITS Prof. Ray Innskeep and Dr Mike Evers excavated the site where von Bezing found the remains. This site and in particular its unique finds (heads, clay masks) instantly became internationally famous and was henceforth known as the Lydenburg Heads site.

Two of the clay masks are large enough to probably fit over the head of a child, the other five are approximately half that size. The masks have both human and animal features, a characteristic that may explain that they had symbolic use during initiation- and other religious ceremonies. Carbon dating proved that the heads date to approximately 600 AD and was made by Early Iron Age people. These people were Bantu herders and agriculturists and probably populated Southern Africa from areas north-east of the Limpopo river. Similar ceramics were later found in the Gustav Klingbiel Nature Reserve and researchers believe that they are related to the ceramic wares (pottery) of the Lydenburg Heads site in form, function and decorative motive. This sequence of pottery is formally known as the Klingbiel type pottery. No clay masks were found in a context similar to this pottery sequence.

Two larger heads and five smaller ones make up the Lydenburg find. The Lydenburg heads are made of the same clay used in making household pottery. It is also made with the same technique used in the manufacture of household pottery. The smaller heads display the modelling of a curved forehead and the back neck as it curves into the skull. Around the neck of each of the heads, two or three rings are engraved horizontally and are filled in with hatching marks to form a pattern. A ridge

of clay over the forehead and above the ears indicates the hairline. On the two larger heads a few rows of small clay balls indicate hair decorations. The mouth consists of lips – the smaller heads also have teeth. The seventh head has the snout of an animal and is the only head that represents an animal.

Some archaeological research was done during the 1970's at sites belonging to the Early Iron Age (EIA), location Plaston, a settlement close to White River (Evers, 1977). This site is located on a spur between the White River and a small tributary. It is situated on holding 119 at Plaston.

The site was discovered during house building operations when a collection of pottery sherds was excavated. The finds consisted of pottery shards both on the surface and excavated.

Some of the pottery vessels were decorated with a red ochre wash. Two major decoration motifs occurred on the pots:

- Punctuation, using a single stylus; and
- Broad line incision, the more common motif.

A number of EIA pottery collections from Mpumalanga and Limpopo may be compared to the Plaston sample. They include Silver Leaves, Eiland, Matola, Klingbiel and the Lydenburg Heads site. The Plaston sample is distinguished from samples of these sites in terms of rim morphology, the majority of rims from Plaston are rounded and very few bevelled. Rims from the other sites show more bevelled rims (Evers, 1977:176).

Early Iron Age pottery was also excavated by archaeologist, Prof. Tom Huffman during 1997 on location where the Riverside Government complex is currently situated (Huffman, 1998). This site is situated a few km north of Nelspruit next to the confluence of the Nelspruit and Crocodile River. It was discovered during the course of an environmental impact assessment for the new Mpumalanga Government complex offices. A bulldozer cutting exposed storage pits, cattle byres, a burial and midden on the crest of a gentle slope. Salvage excavations conducted during December 1997 and March 1998 recovered the burial and contents of several pits.

One of the pits contained, among other items, pottery dating to the eleventh century (AD 1070 ± 40 BP). This relates the pottery to the Mzonjani and Broederstroom phases. The early assemblage belongs to the Kwale branch of the Urewe tradition.

During the early 1970s Dr Mike Evers of the University of the Witwatersrand conducted fieldwork and excavations in the Eastern Transvaal. Two areas were studied: the first area was the Letaba area south of the Groot Letaba River, west of the Lebombo Mountains, east of the great escarpment and north of the Olifants River. The second area was the Eastern Transvaal escarpment area between Lydenburg and Machadodorp.

These two areas are referred to as the Lowveld and escarpment respectively. The earliest work on Iron Age archaeology was conducted by Trevor and Hall in 1912. This revealed prehistoric copper-, gold- and iron mines. Schwelinus (1937) reported smelting furnaces, a salt factory and terraces near Phalaborwa. In the same year D.S. van der Merwe located ruins, graves, furnaces, terraces and soapstone objects in the Letaba area.

Mason (1964, 1965, 1967, 1968) started the first scientific excavation in the Lowveld, followed by N.J. van der Merwe and Scully. M. Klapwijk (1973, 1974) also excavated an EIA site at Silverleaves and Evers and van den Berg (1974) excavated at Harmony and Eiland, both EIA sites.

Research by the National Cultural History Museum resulted in the excavation of an EIA site in Sekhukuneland, known as Mototolong (Van Schalkwyk, 2007). The site is characterized by four large cattle kraals containing ceramics, which may be attributed to the Mzonjani and Doornkop occupational phases.

4.2.3. Late Iron Age

The later phases of the Iron Age (AD 1600-1800's) are represented by various tribes including Ndebele, Swazi, BaKoni, and Pedi, marked by extensive stonewalled settlements found throughout the escarpment and particularly around Machadodorp, Lydenburg, Badfontein, Sekhukuneland, Roossenekal and Steelpoort. The BaKoni were the architects of a unique archaeological stone building complex who by the 19th century spoke seKoni which was similar to Sepedi. The core elements of this tradition are stone-walled enclosures, roads and terraces. These settlement complexes may be divided into three basic features: homesteads, terraces and cattle tracks. Researchers such as Mike Evers (1975) and David Collett (1982) identified three basic settlement layouts in this area. Basically these sites can be divided into simple and complex ruins. Simple ruins are normally small in relation to more complex sites and have smaller central cattle byres and fewer huts. Complex ruins consist of a central cattle byre, which has two opposing entrances and a number of semi-circular enclosures surrounding it. The perimeter wall of these sites is sometimes poorly visible. Huts are built between the central enclosure and the perimeter wall. These are all connected by track-ways referred to as cattle tracks. These tracks are made by building stone walls, which forms a walkway for cattle to the centrally located cattle byres.

5. Site descriptions, locations and impact significance assessment

A total of thirteen (13) sites were recorded during the survey. In terms of sites of archaeological nature, no sites were identified. In terms of built environment, two buildings, the farmstead and an associated rondavel were documented but both are located outside of the proposed development area. In terms of burial grounds and graves (section 36 of the Act) seven unmarked gravesites (Sites BD 1, 4-10) were located. All of these sites except sites BD1 and 9, are not located in the proposed development area (Sites BD 4-10) (see maps Appendix C). The sites are tabled in Appendix B and their photos in Appendix D. A map of their location is also provided in Appendix C.

A total of fourteen (14) survey orientation locations were documented (SO 1-14) which includes a GPS location and photographs of the landscape at that particular location. Twelve of these (SO 1-6 and 19-24) are located on the farm Barclay Vale and the remaining twenty three (SO 7-18 and 25-35) are located on the farm Montrose. The survey orientation sites are tabled in Appendix B and their photos in Appendix D. A map of their location is also provided in Appendix C.

Tables indicate the **site significance rating scales and status** in terms of possible impacts of the proposed actions on any located or identified heritage sites (**Table 5.5 & 5.6**). **Survey orientation sites are not discussed in tables 5.3-5.6 as they are not sites with any heritage significance.**

Table 5.1. Summary of located sites and their heritage significance

Type of site	Identified sites	Significance
Graves and graveyards	BD 1, 4 -10	LS 3A High
Late Iron Age	None	GP B
Early Iron Age	None	N/A
Historical buildings or structures	BD 2, 3	GP B
Historical features and ruins	BD 11-13	N/A
Stone Age sites	None	N/A

Table 5.2. Significance rating guidelines for sites

Field Rating	Grade	Significance	Recommended Mitigation
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1	High Significance	Conservation, nomination as national site
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2	High Significance	Conservation; Provincial site nomination
Local significance (LS 3A)	Grade 3A	High Significance	Conservation, No mitigation advised
Local Significance (LS 3B)	Grade 3B	High Significance	Mitigation but at least part of site should be retained
Generally Protected A (GPA)	GPA	High/ Medium Significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GPB)	GPB	Medium Significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GPC)	GPC	Low Significance	Destruction

5.1. Description of located sites

5.1.1. Site BD 1.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 41, 42).

Description: A formal graveyard. This is the Bornman family graveyard. The gravestone of both Petrus Johannes Uys Bornman born 03-12-1920, died 22-08-1994 and his wife Maria Johanna born 02-12-1912, died 07-07-2010 is located here.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

Probable impact as the site is located within the project area.

Recommendation:

Avoid any negative impact. Fencing of the graveyard is recommended and a buffer zone of at least 20 metres around the graveyard is recommended to avoid any impact. All graves are usually graded as High Local Significance (LS 3A; table 5.1 & 5.2) those older than 60 years are protected in terms of the NHRA (25 of 1999) section 36. Therefore a permit needs to be obtained from the South African

Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) if the graves were to be exhumed and re-interred. Construction contractors must be made aware of the location of the graves in order to minimise impact, fencing of the graves will contribute to their conservation. Earth moving operators must be made aware of the location of the graves in order to minimise impact, fencing of the graves will contribute to their conservation.

5.1.2. Site BD 2.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 43).

Description: The farmstead. According to informant Mrs Lalie Smith who was born and raised at the farmstead this building has been there since she can remember. It is also visible on topographic maps dating to 1943 (See Appendix C Maps).

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will probably not be impacted upon as it is located outside of the proposed development area. Cumulative impacts is however possible.

Recommendation:

General maintenance and upkeep. Avoid any alteration or demolition of the building. When alteration or demolition is planned a permit must be obtained prior thereto from either the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority (PHRA) or SAHRA.

5.1.3. Site BD 3.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 44).

Description: A rondavel associated with the farmstead. According to informant Mrs Lalie Smith who was born and raised at the farmstead this building has been there since she can remember.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will probably not be impacted upon as it is located outside of the proposed development area. Cumulative impacts is however possible.

Recommendation:

General maintenance and upkeep. Avoid any alteration or demolition of the building. When alteration or demolition is planned a permit must be obtained prior thereto from either the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority (PHRA) or SAHRA.

5.1.4. Site BD 4.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 45, 46).

Description: The location of at least 5 unmarked graves pointed out by informant Mr Bheki Maseko.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will not be impacted upon by the development as it is located outside of the proposed development area.

Recommendation:

High significance. Ensure a buffer area of at least 20 metres around the graves so as to minimize impact and fence with access gate for family to visit. If this is not possible and the grave is to be exhumed and re-interred a formal permit application process in accordance with Section 36 of the NHRA should be followed. The Human Tissues Act 65 of 1983 applies to graves younger than 60 years. Graves which are older than 60 years are protected under section 36 of the NHRA (25 of 1999) and therefore a permit must be issued by SAHRA before the grave may be relocated or exhumed. Earth moving operators must be made aware of the location of the graves in order to minimise impact, fencing of the graves will contribute to their conservation.

5.1.5. Site BD 5.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 47).

Description: The location of at least 1 unmarked grave pointed out by informant Mr Bheki Maseko.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will not be impacted upon by the development as it is located outside of the proposed development area.

Recommendation:

High significance. Ensure a buffer area of at least 20 metres around the graves so as to minimize impact and fence with access gate for family to visit. If this is not possible and the grave is to be

exhumed and re-interred a formal permit application process in accordance with Section 36 of the NHRA should be followed. The Human Tissues Act 65 of 1983 applies to graves younger than 60 years. Graves which are older than 60 years are protected under section 36 of the NHRA (25 of 1999) and therefore a permit must be issued by SAHRA before the grave may be relocated or exhumed. Earth moving operators must be made aware of the location of the graves in order to minimise impact, fencing of the graves will contribute to their conservation.

5.1.6. Site BD 6.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 48).

Description: The location of at least 2 unmarked grave pointed out by informant Mr Bheki Maseko.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will not be impacted upon by the development as it is located outside of the proposed development area.

Recommendation:

High significance. Ensure a buffer area of at least 20 metres around the graves so as to minimize impact and fence with access gate for family to visit. If this is not possible and the grave is to be exhumed and re-interred a formal permit application process in accordance with Section 36 of the NHRA should be followed. The Human Tissues Act 65 of 1983 applies to graves younger than 60 years. Graves which are older than 60 years are protected under section 36 of the NHRA (25 of 1999) and therefore a permit must be issued by SAHRA before the grave may be relocated or exhumed. Earth moving operators must be made aware of the location of the graves in order to minimise impact, fencing of the graves will contribute to their conservation.

5.1.7. Site BD 7.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 49-51).

Description: The location of one unmarked grave pointed out by informant Mr Bheki Maseko. According to him this is the grave of his grandfather, Mr filemon Khumalo.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will not be impacted upon by the development as it is located outside of the proposed development area.

Recommendation:

High significance. Ensure a buffer area of at least 20 metres around the graves so as to minimize impact and fence with access gate for family to visit. If this is not possible and the grave is to be exhumed and re-interred a formal permit application process in accordance with Section 36 of the NHRA should be followed. The Human Tissues Act 65 of 1983 applies to graves younger than 60 years. Graves which are older than 60 years are protected under section 36 of the NHRA (25 of 1999) and therefore a permit must be issued by SAHRA before the grave may be relocated or exhumed. Earth moving operators must be made aware of the location of the graves in order to minimise impact, fencing of the graves will contribute to their conservation.

5.1.8. Site BD 8.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 52).

Description: The location of at least seven graves pointed out by informant Mr Bheki Maseko.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will not be impacted upon by the development as it is located outside of the proposed development area.

Recommendation:

High significance. Ensure a buffer area of at least 20 metres around the grave so as to minimize impact and fence with access gate for family to visit. If this is not possible and the grave is to be exhumed and re-interred a formal permit application process in accordance with Section 36 of the NHRA should be followed.

5.1.9. Site BD 9.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 53).

Description: This is the location of an informal graveyard with at least 3 graves. All the graves are unmarked, they do not have headstones. The graves were pointed out by Mr Bheki Maseko who resides on the farm. He stated that the graves belong to the Sibongo Shongwe family.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site may be affected by the proposed development as it is located inside the project area.

Recommendation:

Earth moving operators must be made aware of the location of the graves in order to minimise impact, fencing of the graves will contribute to their conservation. Any surviving relatives should be allowed access. If this is not possible, heritage legislation guides alternative options. The Human Tissues Act 65 of 1983 applies to graves younger than 60 years. Graves which are older than 60 years are protected under section 36 of the NHRA (25 of 1999) and therefore a permit must be issued by SAHRA before the grave may be relocated or exhumed. A buffer zone of at least 20 metres is recommended to minimize impact.

5.1.10. Site BD 10.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 54, 55).

Description: This is the location of an informal graveyard with at least eight (8) unmarked graves. It was pointed out by informant Mr Bheki Maseko.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will not be impacted upon by the development as it is located outside of the proposed development area.

Recommendation:

Earth moving operators must be made aware of the location of the graves in order to minimise impact, fencing of the graves will contribute to their conservation. Any surviving relatives should be allowed access. If this is not possible, heritage legislation guides alternative options. The Human Tissues Act 65 of 1983 applies to graves younger than 60 years. Graves which are older than 60 years are protected under section 36 of the NHRA (25 of 1999) and therefore a permit must be

issued by SAHRA before the grave may be relocated or exhumed. A buffer zone of at least 20 metres is recommended to minimize impact.

5.1.11. Site BD 11.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 56).

Description: This is a small ruined building.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will probably not be affected by the proposed development activity as it is located outside of the project area.

Recommendation:

The ruin is not regarded as being of any heritage significance. No heritage management recommendations.

5.1.12. Site BD 12.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 57).

Description: This is a site where the remains of a ruined section of walling is located. The dense undergrowth and grass drastically limits visibility. It is highly probable that buildings which once stood here were demolished long ago. It is probably the remains of workers quarters as indicated on the 1:50 000 topographical map of 1989 (2530 DB).

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will probably be affected by the proposed development activity as it is located in the project area.

Recommendation:

The site is not regarded as being of high heritage significance but impact by the proposed agricultural development must be monitored in the event that burials may be concealed at or close-by the site. Also see section 6.1.

5.1.13. Site BD 13.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 58, 59).

Description: This is a site where the remains of a ruined farm workers dwellings is located. The dense undergrowth and grass drastically limits visibility. It is highly probable that buildings which once stood here were demolished long ago. It is probably the remains of workers quarters as indicated on the 1:50 000 topographical map of 1989 (2530 DB).

Impact of the proposed development/ activity:

The site will probably not be affected by the proposed development activity as it is located outside the project area.

Recommendation:

The site is not regarded as being of high heritage significance but impact by the proposed agricultural development must be monitored in the event that burials may be concealed at or close-by the site. Also see section 6.1.

Survey orientations:

5.1.14. Site SO 1.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig.1, 2).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.15. Site SO 2.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 3-5).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.16. Site SO 3.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 6-9).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.17. Site SO 4.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 10, 11).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.18. Site SO 5.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig.12-14).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.19. Site SO 6.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 15, 16).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.20. Site SO 7.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 17, 18).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.21. Site SO 8.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 19-21).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.22. Site SO 9.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 22-24).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.23. Site SO 10.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 25-28).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.24. Site SO 11.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 29-31).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.25. Site SO 12.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 32-34).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.26. Site SO 13.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 35-37).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

5.1.27. Site SO 14.

Location: See Appendix B and D (fig. 38-40).

Description: Survey orientation location.

Impact of the proposed development/ activity: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

TABLE 5.3. General description of located sites and field rating.

Site No.	Description	Type of significance	Degree of significance	NHRA heritage resource & rating
BD 1	Graves	Burial grounds & graves	Archaeological: N/K Historic: High	Burial Grounds & graves. High. LS GPA.
BD 2	House/ farmstead	Built environment	Archaeological: N/A Historic: Medium	Structures (Sect. 34). Medium. GP B.
BD 3	Rondavel	Built environment	Archaeological: N/A Historic: Medium	Structures (Sect. 34). Medium. GPB.
BD 4	Graves	Burial grounds & graves	Archaeological: N/K Historic: High	Burial Grounds & graves. High. LS GPA.
BD 5	Graves	Burial grounds & graves	Archaeological: N/K Historic: High	Burial Grounds & graves. High. LS GPA.
BD 6	Graves	Burial grounds & graves	Archaeological: N/K Historic: High	Burial Grounds & graves. High. LS GPA.
BD 7	Graves	Burial grounds & graves	Archaeological: N/K Historic: High	Burial Grounds & graves. High. LS GPA.
BD 8	Graves	Burial grounds & graves	Archaeological: N/K Historic: High	Burial Grounds & graves. High. LS GPA.
BD 9	Graves	Burial grounds & graves	Archaeological: N/K Historic: High	Burial Grounds & graves. High. LS GPA.
BD 10	Graves	Burial grounds & graves	Archaeological: N/K Historic: High	Burial Grounds & graves. High. LS GPA.
BD 11	Ruins of buildings	Built environment	Archaeological: N/A Historic: Low	Structures (Sect. 34). Low. GP C.
BD 12	Ruins of buildings	Built environment	Archaeological: N/A Historic: Low	Structures (Sect. 34). Low. GP C.
BD 13	Ruins of buildings	Built environment	Archaeological: N/A Historic: Low	Structures (Sect. 34). Low. GP C.

TABLE 5.4. Site condition assessment and management recommendations.

Site no.	Type of Heritage resource	Integrity of cultural material	Preservation condition of site	Relative location	Quality of archaeological/historic material	Quantity of site features	Recommended conservation management
BD 1	Burial grounds & graves	N/K	Fair	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: N/A	1	Avoid if possible & fence or relocation permit
BD 2	Built environment	N/A	Good	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: Good	1	Not located in project area. Older than 60 years, mitigation before destruction
BD 3	Built environment	N/A	Good	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: Good	1	Not located in project area. Older than 60 years, mitigation before destruction
BD 4	Burial grounds & graves	N/K	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: N/A	5	Outside project area. Avoid if possible & fence or relocation permit
BD 5	Burial grounds & graves	N/K	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: N/A	1	Outside project area. Avoid if possible & fence or relocation permit
BD 6	Burial grounds & graves	N/K	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: N/A	2	Outside project area. Avoid if possible & fence or relocation permit
BD 7	Burial grounds & graves	N/K	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: N/A	1	Outside project area. Avoid if possible & fence or relocation permit

BD 8	Burial grounds & graves	N/K	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: N/A	7	Outside project area. Avoid if possible & fence or relocation permit
BD 9	Burial grounds & graves	N/K	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: N/A	3	Avoid if possible & fence or relocation permit
BD 10	Burial grounds & graves	N/K	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: N/A Historically: N/A	8	Outside project area. Avoid if possible & fence or relocation permit
BD 11	Built environment	N/A	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: Poor Historically: Poor	1	Monitor before destruction
BD 12	Built environment	N/A	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: Poor Historically: Poor	1	Monitor before destruction
BD 13	Built environment	N/A	Poor	Bornmansdrift 639 JT	Archaeology: Poor Historically: Poor	1	Monitor before destruction

TABLE 5.5. Significance Rating Scales of Impact

Site No.	Nature of impact	Type of site	Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability	Score total
BD 1	Agric. Development	Graves	Site	Short term	High	Possible	5
BD 2	Agric. Development	House	Site	Short term	Low	Possible	3
BD 3	Agric. Development	House	Site	Short term	Low	Possible	3
BD 4	Agric. Development	Graves	Site	Short term	Low	Improbable	2
BD 5	Agric. Development	Graves	Site	Short term	Low	Improbable	2
BD 6	Agric. Development	Graves	Site	Short term	Low	Improbable	2
BD 7	Agric. Development	Graves	Site	Short term	Low	Improbable	2
BD 8	Agric. Development	Graves	Site	Short term	Low	Improbable	2
BD 9	Agric. Development	Graves	Site	Short term	High	Possible	5
BD 10	Agric. Development	Graves	Site	Short term	Low	Improbable	2
BD 11	Agric. development	Ruins	Site	Short term	Low	Improbable	2
BD 12	Agric. development	Ruins	Site	Short term	High	Possible	5
BD 13	Agric. development	Ruins	Site	Short term	High	Possible	5

*Notes: Short term ≥ 5 years, Medium term 5-15 years, Long term 15-30 years, Permanent 30+ years

Intensity: Very High (4), High (3), Moderate (2), Low (1)

Probability: Improbable (1), Possible (2), Highly probable (3), Definite (4)

TABLE 5.6. Site current status and future impact scores

Site No.	Current Status	Low impact (4-6 points)	Medium impact (7-9 points)	High impact (10-12 points)	Very high impact (13-16 points)	Score Total
BD 1	Neutral	-	-	High (12)	-	12
BD 2	Neutral	Low (6)	-	-	-	6
BD 3	Neutral	Low (6)	-	-	-	6
BD 4	Neutral	Low (4)	-	-	-	4
BD 5	Neutral	Low (4)	-	-	-	4
BD 6	Neutral	Low (4)	-	-	-	4
BD 7	Neutral	Low (6)	-	-	-	6
BD 8	Neutral	Low (4)	-	-	-	4
BD 9	Neutral	-	-	High (12)	-	12
BD 10	Neutral	Low (4)	-	-	-	4
BD 11	Neutral	Low (4)	-	-	-	4
BD 12	Neutral	-	-	High (12)	-	12
BD 13	Neutral	-	-	High (12)	-	12

5.2. Cumulative impacts on the heritage landscape

Cumulative impacts can occur when a range of impacts which result from several concurrent processes have impact on heritage resources. The importance of addressing cumulative impacts is that the total impact of several factors together is often greater than one single process or activity that may impact on heritage resources. There may be some indirect impact on sites BD 2 and BD 3 as they are located outside of but close to the project area. Any negative impact including alteration or demolition should be avoided and must be permitted before such action is taken. There may be some indirect impact on grave sites BD 1, BD 7 and BD 9. Any negative impact including damage caused by earthworks, alteration of the graves or demolition must be avoided. It is recommended that all gravesites be fenced to protect them and access be allowed to families of the deceased when needed. A buffer zone of at least 20 metres should be provided for at the gravesites to minimize any impact. Also see section 6.1. Recommended management measures.

6. Summary of findings and recommendations

A total of thirteen (13) sites were recorded during the survey. They were numbered BD1-13. In terms of the archaeological component of the Act (25 of 1999, section 35) no sites were identified. In terms of the built environment (section 34 of the Act) two significant buildings were identified (Sites BD 2 and BD 3) they are however located outside of the proposed development area. The sites of this nature comprise of buildings and structures associated with previous farming activity and residence. The buildings are considered to be of medium heritage significance and permitting before destruction is advised.

In terms of burial grounds and graves (section 36 of the Act) eight unmarked gravesites (Sites BD1, 4-10) were located. Of these only sites BD 1 and 9 are located inside the project area, the rest are not (Sites BD 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10) (see maps Appendix C). All these sites are considered to be of high heritage and social significance. All graves are usually graded as High Local Significance (LS 3A; table 5.1 & 5.2) those older than 60 years are protected in terms of the NHRA (25 of 1999) section 36. Therefore a permit needs to be obtained from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) before the graves may be impacted upon. It is recommended that all gravesites be fenced to protect them and access be allowed to families of the deceased when needed.

A total of fourteen (14) survey orientation locations were documented (SO 1-14) which includes a GPS location and photographs of the landscape at that particular location.

It is not within the expertise of this report or the surveyor to comment on possible palaeontological remains which may be located in the study area.

The bulk of archaeological remains are normally located beneath the soil surface. It is therefore possible that some significant cultural material or remains were not located during this survey and will only be revealed when the soil is disturbed. Should excavation or large scale earth moving activities reveal any human skeletal remains, broken pieces of ceramic pottery, large quantities of sub-surface charcoal or any material that can be associated with previous occupation, a qualified archaeologist should be notified immediately. This will also temporarily halt such activities until an archaeologist has assessed the situation. It should be noted that if such a situation occurs it may have further financial implications.

6.1. Recommended management measures

Management objectives include not to impact on sites of heritage significance. Monitoring programmes should be followed in case a chance find of a heritage object or human remains occur.

- The contractors and workers should be notified that archaeological or burial sites might be exposed during the construction work. They should be notified that there are some gravesites inside (Sites BD1, BD 9) and close to (BD 7) the project area and that any activity closer than 20 metres of these sites should be avoided.
- 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 specialist, 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).

7. Bibliography

1. Amery, L.S. (ed), 1909. *The times history of the war in South Africa 1899-1902*, Vol VI. London,
2. Barnard, C. 1975. *Die Transvaalse Laeveld. Komee van 'n Kontrei*.
3. Bergh, J.S. (ed.) 1998. *Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies*. (J.L. van Schaik, Pretoria).
4. Bornman, H. 1995. *Pioneers of the Lowveld*.
5. Bornman, H. (red.) 1979. *Nelspruit: 75 in '80*. Stadsraad van Nelspruit.
6. Breutz, P.L. 1985. *Pre-Colonial Africa: The South-Eastern Bantu Cultural Province*.
7. Delius, P. 2007. *Mpumalanga History and Heritage*. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
8. De Jong, R.C, & van der Waal, G.M. and Heydenrych, D.H. 1988. *ZAZM 100: 1887-1889, The buildings, steam engines and structures of the Netherlands South African Railway Company*. Johannesburg.
9. Du Preez, S. J. *Peace attempts during the Anglo Boer War until March 1901*. Magister Artium thesis in History. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
10. Evers, T.M. in Voight, E.A. 1981. *Guide to Archaeological Sites in the Northern and Eastern Transvaal*. Transvaal Museum, Pretoria.
11. Hall, H.L. 1938 (1990). *I Have Reaped my Mealies. An Autobiography*. Whitnall Simonsen.
12. Huffman, T. N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age: The Archaeology of Pre-Colonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa*. Kwa-Zulu Natal Press.
13. Jones, H. M. & Jones G. M. 1999. *A Gazetteer of the Second Anglo-Boer War. 1899-1902*. Buckinghamshire: The Military Press.
14. Mason, R. 1962. *Prehistory of the Transvaal: a record of human activity*. Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg.
15. Massie, R.H. 1905. *The Native tribes of Transvaal. Prepared for the general staff war office*. Harrison and Sons, London.
16. Myburgh, A.C. 1956. *Die Stamme van die Distrik Carolina*. Staatsdrukker. Pretoria.
17. Packard, P. 2001. *"Malaria blocks development" revisited: the role of disease in the history of agricultural development in the Eastern and Northern Transvaal Lowveld. 1890-1960*. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27 (3), September 2001.

18. Ross, R. 2002. **A Concise History of South Africa**. Cambridge.
19. Surplus people project: forced removal in South Africa. Volume 5: *Transvaal*. Cape Town. 1983.
20. Union of South Africa. 1918. *Majority Report of the Eastern Transvaal Natives Land Committee*. Cape Town.
21. Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2002. **Archaeological survey of a section of the Secunda-Mozambique Gas Pipeline, Barberton District, Mpumalanga**. An unpublished report by the National Cultural History Museum on file at SAHRA as: 2002-SAHRA-0110.
22. Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 2002. **Die Metodiek van Kultuurhulpbronbestuur (KHB)**. S.A. Tydskrif vir Kultuurgeskiedenis 16(2).
23. Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 1995. **Die bydrae van Argeologie tot Kultuurhulpbronbestuur**. Referaat gelewer voor die Suid-Afrikaanse Vereniging vir Kultuurgeskiedenis, Transvaal Streektak, Sunnyside.
24. Van Wyk Rowe, C. 2015. Phase 1 **Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment of the stone walled settlements on Taurus Plantation, Barberton District, Mpumalanga Province**. On file at SAHRIS as no: 6385.

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

1. National Archives of South Africa. 1895. *TAB, OD: OR3882/95. MJ Bornman, Bornmansdrift, District Barberton. Vraagt onderwyzer teen \$60 per jaar en vrye woning boven subsidie van 10 kinderen teen 1 Augustus eerst komend.*
2. National Archives of South Africa. 1903. *TAB, TAD: 1016 W46. HJ Bornman Bornman's Drift 42, 43, 47, 112 en 113. Barberton Distrik.*
3. National Archives of South Africa. 1968. *TAB, WAT: 630/1968. Water Court Case. Robert Cumming McMaster versus Haviland Estates (Pty.) Ltd. and others. Castle Kop, Suid Kaap River, Barberton.*
4. National Archives of South Africa. 1970. *SAB, CDB: 1722 PB3/2/3/111/12. Beheer oor Plaaslike owerhede. Verandering van grense. Transvaalse Raad op die Ontwikkeling van Buitestedelike Gebiede. Die plaas Moseley 641 JT. Distrik Barberton.*
5. National Archives of South Africa. N/d. *Maps: 3/1254. Kruger National Park.*

ELECTRONIC SOURCES:

1. Windeed Search Engine. 2017. *Deeds Office Property. Bornmansdrift, 639, 0 (Remaining Extent) (Mpumalanga)*. [Accessed: 28 August 2017]

MAPS

1. Major Jackson, H. M. 1902. *Transvaal Major Jackson Series Map. Sheet No. 8. Barberton*. Pretoria: Field Intelligence Department.
2. Surveyor-General. 1917. *Union of South Africa. Province of Transvaal. Magisterial District of Barberton*. Pretoria: Surveyor-General's Office.
3. Topographical Map. 1942. *South Africa. 1:250 000 Sheet. 2530 Barberton. First Edition*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
4. Topographical Map. 1968. *South Africa. 1:50 000 Sheet. 2530DB Kaapsehoop. Second Edition* Pretoria: Government Printer.
5. Topographical Map. 1974. *South Africa. 1:250 000 Sheet. 2530 Barberton. Second Edition* Pretoria: Government Printer.
6. Topographical Map. 1984. *South Africa. 1:50 000 Sheet. 2530DB Kaapsehoop. Third Edition* Pretoria: Government Printer.
7. Topographical Map. 2000. *South Africa. 1:250 000 Sheet. 2530 Nelspruit. Fifth Edition* Pretoria: Government Printer.

Appendix A

Terminology

“Alter” means any action affecting the structure, appearance or physical properties of a place or object, whether by way of structural or other works, by painting, plastering or other decoration or any other means.

“Archaeological” means –

- Material remains resulting from human activity which are in a state of disuse and are in or on land and which are older than 100 years, including artifacts, human and hominid remains and artificial features or structures;
- Rock Art, being any form of painting, engraving or other graphic representation on a fixed rock surface or loose rock or stone, which was executed by human agency and which is older than 100 years, including any area within 10m of such representation;
- Wrecks, being any vessel or aircraft, or any part thereof, which was wrecked in South Africa, whether on land, in the internal waters, the territorial waters or in the maritime culture zone of the Republic, as defined respectively in sections 3, 4 and 6 of the Maritime Zones Act, 1994 (Act No. 15 of 1994), and any cargo, debris or artifacts found or associated therewith, which is older than 60 years or which SAHRA considers to be worthy of conservation; and
- Features, structures and artefacts associated with military history which are older than 75 years and the sites on which they are found;

“Conservation”, in relation to heritage resources, includes protection, maintenance, preservation and sustainable use of places or objects so as to safeguard their cultural significance;

“Cultural significance” means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance;

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

- construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change of use of a place or a structure at a place;
- carrying out any works on or over or under a place;

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

“Expropriate” means the process as determined by the terms of and according to procedures described in the Expropriation Act, 1975 (Act No. 63 of 1975);

“Foreign cultural property”, in relation to a reciprocating state, means any object that is specifically designated by that state as being of importance for archaeology, history, literature, art or science;

“Grave” means a place of internment and includes the contents, headstone or other marker of such a place, and any other structure on or associated with such place;

“Heritage resource” means any place or object of cultural significance;

“Heritage register” means a list of heritage resources in a province;

“Heritage resources authority” means the South African Heritage Resources Agency, established in terms of section 11, or, insofar as this Act (25 of 1999) is applicable in or in respect of a province, a provincial heritage resources authority (PHRA);

“Heritage site” means a place declared to be a national heritage site by SAHRA or a place declared to be a provincial heritage site by a provincial heritage resources authority;

“Improvement” in relation to heritage resources, includes the repair, restoration and rehabilitation of a place protected in terms of this Act (25 of 1999);

“Land” includes land covered by water and the air space above the land;

“Living heritage” means the intangible aspects of inherited culture, and may include –

- cultural tradition;
- oral history;
- performance;
- ritual;
- popular memory;
- skills and techniques;
- indigenous knowledge systems; and
- the holistic approach to nature, society and social relationships;

“Management” in relation to heritage resources, includes the conservation, presentation and improvement of a place protected in terms of the Act;

“Object” means any moveable property of cultural significance which may be protected in terms of any provisions of the Act, including –

- any archaeological artifact;
- palaeontological and rare geological specimens;
- meteorites;
- other objects referred to in section 3 of the Act;

“Owner” includes the owner’s authorized agent and any person with a real interest in the property and –

- in the case of a place owned by the State or State-aided institutions, the Minister or any other person or body of persons responsible for the care, management or control of that place;
- in the case of tribal trust land, the recognized traditional authority;

“Place” includes –

- a site, area or region;
- a building or other structure which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such building or other structure;
- a group of buildings or other structures which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such group of buildings or other structures;
- an open space, including a public square, street or park; and
- in relation to the management of a place, includes the immediate surroundings of a place;

“Site” means any area of land, including land covered by water, and including any structures or objects thereon;

“Structure” means any building, works, device or other facility made by people and which is fixed to land, and includes any fixtures, fittings and equipment associated therewith.

Appendix B

List of sites

Thirteen sites and fourteen survey orientation locations were recorded. The survey orientation sites were named SO 1-14 and the heritage sites BD 1-13. The prefix BD represents the farm "Bornmansdrift".

Table A. Survey Orientation Locations.


Site Name	Date of compilation	GPS Coordinates		Photo figure No.
SO 1	21/10/2017	S25°42'59.65"	E030°57'34.19"	
SO 2	21/10/2017	S25°43'19.11"	E030°58'16.56"	
SO 3	21/10/2017	S25°43'18.74"	E030°58'26.00"	
SO 4	21/10/2017	S25°43'15.31"	E030°58'25.00"	
SO 5	21/10/2017	S25°43'25.60"	E030°58'24.07"	
SO 6	21/10/2017	S25°43'29.84"	E030°58'16.47"	
SO 7	21/10/2017	S25°43'29.50"	E030°58'27.15"	
SO 8	21/10/2017	S25°43'20.99"	E030°58'10.46"	
SO 9	21/10/2017	S25°43'08.89"	E030°58'16.60"	
SO 10	21/10/2017	S25°42'54.61"	E030°57'53.10"	
SO 11	21/10/2017	S25°43'05.52"	E030°57'54.59"	
SO 12	21/10/2017	S25°42'51.74"	E030°57'45.64"	
SO 13	21/10/2017	S25°42'48.40"	E030°57'30.85"	
SO 14	21/10/2017	S25°43'03.71"	E030°58'13.31"	

Table B. Recorded sites.


Site Name	Date of compilation	GPS Coordinates		Photo figure No.
BD 1	21/10/2017	S25°43'23.78"	E030°58'09.83"	
BD 2	21/10/2017	S25°43'25.80"	E030°58'05.57"	
BD 3	21/10/2017	S25°43'26.36"	E030°58'05.73"	
BD 4	21/10/2017	S25°43'24.30"	E030°57'58.19"	
BD 5	21/10/2017	S25°43'28.62"	E030°58'02.81"	

BD 6	21/10/2017	S25°43'21.31"	E030°57'52.12"	
BD 7	21/10/2017	S25°43'14.85"	E030°57'46.17"	
BD 8	21/10/2017	S25°43'09.33"	E030°57'36.02"	
BD 9	21/10/2017	S25°42'58.49"	E030°57'33.01"	
BD 10	21/10/2017	S25°43'39.00"	E030°57'58.06"	
BD 11	21/10/2017	S25°43'42.55"	E030°58'28.44"	
BD 12	21/10/2017	S25°43'35.09"	E030°58'21.09"	
BD 13	21/10/2017	S25°43'35.56"	E030°58'21.69"	


Appendix C



1:50 000 Topographical Map 2530 DB (1943). The historic farmstead encircled in red.



1:50 000 Topographical Map 2530 DB (1989).



Aerial view: Google Earth 2017.

Appendix D

Survey Orientation Photos



Fig. 1. Site SO 1. Photo taken in a eastern direction.



Fig. 2. Site SO 1. Photo taken in a western direction.



Fig. 3. Site SO 2. Photo taken in a northern direction.



Fig. 4. Site SO 2. Photo taken east.



Fig. 5. Site SO 2. Photo taken in a south eastern direction.



Fig. 6. Site SO 3. Photo taken in a northern direction.



Fig. 7. Site SO 3. Photo taken in a eastern direction.



Fig. 8. Site SO 3. Photo taken in a western direction.



Fig. 9. Site SO 3. Photo taken in a southern direction.



Fig. 10. Site SO 4. Photo taken in a southern eastern direction. Note the dense thicket.



Fig. 11. Site SO 4. Photo taken in a south western direction. Note the dense thicket.



Fig. 12. Site SO 5. Photo taken in a north eastern direction.



Fig. 13. Site SO 5. Photo taken in a south eastern direction.



Fig. 14. Site SO 5. Photo taken in a south western direction.



Fig. 15. Site SO 6. Photo taken in a north eastern direction. Note the dense thicket here.



Fig. 16. Site SO 6. Photo taken in a south western direction.



Fig. 17. Site SO 7. Photo taken in a northern direction.



Fig. 18. Site SO 7. Photo taken in a south western direction.



Fig. 19. Site SO 8. Photo taken in a north eastern direction.



Fig. 20. Site SO 8. Photo taken in a south western direction.



Fig. 21. Site SO 8. Photo taken in a western direction.



Fig. 22. Site SO 9. Photo taken in a northern direction. Dense thicket visible.



Fig. 23. Site SO 9. Photo taken in a eastern direction. Dense undergrowth visible.



Fig. 24. Site SO 9. Photo taken in a western direction. Dense undergrowth visible.



Fig. 25. Site SO 10. Photo taken in a northern direction.



Fig. 26. Site SO 10. Photo taken in a eastern direction.



Fig. 27. Site SO 10. Photo taken in a south western direction.



Fig. 28. Site SO 10. Photo taken in a western direction.



Fig. 29. Site SO 11. Photo taken in a northern direction. Note the dense Lantana.



Fig. 30. Site SO 11. Photo taken in a southern direction. Note the dense Lantana.



Fig. 31. Site SO 11. Photo taken in a eastern direction.



Fig. 32. Site SO 12. Photo taken in a north eastern direction.



Fig. 33. Site SO 12. Photo taken in a southern direction.



Fig. 34. Site SO 12. Photo taken in a south western direction.



Fig. 35. Site SO 13. Photo taken in a north western direction.



Fig. 36. Site SO 13. Photo taken in a south eastern direction.



Fig. 37. Site SO 13. Photo taken in a western direction.



Fig. 38. Site SO 14. Photo taken in a eastern direction.



Fig. 39. Site SO 14. Photo taken in a southern direction.



Fig. 40. Site SO 14. Photo taken in a south western direction.

Site Photos



Fig. 41. Site BD 1. Photo taken in a south eastern direction. The Bornman family graveyard.



Fig. 42. Site BD 1. The gravestone of both Petrus Johannes Uys Bornman born 03-12-1920, died 22-08-1994 and his wife Maria Johanna born 02-12-1912, died 07-07-2010.



Fig. 43. Site BD 2. The historic farmstead Photo taken in a southern direction.



Fig. 44. Site BD 3. Photo taken in south western direction. This is a rondavel associated with the main farmstead.



Fig. 45. Site BD 4. One of the 5 unmarked graves located here.



Fig. 46. Site BD 4. Photo take in a northern direction. Informant Mr Bheki Maseko points out the unmarked graves located here.



Fig. 47. Site BD 5. Photo taken in a south eastern direction. Informant Mr Bheki Maseko relates that family of the deceased still resides in the area with the name Ginindza.



Fig. 48. Site BD 6. Photo taken in a north eastern direction. Two unmarked graves are located here.



Fig. 49. Site BD 7. A single unmarked grave. According to informant Mr Bheki Maseko this is the grave of his grandfather, Filemon Khumalo.



Fig. 50. Site BD 7. Photo taken in a northern direction. A general photo at site BD 7 to illustrate how impenetrable the Lantana is here.



Fig. 51. Site BD 7. Photo taken in a eastern direction. A general photo at site BD 7 to illustrate how impenetrable the Lantana is here.



Fig. 52. Site BD 8. Photo taken in a south eastern direction. There are approximately 7 unmarked graves located here.




Fig. 53. Site BD 9. Photo taken in a south eastern direction. There are three unmarked graves located here. They were pointed out by informant Mr Bheki Maseko. The deceased is family of his with the name Shongwe.



Fig. 54. Site BD 10. Approximately 8 graves located here. Much overgrown and in poor condition.



Fig. 55. Site BD 10. A photo of one of the unmarked graves at the site. Photo taken towards the south west.



Fig. 56. Site BD 11. A photo of the site towards the north. Ruins of a small office alongside historic vegetable fields.



Fig. 57. Site BD 12. A photo of the site towards the north. The remains of a perimeter wall associated with historic farm workers dwellings.




Fig. 58. Site BD 13. A photo of the site towards the east. Some of the collapsed stone walling of old farm workers dwellings is still visible.



Fig. 59. Site BD 13. A photo of the site towards south westt. Some of the collapsed stone walling of old farm workers dwellings is still visible.