

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESKTOP STUDY

**for the Application of a Prospecting Right
on Portions 4 & 5 of the Farm Klipfontein
459 and Portion 1 and the RE of the Farm
Enkeldoorn 605, Bothaville, Free State**

**Author ©:
Tobias Coetzee, MA (Archaeology) (UP)
July 2021**

Archaeological Desktop Study for the Application of a Prospecting Right on Portions 4 & 5 of the Farm Klipfontein 459 and Portion 1 and the RE of the Farm Enkeldoorn 605, Bothaville, Free State

For: Eco Elementum (Pty) Ltd

361 Oberon Ave

Glenfield Office Park

Nika Building

Faerie Glen

Pretoria


0081

Report No: NTM_0907212

Version: 1

Email: tobias.coetzee@gmail.com

- I, Tobias Coetzee, declare that –
- I act as the independent specialist;
- I am conducting any work and activity relating to the proposed National Treasure Minerals Project in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the client;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have the required expertise in conducting the specialist report and I will comply with legislation, regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I have not, 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 declaration are true and correct.



Date: 26 July 2021

Executive Summary

The author was appointed by Eco Elementum (Pty) Ltd to undertake an Archaeological Desktop study for National Treasure Minerals (Pty) Ltd on the listed Farm Portions (**Table 1**) within the Nala Local Municipality in the Free State Province. The study area is located roughly 14 km north-northwest of Bothaville and 4 km east of the Vaal River and border with the North West Province. The aim of this report is to contextualise the general study area in terms of heritage resources and will provide the developers with general information regarding potentially sensitive areas. This will also shed light on what is to be expected during a Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment and aid in interpreting finds.

A total of six sites consisting of a combination of buildings, huts and cemeteries were noted on historical topographical maps and aerial imagery (**Table 2**). Based on contemporary satellite imagery, three of these sites are associated with surface remains, while two appear to have been demolished as no surface remains are visible on satellite imagery. Although no surface remains are evident, subsurface culturally significant material might still be present. However, two of the sites date to recent times and are unlikely to be significant from a heritage perspective. The remaining sites, consisting of a cemetery, demolished buildings and a site associated with surface remains, should be avoided by the proposed prospecting activities. A full Phase 1 AIA (Archaeological Impact Assessment) must be done should any development that triggers an AIA result from the prospecting project, including if the cumulative impact of the proposed prospecting exceeds 0.5 ha.

List of Abbreviations

AIA – Archaeological Impact Assessment

CRM – Cultural Resource Management

DMR – Department of Mineral Resources

EIA – Environmental Impact Assessment

ESA – Early Stone Age

ha – Hectare

HIA – Heritage Impact Assessment

km – Kilometre

LIA – Late Iron Age

LSA – Later Stone Age

m – Metre

MASL – Metres Above Sea Level

MEC – Member of the Executive Council

MSA – Middle Stone Age

NHRA – National Heritage Resources Act

NTM – National Treasure Minerals

SAHRA – South African Heritage Resources Agency

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
List of Abbreviations	4
1. Project Background	7
1.1 Introduction	7
1.2 Legislation	9
1.2.1 The EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) and AIA processes	9
1.2.2 Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites	10
2. Study Area and Project Description	13
2.1 Location & Physical Environment	13
2.2 Project description	15
3. Archaeological Background	18
3.1 The Stone Age	18
3.2 The Iron Age & Historical Period	19
3.3 Previous Heritage Studies	23
4. Evaluation	24
5. Statement of Significance & Recommendations	24
5.1 Statement of significance	24
5.2 Recommendations	27
6. Addendum: Terminology	28
7. References	29
Appendix A: Historical Aerial Imagery & Topographical Maps	A

List of Figures

Figure 1: Regional and provincial location of the study area.....	8
Figure 2: Proposed layout map (Provided by Eco Elementum 2021).	14
Figure 3: Segment of SA 1:50 000 2726 BA & BC indicating the farm portions demarcated for prospecting.	16
Figure 4: Proposed prospecting area portrayed on a 2020 satellite image.	17
Figure 5: ESA artefacts from Sterkfontein (Volman 1984).	19
Figure 6: MSA artefacts from Howiesons Poort (Volman 1984).	19
Figure 7: LSA scrapers (Klein 1984).	19
Figure 8: Example of undecorated potsherds.	21
Figure 9: Example of a decorated potsherd.	21
Figure 10: Example of a potential granary base.	21
Figure 11: Example of a stone-walled site.	22
Figure 12 : Example of a broken lower grinding stone.	22
Figure 13: Example of a dilapidated stone-walled site.	22
Figure 14: Example of a historical building.	23
Figure 15: Example of a potential informal grave.	23
Figure 16: Potential Sites & Sensitive Areas.	26
Figure 17: Segment of 1947 SA 1:50 000 2726 BA & BC indicating the study area.	B
Figure 18: 1964 Aerial mage of the study area.	C
Figure 19: 1975 Aerial mage of the study area.	D
Figure 20: Segment of 1975 SA 1:50 000 2726 BC indicating the study area.	E
Figure 21: Segment of 1997 SA 1:50 000 2726 BA & BC indicating the study area.	F
Figure 22: Segment of 2008 SA 1:50 000 2726 BA & BC indicating the study area.	G

List of Tables

Table 1: Property name & coordinates.....	13
Table 2: Potential site location.	25

1. Project Background

1.1 Introduction

Eco Elementum (Pty) Ltd appointed the author to undertake an Archaeological Desktop study for National Treasure Minerals (Pty) Ltd on the following parent farms: Enkeldoorn 605 and Klipfontein 459 within the Nala Local Municipality in the Free State Province. The study area is located roughly 14 km north-northwest of Bothaville (**Figure 1**) and the identified farm portions are listed in **Table 1**. The purpose of this study is to contextualise the demarcated study area in order to determine the scope of heritage resources that might be encountered during the prospecting phase and subsequent heritage studies, as well as to provide recommendations for the safeguarding of archaeological resources during prospecting. The aim of this report is to provide the developer with information regarding heritage resources in the vicinity of the study area based on results from previous studies, written historical information and historical topographical maps and aerial photographs.

In the following report, a broad overview of the proposed prospecting is provided and the study area is contextualised in terms of heritage resources. The prospecting application is for Monazite (Heavy Minerals), Rutile (Heavy Minerals), Rare Earths, Zircon, Garnet, Zirconium Ore, Titanium and Leucosene (Heavy Minerals). The legislation section included serves as a guide towards the effective identification and protection of heritage resources and will apply to any such material unearthed during the prospecting phase.




Figure 1: Regional and provincial location of the study area.

1.2 Legislation

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) aims to conserve and control the management, research, alteration and destruction of cultural resources of South Africa and to prosecute if necessary. It is therefore crucially important to adhere to heritage resource legislation contained in the Government Gazette of the Republic of South Africa (Act No.25 of 1999), as many heritage sites are threatened daily by development. Conservation legislation requires an impact assessment report to be submitted for development authorisation that must include an AIA if triggered.

Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIAs) should be done by qualified professionals with adequate knowledge to (a) identify all heritage resources that might occur in areas of development and (b) make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact of the sites.

1.2.1 The EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) and AIA processes

Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessments generally involve the identification of sites during a field survey with assessment of their significance, the possible impact that the development might have, and relevant recommendations.

All Archaeological Impact Assessment reports should include:

- a. Location of the sites that are found;
- b. Short descriptions of the characteristics of each site;
- c. Short assessments of how important each site is, indicating which should be conserved and which mitigated;
- d. Assessments of the potential impact of the development on the site(s);
- e. In some cases a shovel test, to establish the extent of a site, or collection of material, to identify the associations of the site, may be necessary (a pre-arranged SAHRA permit is required); and
- f. Recommendations for conservation or mitigation.

This AIA report is intended to inform the client about the legislative protection of heritage resources and their significance and make appropriate recommendations. It is essential to also provide the heritage authority with sufficient information about the sites to enable the authority to assess with confidence:

- a. Whether or not it has objections to a development;
- b. What the conditions are upon which such development might proceed;
- c. Which sites require permits for mitigation or destruction;

- d. Which sites require mitigation and what this should comprise;
- e. Whether sites must be conserved and what alternatives can be proposed to relocate the development in such a way as to conserve other sites; and
- f. What measures should or could be put in place to protect the sites which should be conserved.

When a Phase 1 AIA is part of an EIA, wider issues such as public consultation and assessment of the spatial and visual impacts of the development may be undertaken as part of the general study and may not be required from the archaeologist. If, however, the Phase 1 project forms a major component of an AIA it will be necessary to ensure that the study addresses such issues and complies with Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act.

1.2.2 Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites

National Heritage Resource Act No.25 of April 1999

Buildings are among the most enduring features of human occupation, and this definition therefore includes all buildings older than 60 years, modern architecture as well as ruins, fortifications and Farming Community settlements. The Act identifies heritage objects as:

- objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects, meteorites and rare geological specimens;
- visual art objects;
- military objects;
- numismatic objects;
- objects of cultural and historical significance;
- objects to which oral traditions are attached and which are associated with living heritage;
- objects of scientific or technological interest;
- books, records, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic material, film or video or sound recordings, excluding those that are public records as defined in section 1(xiv) of the National Archives of South Africa Act, 1996 (Act No. 43 of 1996), or in a provincial law pertaining to records or archives;
- any other prescribed category.

With regards to activities and work on archaeological and heritage sites this Act states that:

“No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.” (34. [1] 1999:58)

and

“No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority:

- (a) destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;*
- (b) destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological material or object or any meteorite;*
- (c) trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or palaeontological material or object, or any meteorite; or*
- (d) bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.”(35. [4] 1999:58)*

and

“No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority:

- (a) destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;*
- (b) destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority;*
- (c) bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) and excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.” (36. [3] 1999:60)*

On the development of any area the gazette states that:

“...any person who intends to undertake a development categorised as:

- (a) the construction of a road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;*
- (b) the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length;*

- (c) *any development or other activity which will change the character of a site-*
 - i. *exceeding 5000m² in extent; or*
 - ii. *involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or*
 - iii. *involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or*
 - iv. *the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;*
- (d) *the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10000m² in extent; or*
- (e) *any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority, must at the very earliest stages of initiating such a development, notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.” (38. [1] 1999:62-64)*

and

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

- (a) *The identification and mapping of all heritage resources in the area affected;*
- (b) *an assessment of the significance of such resources in terms of the heritage assessment criteria set out in section 6(2) or prescribed under section 7;*
- (c) *an assessment of the impact of the development on such heritage resources;*
- (d) *an evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the sustainable social and economic benefits to be derived from the development;*
- (e) *the results of consultation with communities affected by the proposed development and other interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources;*
- (f) *if heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the consideration of alternatives; and*
- (g) *plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after the completion of the proposed development.” (38. [3] 1999:64)*

The Human Tissues Act (65 of 1983) and Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies (Ordinance 7 of 1925) protects graves younger than 60 years. These fall under the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the Provincial Health Departments. Approval for the exhumation and re-burial must be obtained from the relevant Provincial MEC as well as the relevant Local Authorities. Graves 60 years or older fall under the jurisdiction of the National Heritage Resources Act as well as the Human Tissues Act, 1983.

2. Study Area and Project Description

2.1 Location & Physical Environment

The National Treasure Minerals (Pty) Ltd project is situated on the properties listed in **Table 1**. It should be noted that a discrepancy was noted on the provided layout map (**Figure 2**). According to the map outline, Portions 4 & 5 of the Farm Klipfontein 459 are included in the proposed prospecting right application, but the description lists Portions 4 & 5 of the Farm Rietfontein 458. The Klipfontein portions were used in this version of the report.

Table 1: Property name & coordinates.

Property	Portion	Map Reference (1:50 000)	Lat (y)	Lon (x)	Extent (ha)
Klipfontein 459	4/459	2726 BA & BC	-27.256180	26.583312	300.9
Klipfontein 459	5/459	2726 BA & BC	-27.256770	26.597439	362.9
Enkeldoorn 605	RE/605	2726 BC	-27.268929	26.545381	191.6
Enkeldoorn 605	1/605	2726 BC	-27.274255	26.539504	215.0
Total					1070.5




Figure 2: Proposed layout map (Provided by Eco Elementum 2021).

Bothaville is located roughly 14 km to the south-southeast of the proposed prospecting area, while Klerksdorp is located 41 km to the northeast and Leudoringstad 33 km to the west-southwest. The demarcated farm portions fall within the Nala Local Municipality and the Lejweleputs District Municipality in the Free State Province. The R30 primary road runs NNE-SSW approximately 5 km to the east.

In terms of vegetation, the study area falls within the Grassland Biome which is typically associated with summer rainfall regions. This Biome covers approximately 28% of South Africa. Locally, the study area falls within the Vaal-Vet Sandy Grassland vegetation unit. This vegetation unit is found in the North West and Free State Provinces. Associated regions include the area south of Lichtenburg and Ventersdorp, stretching further southwards to Klerksdorp, Leudoringstad, Bothaville and to the Brandford area north of Bloemfontein. Vaal-Vet Sandy Grassland is considered endangered with a conservation target of 24%. About 0.3% is statutorily conserved in the Bloemhof Dam, Schoonspruit, Sandveld, Faan Meintjies, Wolvespruit and Soetdoring Nature Reserves. Cultivation transformed more than 63%, while the rest is under severe pressure from cattle and sheep grazing. Erosion characteristics vary between very low and low (Mucina & Rutherford 2006).

According to Mucina & Rutherford (2006) the average elevation for Vaal-Vet Sandy Grassland varies between 1220 and 1560 MASL (metres above sea level). The average elevation for the study area is roughly 1280 MASL and slopes from the higher eastern sections to the slightly lower western section.

The study area falls within the summer rainfall region and the average annual rainfall is roughly 565 mm per year. The average maximum temperature for the study area is recorded during January when an average of 23.4 °C is reached. On average July is the coldest month (Climate-data.org 08/07/2021).

The study area falls within the C24J Quaternary Catchment of the Middle Vaal Water Management Area. The closest perennial river to the study area is the Vaal River that flows approximately 4 km to the west. A non-perennial river, the Sooifonteinleegte, flows along the southern boundary of the study area and intersects Portion 1 of the Farm Enkeldoorn 605, as well as Portions 4 & 5 of the Farm Klipfontein 459. The Bloemhof Dam is located 63 km to the southwest.

Access to the site appears to be through local roads turning from the R502 and R504 secondary roads. The majority of the study area appears to be cultivated, while smaller sections are associated with open veldt. These sections are likely to be used for grazing. Residences and outbuildings are evident on Portion 1 of the Farm Enkeldoorn 605 and Portion 5 of the Farm Klipfontein 459.

2.2 Project description

The prospecting right application for Monazite (Heavy Minerals), Rutile (Heavy Minerals), Rare Earths, Zircon, Garnet, Zirconium Ore, Titanium and Leucoxene (Heavy Minerals) covers about 1070.5 ha (**Figures 3 & 4**). For the prospecting phase, however, several sites will be selected for geotechnical drilling. These boreholes and its associated activities will impact on a surface area of between 250 and 625 m². The full extent of the drill site will also be demarcated and no drilling will be done outside of the boundary.

Prospecting activities will include the following:

Current access roads will be used as far as possible, but in cases where access roads to drill sites do not exist, a single track will be selected based on the area where the least environmental impact will occur. The same tracks will be used should repeated access be required. Vegetation and topsoil excavated during the drilling process will be stockpiled next to sumps where it will serve as a storm water diversion berm. On completion of the drilling process, the rehabilitated sumps will be backfilled with the stockpiled material. Because a constant water supply is needed for the drilling process, 15 000l will be stored in tanks. The plastic-lined sumps will be used to recycle water through a filter process in order to maintain a constant clean water source for the purpose of drilling. In terms of potable water for employees and workers, a temporary 260l tank will be placed on-site. Additional facilities will include temporary portable toilets, berms, and a maximum of 60m³ of diesel fuel located on an impermeable surface with bunds.




Figure 3: Segment of SA 1:50 000 2726 BA & BC indicating the farm portions demarcated for prospecting.




Figure 4: Proposed prospecting area portrayed on a 2020 satellite image.

3. Archaeological Background

Southern African archaeology is broadly divided into the Early, Middle and Later Stone Ages; Early, Middle and Later Iron Ages; and Historical or Colonial Periods. This section of the report provides a general background to archaeology in South Africa.

3.1 The Stone Age

The earliest stone tool industry, the Oldowan, was developed by early human ancestors which were the earliest members of the genus *Homo*, such as *Homo habilis*, around 2.6 million years ago. It comprises tools such as cobble cores and pebble choppers (Toth & Schick 2007). Archaeologists suggest these stone tools are the earliest direct evidence for culture in southern Africa (Clarke & Kuman 2000). The advent of culture indicates the advent of more cognitively modern hominins (Mitchell 2002: 56, 57).

The Acheulean industry completely replaced the Oldowan industry. The Acheulian industry was first developed by *Homo ergaster* between 1.8 to 1.65 million years ago and lasted until around 300 000 years ago. Archaeological evidence from this period is also found at Swartkrans, Kromdraai and Sterkfontein. The most typical tools of the ESA (Early Stone Age) are handaxes, cleavers, choppers and spheroids. Although hominins seemingly used handaxes often, scholars disagree about their use. There are no indications of hafting, and some artefacts are far too large for it. Hominins likely used choppers and scrapers for skinning and butchering scavenged animals and often obtained sharp ended sticks for digging up edible roots. Presumably, early humans used wooden spears as early as 5 million years ago to hunt small animals.

Middle Stone Age (MSA) artefacts started appearing about 250 000 years ago and replaced the larger Early Stone Age bifaces, handaxes and cleavers with smaller flake industries consisting of scrapers, points and blades. These artefacts roughly fall in the 40-100 mm size range and were, in some cases, attached to handles, indicating a significant technical advance. The first *Homo sapiens* species also emerged during this period. Associated sites are Klasies River Mouth, Blombos Cave and Border Cave (Deacon & Deacon 1999).

Although the transition from the Middle Stone Age to the Later Stone Age (LSA) did not occur simultaneously across the whole of southern Africa, the Later Stone Age ranges from about 20 000 to 2000 years ago. Stone tools from this period are generally smaller, but were used to do the same job as those from previous periods; only in a different, more efficient way. The Later Stone Age is associated with: rock art, smaller stone tools (microliths), bows and arrows, bored stones, grooved stones, polished bone tools, earthenware pottery and beads. Examples of Later Stone Age sites are Nelson Bay Cave, Rose Cottage Cave and Boomplaas Cave (Deacon & Deacon 1999). These artefacts are often associated with rocky outcrops or water sources. **Figures 5 – 7** below shows examples of stone tools often associated with the ESA, MSA and LSA of southern Africa. The LSA site, Matlwase, is located just south of Wolmaransstad in the general vicinity of the study area (Korsman et al. 1998: 95).




Figure 5: ESA artefacts from Sterkfontein (Volman 1984).




Figure 6: MSA artefacts from Howiesons Poort (Volman 1984).



Figure 7: LSA scrapers (Klein 1984).

3.2 The Iron Age & Historical Period

The Early Iron Age marks the movement of farming communities into South Africa in the first millennium AD, or around 2500 years ago (Mitchell 2002:259, 260). These groups were agro-pastoralist communities that settled in the vicinity of water in order to provide subsistence for their cattle and crops. Archaeological evidence from Early Iron Age sites is mostly artefacts in the form of ceramic assemblages. The origins and archaeological identities of this period are largely based upon ceramic typologies. Some scholars classify Early Iron Age ceramic traditions into different “streams” or “trends” in pot types and decoration, which emerged over time in southern Africa. These “streams” are identified as the Kwale Branch (east), the Nkope Branch (central) and the Kalundu Branch (west). Early Iron Age ceramics typically display features such as large and prominent inverted rims, large neck areas and fine elaborate decorations. This period continued until the end of the first millennium AD (Mitchell 2002; Huffman 2007). Some well-known Early Iron Age sites include the Lydenburg Heads in Mpumalanga, Happy Rest in the Limpopo Province and Mzonjani in Kwa-Zulu Natal.

The Middle Iron Age roughly stretches from AD 900 to 1300 and marks the origins of the Zimbabwe culture. During this period cattle herding appeared to play an increasingly important role in society. However, it was proved that cattle remained an important source of wealth throughout the Iron Age. An important shift in the Iron Age of southern Africa took place in the Shashe-Limpopo basin during this period, namely the development of

class distinction and sacred leadership. The Zimbabwe culture can be divided into three periods based on certain capitals. Mapungubwe, the first period, dates from AD 1220 to 1300, Great Zimbabwe from AD 1300 to 1450, and Khami from AD 1450 to 1820 (Huffman 2007: 361, 362).

The Late Iron Age (LIA) roughly dates from AD 1300 to 1840. It is generally accepted that Great Zimbabwe replaced Mapungubwe. Some characteristics include a greater focus on economic growth and the increased importance of trade. Specialisation in terms of natural resources also started to play a role, as can be seen from the distribution of iron slag which tend to occur only in certain localities compared to a wide distribution during earlier times. It was also during the Late Iron Age that different areas of South Africa were populated, such as the interior of KwaZulu Natal, the Free State, the Gauteng Highveld and the Transkei. Another characteristic is the increased use of stone as building material. Some artefacts associated with this period are knife-blades, hoes, adzes, awls, other metal objects as well as bone tools and grinding stones.

The Rolong, who split into 4 groups during the 18th Century, occupied the area between the Vaal River and Molopo River prior to the “difaqane”. According to Ratlou-Rolong accounts during the Bloemhof Commission of 1871, they were traditionally associated with the area from Bloemhof to Khunwana and from there to the Setlagole and the Molopo. It is also known that the Seleka-Rolong under Sehunelo attacked the Ratlou-Rolong just prior to the “difaqane” at Thabeng on the farm Buisfontein near Schoonspruit, from where they settled at Makwassiespruit. It is at Makwassiespruit where the missionary, S. Broadbent, met with them. The ruins of his home are located ENE of Wolmaransstad near the Makwassiespruit. Another group, the Tsatsing of Thamaga, occupied the area in the vicinity of present day Schweizer-Reneke and Delareyville in 1820 (Bergh 1998: 106).

The Historical period mainly deals with Europe’s discovery, settlement and impact on southern Africa. Some topics covered by the Historical period include Dutch settlement in the Western Cape, early mission stations, Voortrekker routes and the Anglo Boer War. This time period also saw the compilation of early maps by missionaries, explorers, military personnel, etc.

Figures 8 – 15 are examples of heritage sites sometimes encountered – such areas should be avoided.



Figure 8: Example of undecorated potsherds.



Figure 9: Example of a decorated potsherd.



Figure 10: Example of a potential granary base.



Figure 11: Example of a stone-walled site.



Figure 12 : Example of a broken lower grinding stone.



Figure 13: Example of a dilapidated stone-walled site.



Figure 14: Example of a historical building.



Figure 15: Example of a potential informal grave.

3.3 Previous Heritage Studies

Orkney Solar Farm

The AIA conducted for the development of the Orkney Solar Farm on the Remaining Extent of Portion 7 and 21 of the Farm Wolvehuis 114 recorded two burial sites. The foundations of several structures exceeding 60 years of age were noted, but were not regarded to be of significance due to the dilapidated state. No other sites of heritage significance were recorded. The Orkney Solar Farm project area is located approximately 26 km northeast of the proposed prospecting site (Van der Walt 2017).

Rulaganyang Extension 2 Township Establishment

The HIA survey done for the development of the Rulaganyang Extension 2 Township on a portion of the remaining extent of Portion 11 of the Farm Leeuwfontein 29 HO near Witpoort, recorded no sites on the specific land parcel. However, it was noted that a number of known cultural heritage sites exist in the larger area. The

Rulaganyang Extension 2 Township is located approximately 57 km west of the proposed prospecting site (Pelser 2017).

Residential Developments on the Farm Kransdrift 243

A Heritage Impact Assessment for a leisure residential development along the Vaal River was conducted on the Farm Kransdrift 243. It was noted that the study area consisted of sandy river deposit that was previously cultivated. The study, done on an area located approximately 10 km southwest of the proposed National Treasure Minerals prospecting project, revealed no heritage sites (Dreyer 2007).

4. Evaluation

The significance of an archaeological site is based on the amount of deposit, the integrity of the context, the kind of deposit and the potential to help answer present research questions. Historical structures are defined by Section 34 of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999, while other historical and cultural significant sites, places and features, are generally determined by community preferences.

A fundamental aspect in the conservation of a heritage resource relates to whether the sustainable social and economic benefits of a proposed development outweigh the conservation issues at stake. There are many aspects that must be taken into consideration when determining significance, such as rarity, national significance, scientific importance, cultural and religious significance, and not least, community preferences. When, for whatever reason the protection of a heritage site is not deemed necessary or practical, its research potential must be assessed and if appropriate mitigated in order to gain data / information which would otherwise be lost. Such sites must be adequately recorded and sampled before being destroyed.

5. Statement of Significance & Recommendations

5.1 Statement of significance

The study area: Portions 4 & 5 of the Farm Klipfontein 459 and Portion 1 and the RE of the Farm Enkeldoorn 605, Free State

As can be seen from previous research done in the area, the general region is significant from a heritage perspective. Heritage sites are likely to include LSA material, cemeteries/burial sites and historical structures. Since heritage sites, such as burial sites, are not always clearly identifiable due to disturbed/removed surface features, care must be exercised when prospecting.

The **Appendix A** figures indicate the study area on 1947, 1975 (partially), 1997 and 2008 topographical maps, as well as on 1964 and 1975 aerial images, while **Table 2** lists the potential sites, type of site, location, estimated extent and current status as observed on recent satellite imagery. **Figure 16** indicates the identified potential sites.

The historical topographical maps show that between 1947 and 1975 agricultural activities expanded significantly, only to decrease by 1997 and again increase by 2008.

Six potential sites were identified on the historical aerial images: One on the Remaining Extent of the Farm Enkeldoorn 605, one on Portion 1 of the Farm Enkeldoorn 605, one on Portion 4 of the Farm Klipfontein 459 and three on Portion 5 of the Farm Klipfontein 459. A total of 4 sites associated with buildings were noted, one is indicated as a cemetery and one as a hut. The status of the cemetery is unknown, while three sites are associated with intact buildings as observed on contemporary satellite imagery. The remaining two sites appear to have been demolished as no surface features are noted on contemporary satellite imagery, but might be associated with subsurface culturally significant remains. It is also unknown whether the sites associated with intact buildings have been demolished and replaced by modern buildings. Should any parts of the sites observed on the 1947 topographical map still exist, it would be at least 74 years old and would therefore be protected by the NHRA (National Heritage Resources Act) 25 of 1999. Since the site identified on the 1964 aerial image might have been constructed between 1947 and 1961, this site might exceed 60 years of age as well and would therefore also be protected by the NHRA 25 of 1999. Additionally, the possibility exists that other buildings were constructed between 1947 and 1961, but were demolished before 1964 and are therefore not shown on the topographical maps and aerial imagery. The buildings identified on the 1975 topographical map are not visible on the 1964 aerial images, do not exceed 60 years of age and are therefore not considered significant from a heritage perspective.

Table 2: Potential site location.

Site No	Type	Parent Farm	Farm Portion	Current Status	Estimated Extent (ha)	Lat (y)	Lon (x)
B01	Hut	Klipfontein 459	4	Demolished	1.9	-27.248085	26.579814
B02	Cemetery	Klipfontein 459	5	Unknown	1.4	-27.268506	26.604448
B03	Building	Enkeldoorn 605	RE	Demolished	0.9	-27.277953	26.547745
B04	Building	Enkeldoorn 605	1	Intact	1.8	-27.268886	26.540082
B05	Building	Klipfontein 459	5	Intact	4.4	-27.266939	26.597418
B06	Building	Klipfontein 459	5	Intact	3.1	-27.266957	26.601523




Figure 16: Potential Sites & Sensitive Areas.

5.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in order to avoid the destruction of heritage remains within the area demarcated for prospecting:

- Although the two demolished sites dating to 1947 (**Table 2**) appear not to be associated with surface remains, subsurface culturally significant material might be present. Therefore, it is recommended that these sites be avoided by the proposed prospecting activities. Should this not be possible, a qualified archaeologist should be present on-site during prospecting in order to limit potential impact on heritage resources.
- The intact site dating to 1964 (**Table 2**) might be of cultural significance as the possibility exists that the associated buildings and structures exceed 60 years of age. It is therefore recommended that this area be avoided by the proposed prospecting activities. Should this not be possible, a qualified archaeologist should be present on-site during prospecting in order to limit potential impact on heritage resources.
- The two sites dating to 1975 are of contemporary origin and are unlikely to be significant from a heritage perspective.
- The area associated with the cemetery (B02) should be avoided by the proposed prospecting activities.
- It is advised that a qualified archaeologist be contacted whenever uncertainty regarding potential heritage remains exists.
- Prospecting should not take place in the vicinity of stone cairns, potential burial sites, stone-walling, building ruins or any other heritage material or structures.
- Should the prospecting outcome result in further development or construction, a full Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment must be conducted on the affected area if triggered. Also, a full Phase 1 AIA must be done should the cumulative impact of the proposed prospecting exceed 0.5 ha.
- Because archaeological artefacts generally occur below surface, the possibility exists that culturally significant material may be exposed during the prospecting phase, in which case all activities must be suspended pending further archaeological investigations by a qualified archaeologist. Also, should skeletal remains be exposed, all activities must be suspended and the relevant heritage resources authority contacted (See National Heritage Resources Act, 25 of 1999 section 36 (6)).

- From a heritage point of view, prospecting may proceed on the demarcated portions, subject to the abovementioned conditions and recommendations.

6. Addendum: Terminology

Archaeology:

The study of the human past through its material remains.

Artefact:

Any portable object used, modified, or made by humans; e.g. pottery and metal objects.

Assemblage:

A group of artefacts occurring together at a particular time and place, and representing the sum of human activities.

Context:

An artefact's context usually consist of its immediate *matrix* (the material surrounding it e.g. gravel, clay or sand), its *provenience* (horizontal and vertical position within the matrix), and its *association* with other artefacts (occurrence together with other archaeological remains, usually in the same matrix).

Cultural Resource Management (CRM):

The safeguarding of the archaeological heritage through the protection of sites and through salvage archaeology (rescue archaeology), generally within the framework of legislation designed to safeguard the past.

Excavation:

The principal method of data acquisition in archaeology, involving the systematic uncovering of archaeological remains through the removal of the deposits of soil and other material covering and accompanying it.

Feature:

An irremovable artefact; e.g. hearths or architectural elements.

Ground Reconnaissance:

A collective name for a wide variety of methods for identifying individual archaeological sites, including consultation of documentary sources, place-name evidence, local folklore, and legend, but primarily actual fieldwork.

Matrix:

The physical material within which artefacts is embedded or supported, i.e. the material surrounding it e.g. gravel, clay or sand.

Phase 1 Assessments:

Scoping surveys to establish the presence of and to evaluate heritage resources in a given area.

Phase 2 Assessments:

In-depth culture resources management studies which could include major archaeological excavations, detailed site surveys and mapping / plans of sites, including historical / architectural structures and features. Alternatively, the sampling of sites by collecting material, small test pit excavations or auger sampling is required.

Sensitive:

Often refers to graves and burial sites although not necessarily a heritage place, as well as ideologically significant sites such as ritual / religious places. *Sensitive* may also refer to an entire landscape / area known for its significant heritage remains.

Site:

A distinct spatial clustering of artefacts, features, structures, and organic and environmental remains, as the residue of human activity.

Surface survey:

There are two kinds: (1) unsystematic and (2) systematic. The former involves field walking, i.e. scanning the ground along one's path and recording the location of artefacts and surface features. Systematic survey by comparison is less subjective and involves a grid system, such that the survey area is divided into sectors and these are walked ally, thus making the recording of finds more accurate.

7. References

Bergh, J.S. 1998. Swart gemeenskappe teen die begin van die 19de eeu. In: Bergh, J. (ed.) *Geskiedenisatlas Van Suid-Afrika: Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies: 105-109*. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik Uitgewers.

Clarke, R.J. & Kuman, K. 2000. *The Sterkfontein Caves Palaeontological and Archaeological Sites*. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Climate-Data.org. Bothaville Climate. <https://en.climate-data.org/africa/south-africa/free-state/bothaville-26894/>
Accessed 08-07-2021.

Deacon, H. & Deacon, J. 1999. *Human beginnings in South Africa*. Cape Town: David Philip.

Dreyer, C. 2007. First Phase Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Residential Developments on the Farm Kransdrift 243, Bothaville, Free State.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age*. Pietermaritzburg: UKZN Press.

Klein, R. G. (ed.) 1984. *South African prehistory and paleoenvironments*. Rotterdam: Balkema

Korsman, S.A., Van Der Ryst, M.M. & Meyer, A. 1998. Die Vroegste Inwoners. In: Bergh, J. (ed.) *Geskiedenisatlas Van Suid-Afrika: Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies: 93-102*. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik Uitgewers.

Mitchell, P. 2002. *The archaeology of southern Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M. C. 2006. *The Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland*. Strelitzia 19. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

Pelser, A.J. 2017. Report on a Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Rulaganyang Extension 2 Township establishment on a portion of the remaining extent of portion 11 (a portion of portion 1) of the farm Leeuwfontein 29HO near Witpoort, North West Province. Pretoria: APAC

Toth, N. & Schick, K. 2007. *Handbook of paleoanthropology*. Berlin: Springer.

Van der Walt, J. 2017. Archaeological Impact Assessment for the proposed Orkney Solar Farm, North West Province. Modimolle: HCAC

Volman, T. P. 1984. Early Prehistory of southern Africa. In: Klein, R. G. (ed.) *Southern African prehistory and paleoenvironments*. Rotterdam: Balkema.

Human Tissue Act No. 65 of 1983, Government Gazette, Cape Town

National Heritage Resource Act No.25 of 1999, Government Gazette, Cape Town

Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance No. 7 of 1925, Government Gazette, Cape Town

Appendix A: Historical Aerial Imagery & Topographical Maps




Figure 17: Segment of 1947 SA 1:50 000 2726 BA & BC indicating the study area.




Figure 18: 1964 Aerial mage of the study area.




Figure 19: 1975 Aerial mage of the study area.




Figure 20: Segment of 1975 SA 1:50 000 2726 BC indicating the study area.




Figure 21: Segment of 1997 SA 1:50 000 2726 BA & BC indicating the study area.




Figure 22: Segment of 2008 SA 1:50 000 2726 BA & BC indicating the study area.