

***SPECIALIST REPORT***

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR  
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL TOWNSHIP (MORIBE GARDEN):  
REMAINING EXTENT OF PORTION 7 OF THE FARM KAMEELRIVIER 160JR,  
SIYABUSWA  
MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

**REPORT COMPILED FOR  
AFRIKA Enviro & Biology  
P.O. Box 152  
WATERVAL-BOVEN, 1195  
Cell: 0726231845 / Fax: 0866038875**

**JULY 2012**

**ADANSONIA HERITAGE CONSULTANTS  
ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICAN PROFESSIONAL  
ARCHAEOLOGISTS  
C. VAN WYK ROWE  
E-MAIL: [christinevwr@gmail.com](mailto:christinevwr@gmail.com)  
Tel: 0828719553 / Fax: 0867151639  
P.O. BOX 75, PILGRIM'S REST, 1290**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) regarding archaeological and other cultural heritage resources was conducted on the footprint for the proposed residential township “Moripe Garden”, remaining extent of Portion 7 of the farm Kameelrivier 160JR, (portion of portion 1), Siyabuswa.

The study area is situated on topographical map 1:50 000, 2528BB, which is in the Mpumalanga Province. This area falls under the jurisdiction of the Dr. J.S. Moroka Local Municipality and Nkangala District Municipality.

The National Heritage Resources Act, no 25 (1999)(NHRA), protects all heritage resources, which are classified as national estate. The NHRA stipulates that any person who intends to undertake a development, is subjected to the provisions of the Act.

The Dr. J.S. Moroka Local Municipality (the current owners of the site), is requesting the residential township development to meet the growth demand of the existing Siyabuswa Township. The proposed site approximately 50 ha.

The area for the proposed township development (50 ha), is partially vacant, and there are plus or minus 75 upgraded houses already existing along the eastern side of the site. It is currently zoned as agricultural.

The proposed development is adjacent to the existing Siyabuswa township and the locals use the area for collecting firewood and medicinal plants, grazing their livestock (cattle) and dumping of refuse. Mr. Aubrey Mabunda from the Dr. J.S. Moroka Municipality accompanied the author during the survey. He has lived in this area since childhood, and consulted with the local community who confirmed that they are not aware of any graves or ancient settlements in the study area. The survey revealed only two foundations, consisting of concrete slabs and bricks of a recent nature. No other archaeological or historical remains were observed in the study area.

Based on the survey and the findings in this report, Adansonia Heritage Consultants states that there are no compelling reasons which may prevent the proposed development to continue.

**Disclaimer:** *Although all possible care is taken to identify all sites of cultural significance during the investigation, it is possible that hidden or sub-surface sites could be overlooked during the study, Christine Rowe trading as Adansonia Heritage Consultants will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred by the client as a result.*

**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 Christine Rowe trading as Adansonia Heritage Consultants. 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 the above. The Client, on acceptance of any submission by Christine Rowe, trading as Adansonia Heritage Consultants and on condition that the Client pays the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit and for the specified project only:*

- 1) The results of the project;*
- 2) The technology described in any report;*
- 3) Recommendations delivered to the Client.*

## CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
DISCLAIMER	3
A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PROJECT	5
• Terms of Reference	6
• Legal requirements	6
B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE STUDY AREA	9
• Literature review, museum databases & previous relevant impact assessments	9
C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT	11
D. LOCALITY	11
• Description of methodology	12
• GPS Co-ordinates of perimeters	13
E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES	13
F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	14
• Summarised identification & cultural significance assessment of affected Heritage resources: General issues of site and context	15
• Summarised recommended impact management interventions	18
G. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE & EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA	20
• Evaluation methods	20
• NHRA	20
• The significance and evaluation of the archaeological and cultural heritage features in the study area	21
• Field rating	21
H. RECOMMENDATION	21
I. CONCLUSION	21
SOURCES	22
<b>Appendix 1:</b> Topographical map: 2528 BB	23
<b>Appendix 2:</b> Google Earth image: The study area in relation to Siyabuswa	24
<b>Appendix 3:</b> Google Earth image: Perimeter of the study area	25
<b>Appendix 4:</b> Photographs of the study area	26

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR  
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL TOWNSHIP (MORIPE GARDEN):  
REMAINING EXTENT OF PORTION 7 OF THE FARM KAMEELRIVIER 160JR,  
SIYABUSWA, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

**A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PROJECT**

The Dr. J.S. Moroka Local Municipality, (the current owners of the remaining extent of Portion 7 (a portion of portion 1) of the farm Kameelrivier 160JR, is requesting the extension of a human settlement development to meet the growth demand of the existing Siyabuswa Township. This proposed development will be known as “Moripe Garden”. Housing is at the forefront of the national agenda for delivery and the government is taking overall responsibility for providing houses to all. This section is approximately 50 ha in extent. A large part of the site is currently vacant, with plus or minus 75 upgraded houses already existing on the eastern side of the site (See **Appendix 3**). The Renosterkop Dam conservation area is located to the northwest of the site and numerous formal and informal settlements are located in all compass directions in the larger study area (See **Appendix 2**).

Adansonia Heritage Consultants were appointed by AFRIKA Enviro & Biology to conduct a Phase 1 heritage impact assessment (HIA) on archaeological and other heritage resources of the study area.

A literature study, relevant to the study area was done, to determine that no archaeological or heritage resources will be impacted upon. (See **Appendix 1**: Topographical Map: 2528 BB).

The aims for this report are to source all relevant information on archaeological and heritage resources in the study area, and to advise the client on sensitive heritage areas as well as where it is viable for the development to take place in terms of the specifications as set out in the National Heritage Resources Act no., 25 of 1999 (NHRA). Recommendations for maximum conservation measures for any heritage resource will also be made. The study area is indicated in **Appendix 1, 2, & 3**. Photographic evidence is in **Appendix 4**.

- This study forms part of an EIA, Consultant: AFRIA Enviro & Biology, P.O. Box 152, Waterval-Boven, 1195, Cell: 0726231845 / Fax: 0866038875.
- Type of development: 50 ha, are earmarked for residential development, portion 7 (a portion of portion 1) of the farm Kameelrivier 160JR, Siyabuswa, Mpumalanga Province.
- Rezoning for the proposed development is in the process, as it is currently zoned as agricultural.
- Location of Province, Magisterial district / Local Authority and Property (farms):  
The area falls within the Mpumalanga Province under the jurisdiction of the Dr. J.S. Moroka local municipality. It includes portion 7 (a portion of portion 1) of the farm Kameelrivier 160JR.
- Land owners: Dr. J. S. Moroka Local Municipality, Siyabuswa.
- **Terms of reference:** As specified by section 38 (3) of the NHRA, the following information is provided in this report.
  - a) The identification and mapping of heritage resources where applicable;
  - b) Assessment of the significance of the resources;
  - c) Alternatives given to affected heritage resources by the development;
  - d) Plans for measures of mitigation.

- **Legal requirements:**

The legal context of the report is grounded in the National Heritage Resources Act no. 25, 1999, as well as the National Environmental Management Act (1998) (NEMA):

- **Section 38 of the NHRA**

This report constitutes a heritage impact assessment investigation linked to the environmental impact assessment required for the development. The proposed development is a listed activity in terms of Section 38 (1) of the NHRA. Section 38 (2) of the NHRA requires the submission of a HIA report for authorisation purposes to the responsible heritage resources agency, (SAHRA).

Heritage conservation and management in South Africa is governed by the NHRA and falls under the overall jurisdiction of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and its provincial offices and counterparts.

Section 38 of the NHRA requires a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to be conducted by an independent heritage management consultant, for the following development categories:

- Any development or other activity which will change the character of a site:
  - exceeding 5000m<sup>2</sup> in extent;
  - the rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000m<sup>2</sup> in extent

In addition, the new EIA regulation promulgated in terms of NEMA, determine that any environmental report will include cultural (heritage) issues.

The end purpose of this report is to alert AFRIKA Enviro & Biology specialists (the client), and interested and affected parties about existing heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed development, and to recommend mitigation measures aimed at reducing the risks of any adverse impacts on these heritage resources. Such measures could include the recording of any heritage buildings or structures older than 60 years prior to demolition, in terms of section 34 of the NHRA and also other sections of this act dealing with archaeological sites, buildings and graves.

The NHRA section 2 (xvi) states that a “heritage resource” means any place or object of cultural significance, and in section 2 (vi) that “cultural significance” means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance.

Apart from a heritage report assisting a client to make informed development decisions, it also serves to provide the relevant heritage resources authority with the necessary data to perform their statutory duties under the NHRA. After evaluating the heritage scoping report, the heritage resources authority will decide on the status of the resource, whether the development may proceed as proposed or whether mitigation is acceptable, and whether the heritage resource require formal protection such as a Grade I, II or III resource, with relevant parties having to comply with all aspects pertaining to such grading.

- **Section 35 of the NHRA**

Section 35 (4) of the NHRA stipulates that no person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA, destroy, damage, excavate, alter or remove from its original position, or collect, any archaeological material or object. This section may apply to any significant archaeological sites that may be discovered. In the case of such chance finds, the heritage practitioner will assist in investigating the extent and significance of the finds and consult with an archaeologist about further action. This may entail removal of material after documenting the find or mapping of larger sections before destruction. This section does not apply, since no archaeological material was found which might be impacted upon by the proposed development.

- **Section 36 of the NHRA**

Section 36 of the NHRA stipulates that no person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA, destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years, which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority. It is possible that chance burials might be discovered during construction work.

- **Section 34 of the NHRA**

Section 34 of the NHRA stipulates that no person may alter, damage, destroy, relocate etc, any building or structure older than 60 years, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority. The remains of recent foundations were observed but they are not older than 60 years, and are of no significance.

- **Section 37 of the NHRA**

This section deals with public monuments and memorials but does not apply in this report.

- **NEMA**

The regulations in terms of Chapter 5 of the National Environmental Management Act, (107/1998), provide for an assessment of development impacts on the cultural (heritage) and social environment and for specialist studies in this regard.



## B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE STUDY AREA

- **Literature review, museum databases & previous relevant impact assessments**

In order to place the study area and Siyabuswa in archaeological context, primary and secondary sources were consulted. Ethnographical and linguistic studies by early researchers such as Ziervogel, Theal and Van Warmelo shed light on the cultural groups living in the area since ca 1600. Historic and academic sources by Küsel and Bergh, were consulted, as well as historic sources by Makhura and Webb.

There are no museums in the town of Siyabuswa or at Marble Hall which could be consulted, and no historical information was available at the municipality. The author had to rely on the assistance of local people documenting relevant history in the area. The 1974 topographical map 2528BB revealed no disturbance on the site except where the dam is, which was an excavation and probably used for road works. Approximately 50% of the site has already been developed by houses (See **Appendix 3**). The remaining section of the study area is currently utilized by the local people to collect firewood, medicinal plants and for livestock grazing. (See **Appendix 1, 2, 3 & 4**).

Very little contemporary research has been done on prehistoric African settlements in the study area. According to Bergh, there are no recorded sites that date from the Stone Age, (including Rock paintings or engravings), or Early Iron Age. It can be confirmed that none of the above mentioned sites were encountered during the survey.<sup>1</sup>

The Siyabuswa area was very sparsely populated during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Bergh<sup>2</sup> does not indicate any cultural group specific to the Siyabuswa area, although the surrounding area from Middelburg, Pretoria, Warmbaths (Bela Bela), and Nylstroom were inhabited by the Ndebele, and small groups of KôPa (baSotho) and Kgatla. Ethnographical and linguistic studies by early researchers such as D. Ziervogel and N.J. Van Warmelo, does not include this area. It may be assumed that some of the *Ndzundza* Ndebele, Manala Ndebela and Hawduba Ndebele were the dominant groups as they do occur extensively

---

<sup>1</sup> J.S. Bergh, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid-Afrika Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies*, pp. 4-7

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

in the surrounding area.<sup>3</sup>

The local inhabitants of Siyabuswa, currently consists of various groups including Ndebele, Sotho and Pedi.<sup>4</sup>

- **AmaNDEBELE**

According to Van Warmelo, the *amaNdebele* are the earliest known offshoot of the *Nguni* group. The Ndebele is divided into two groups, the Southern and the Northern, and they are separated from one another. A certain legendary chief *Msi* or *Musi* heads a list of about twenty-five successive chiefs who lived just north of where Pretoria now stands. His two sons were *Manala* and *Ndzundza* and form the most important tribes of the Southern group. The *abagaNdzundza* moved eastwards and settled near Roos Senekal, and it is said that some of *Manala's* followers, the *abagaManala*, settled in the Witbank district. The tribes slowly broke up after the days of the Republic.<sup>5</sup>

- **CENTRAL SOTHO**

The tribes in this group were at one time largely under the rule of the baPedi, who's last independent king was *Sekhukhune*, who's stronghold was to the east of Siyabuswa (Steelpoort area), although his domain was extremely large.<sup>6</sup> Great numbers of *baSotho* who belong to the above group, who still speak *sePedi* but which became detribalized, live in the districts of Middelburg, Lydenburg, Witbank and Springs. They mingled freely with other groups such as the Zulu, Swazi and Tonga.

- **HISTORY OF SIYABUSWA**

During the apartheid era, Siyabuswa was the capital of the KwaNdebele Bantustan. It served as a capital from 1981 to 1986 when KwaMhlanga replaced it. Most of its inhabitants are members of the Ndebele ethnic group. Currently Siyabuswa is also home to several ethnic groups, namely the Ndebele, the Pedi and the Sotho people.<sup>7</sup>

Siyabuswa is approximately 10 km from Marble Hall.

---

<sup>3</sup> N.J. Van Warmelo, *A preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Siyabuswa Mpumalanga, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siyabuswa\\_Mpumalanga](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siyabuswa_Mpumalanga)

<sup>5</sup> N.J. Van Warmelo, *A preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p. 87.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>7</sup> Siyabuswa Mpumalanga, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siyabuswa\\_Mpumalanga](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siyabuswa_Mpumalanga)

### **C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

The proposed project will involve the following:

- Approximately 50 ha, are earmarked for residential township development, to be known as “Moripe Garden.” There are plus or minus 75 upgraded houses currently on the site.

### **D. LOCALITY**

The proposed project site is located on the western side of Siyabuswa along the R568 road that goes to Marble Hall and KwaMhlanga. The site falls under the jurisdiction of the Dr. J. S. Moroka Local Municipality, which in turn falls within the Nkangala District Municipality, in the Mpumalanga Province (**Appendix 1: Topographical Map & Appendix 3, Google image of study area**).

The proposed area for development is situated on portion 7 (a portion of portion 1) of the farm Kameelrivier 160JR and is currently vacant land with approximately 75 upgraded existing houses. The land belongs to the Dr. J.S. Moroka Local Municipality, and is zoned as agricultural.

The site is characterized by the following features:

- There is a dam on the western side of the site;
- Greenfield or natural section;
- There are currently +/- 75 upgraded houses along the eastern side of the site;
- The Renosterkop Dam conservation area is located to the northwest of the site and numerous formal and informal settlements are located in all directions in the larger study area;
- Nationally, and in broad classification, the site is situated within the Mixed Bushveld (A18) veld type according to Alcocks (1988) and Mixed Bushveld according to Low & Rebelo (1998). It is also classified as Central Sandy Bushveld in Mucina & Rutherford (2006).
- The southern and eastern areas to the study area, are underlain by granite of the Lebowa Granite Suite. In the north, sedimentary rocks of the Waterberg Group are most important. Rock formations are dominated by sandstone, conglomerate, siltstone and shale. Soils vary from deep Hutton to Clovelly and

shallow Glenrosa soil types.<sup>8</sup>

GPS co-ordinates were used to locate the perimeters and any heritage features within the study area.

- **Description of methodology:**

The topographical Map, (**Appendix 1**), and Google images of the site (**Appendix 2 & 3**), indicate the study area of the proposed development. These were intensively studied to assess the current and historic disturbed areas and infrastructure. In order to reach a comprehensive conclusion regarding the cultural heritage resources in the study area, the following methods were used:

- The desktop study consists mainly of archival sources studied on distribution patterns of early African groups who settled in the area since the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and which have been observed in past and present ethnographical research and studies.
- Literary sources, books and government publications, which were available on the subject, have been consulted, in order to establish relevant information.
- Specialists currently working in the field of anthropology and archaeology have also been consulted on the subject.

-Literary sources: A number of books and government publications about prehistory and history of the area were consulted, and revealed sparse information;

-SAHRA database for archaeological sites, were consulted.

- The fieldwork and survey was conducted extensively on foot and with a vehicle, with two people.
- The entire area was previously a natural section with a wetland in the western section. Currently a large portion has already been developed, consisting of +/- 75 existing upgraded houses. The remaining natural section is used for livestock grazing, collecting of firewood and medicinal plants.
- The terrain was mostly even and accessible in dry conditions, so visibility was fair. A small section is wetland, and the area consists mainly of granite, sandstone, conglomerate, siltstone and shale. (**Appendix 3 & 4**).
- The relevant data was located with a GPS instrument (Garmin Etrex) datum WGS 84, and plotted. Co-ordinates were within 4-6 meters of identified sites.

---

<sup>8</sup> Sisonke, Background information document (BID), pp. 1-4.

- Evaluation of the resources which might be impacted upon by the footprint, was done within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 (1999);
- Personal communication with relevant stakeholders on the specific study area, were held, such as the ecologist, Mr. Danie van der Walt and Mr. Aubrey Mabunda from the local municipality, and who grew up in the area, and accompanied the author during the survey.
- **GPS: Co-ordinates of the perimeters of the study area:**

CO-ORDINATES		
Study area	LONG	LAT
SW	S 25° 08' 41.58"	E 28° 55' 39.11"
NW	S 25° 08' 26.74"	E 28° 55' 43.13"
NE	S 25° 08' 30.60"	E 28° 56' 24.16"
SE	S 25° 08' 42.30"	E 28° 56' 17.98"

#### E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES

All comments should be studied in conjunction with the appendices, which indicate the areas, and which corresponds with the summary below. Photographs in **Appendix 4**, show the general view of the study area. Visibility was good.

Site location	Description/Comments	Heritage feature
<b>Appendix 3:</b> Concrete slab, bricks and stones for a foundation	Broken foundation of concrete, stone and brick of a recent structure.	S25° 08' 39.3" E28° 55' 45.3" Fig. 5
<b>Appendix 3:</b> Foundation of recent structure	The broken concrete foundations of an unidentified recent structure. Some of the concrete pieces have pebble patterns in them.	Foundation of structure: S25° 08' 39" E28° 55' 49" Fig. 6

#### Study area: Portion 7 of the farm Kameelrivier 160JR:

The study area was extensively surveyed on foot and per vehicle for any remains of archaeological or historical nature. Visibility was fair and a section in the west is situated in a wetland. The study area is surrounded by formal and informal settlements in the Siyabuswa township, and approximately 75 upgraded houses are already built on the

vacant land (See **Appendix 4**, Fig. 7). The area is classified as sandy bushveld. There are no rocky outcrops. The Renosterkop Dam and conservation area is situated towards the west of the study area.

The inhabitants of the Siyabuswa township utilizes the area for harvesting of firewood and medicinal plants, livestock grazing and dumping of refuse. The area belongs to the Dr. J.S. Moroka Municipality. Mr. Aubrey Mabunda who grew up in the area and who is currently working for the Municipality, assisted with the field survey. He interviewed some of the locals who confirmed that there are no known graves in the study area.<sup>9</sup>

The remains of two separate foundations were observed in the study area (Fig. 5 & 6). Both consist of stones, concrete and bricks and one has a pattern in it made with small white pebbles. These features are of no significance, and is not older than 60 years. The features in the study area do not have any historic value.

#### **F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

<i><b>ACT</b></i>	<i><b>COMPONENT</b></i>	<i><b>IMPLICATION</b></i>	<i><b>RELEVANCE</b></i>	<i><b>COMPLIANCE</b></i>
NHRA	S 34	Impact on buildings and structures older than 60 years	Foundations of 2 structures of recent date, were observed	No significance
NHRA	S35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	None present	None
NHRA	S36	Impact on graves	None present	None
NHRA	S37	Impact on public monuments	None present	None
NHRA	S38	Developments requiring an HIA	Development is a listed activity	HIA done
NEMA	EIA regulations	Activities requiring an EIA	Development is subject to an EIA	HIA is part of EIA

<sup>9</sup> Personal communication: Mr. A. Mabunda, 2012-05-19.

- **Summarised identification and cultural significance assessment of affected heritage resources: General issues of site and context:**

<b>Context</b>		
Urban environmental context	No	NA
Rural environmental context	No	Vacant land
Natural environmental context	No	Partly natural, partly developed
<b>Formal protection (NHRA)</b>		
(S. 28) Is the property part of a protected area?	No	NA
(S. 31) Is the property part of a heritage area?	No	NA
<b>Other</b>		
Is the property near to or visible from any protected heritage sites	No	A distance from the Renosterkop Dam and conservation area
Is the property part of a conservation area of special area in terms of the Zoning scheme?	No	NA
Does the site form part of a historical settlement or townscape?	No	NA
Does the site form part of a rural cultural landscape?	No	NA
Does the site form part of a natural landscape of cultural significance?	No	NA
Is the site adjacent to a scenic route?	No	NA
Is the property within or adjacent to any other area which has special environmental or heritage protection?	No	NA
Does the general context or any adjoining properties have cultural significance?	No	NA

<b>Property features and characteristics</b>		
Have there been any previous development impacts on the property?	Yes	+/- 75 upgraded houses were built towards the eastern section of the study area.
Are there any significant landscape features on the property?	No	NA
Are there any sites or features of geological significance on the property?	No	NA
Does the property have any rocky outcrops on it?	No	NA
Does the property have any fresh water sources (springs, streams, rivers) on or alongside it?	Yes	There is a wetland with an existing dam in the western section of the study area.

<b>Heritage resources on the property</b>		
<b>Formal protection (NHRA)</b>		
National heritage sites (S. 27)	No	NA
Provincial heritage sites (S. 27)	No	NA
Provincial protection (S. 29)	No	NA
Place listed in heritage register (S. 30)	No	NA
<b>General protection (NHRA)</b>		
Structures older than 60 years (S. 34)	No	Two foundations of structures are of a recent date.
Archaeological site or material (S. 35)	No	NA
Palaeontological site or material (S. 35)	No	NA
Graves or burial grounds (S. 36)	No	None were identified.
Public monuments or memorials (S. 37)	No	NA
<b>Other</b>		



<b>Heritage resources on the property</b>		
Any heritage resource identified in a heritage survey (author / date / grading)	No	NA
Any other heritage resources (describe)	No	NA

<b>NHRA S (3)2 Heritage resource category</b>	<b>ELE-MENTS</b>	<b>INDICATORS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE</b>										<b>RISK</b>	
		Histo- rical	Rare	Sci- enti- fic	Typi- cal	Tech- nolog- ical	Aes- thetic	Pers- on / com- munit- y	Land- mark	Mate- rial con- dition	Sust- aina- bility		
Buildings / structures of cultural significance	Foundations encountered	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Foundations of two recent structures have no significance.
Areas attached to oral traditions / intangible heritage	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	-
Historical settlement/ townscapes	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Landscape of cultural significance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Geological site of scientific/ cultural importance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

<b>NHRA</b>	<b>ELE-</b>	<b>INDICATORS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE</b>										<b>RISK</b>	
Archaeological / palaeontological sites	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Grave / burial grounds	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Areas of significance related to labour history	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Movable objects	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

- **Summarised recommended impact management interventions**

<b>NHRA S (3)2 Heritage resource category</b>	<b>SITE</b>	<b>IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE</b>		<b>Impact management</b>	<b>Motivation</b>
		<b>Cultural significance rating</b>			
		<b>Cultural significanc</b>	<b>Impact significanc</b>		
Buildings / structures of cultural significance	No	No	None	No significance	Structures are of recent date and have no historical value.
Areas attached to oral traditions / intangible heritage	No	None	None	-	-
Historical settlement/ townscape	No	None	None	-	-
Landscape of cultural significance	No	None	None	-	-

<b>NHRA S (3)2 Heritage</b>	<b>SITE</b>	<b>IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE Cultural significance rating</b>		<b>Impact management</b>	<b>Motivation</b>
Geological site of scientific/cultural importance	No	None	None	-	-
Archaeological / palaeontological sites	No	None	None	-	-
Grave / burial grounds	No	No	None	-	-
Areas of significance related to labour history	No	None	None	-	-
Movable objects	No	None	None	-	-

<b>ACT</b>	<b>COMPONENT</b>	<b>IMPLICATION</b>	<b>RELEVANCE</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>
NHRA	S 34	Impact on buildings and structures older than 60 years	No foundations older than 60 years	None
NHRA	S35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	None present	None
NHRA	S36	Impact on graves	None present	None
NHRA	S37	Impact on public monuments	None present	None
NHRA	S38	Developments requiring an HIA	Development is a listed activity	Full HIA
NEMA	EIA regulations	Activities requiring an EIA	Development is subject to an EIA	HIA is part of EIA

## **G. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE & EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA**

Section 38 of the NHRA, rates all heritage resources into National, Provincial or Local significance, and proposals in terms of the above is made for all identified heritage features.

### **• Evaluation methods**

Site significance is important to establish the measure of mitigation and / or management of the resources. Sites are evaluated as *HIGH (National importance)*, *MEDIUM (Provincial importance)* or *LOW, (local importance)*, as specified in the NHRA. It is explained as follows:

### **• National Heritage Resources Act**

The National Heritage Resources Act no. 25, 1999 (NHRA) aims to promote good management of the national estate, and to enable and encourage communities to conserve their legacy so that it may be bequeathed to future generations. Heritage is unique and it cannot be renewed, and contributes to redressing past inequities.<sup>10</sup> It promotes previously neglected research areas.

All archaeological and other cultural heritage resources are evaluated according to the NHRA, section 3(3). A place or object is considered to be part of the national estate if it has cultural significance or other special value in terms of:

- (a) its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- (c) its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- (g) its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- (h) its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. p. 2.

<sup>11</sup>National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. pp. 12-14

- **The significance and evaluation of the archaeological and cultural heritage features in the study area, can be summarised as follows:**

<b><i>Site no</i></b>	<b><i>Cultural Heritage features</i></b>	<b><i>Significance</i></b>	<b><i>Measures of mitigation</i></b>
Appendix 3: Foundations of two recent structures	Two foundations consisting of stones, concrete and bricks were observed, one has a pebble pattern in.	No significance	The foundations have no historical value and are not older than 60 years.

- **Field rating:**

No archaeological or historical features were observed in the study area. Two foundations of a recent date were investigated which consist of concrete, bricks & stones. These are not believed to have any historical significance, and are not older than 60 years.

## **H. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The assessment on the study area revealed no archaeological or heritage features which will be impacted upon by the proposed development. Based on the findings in this report, Adansonia Heritage Consultants cc, have no compelling reasons which may prevent the proposed residential township development of the remaining extent of Portion 7 of Kameelrivier, to continue.

## **I. CONCLUSION**

Archaeological material or graves are not always visible during a field survey and therefore some significant material may only be revealed during construction activities of the proposed development. It is therefore recommended that the developers be made aware of this possibility and when human remains, clay or ceramic pottery etc. are observed, a qualified archaeologist must be notified and an assessment be done. Further research might then be necessary in this regard for which the developer will be responsible.

**Adansonia Heritage Consultants can not be held responsible for any archaeological material or graves which were not located during the survey.**

## **SOURCES**

### **NATIONAL LEGISLATION**

- Republic of South Africa, *National Heritage Resources Act*, (Act No. 25 of 1999).

### **LITERARY SOURCES**

- BERGH J.S., Swart gemeenskappe voor die koms van die blankes, in *J.S. Bergh (red).*, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*. J.L. van Schaik, 1999.
- DELIUS P, & M. HAY, *Mpumalanga, an illustrated history*, Highveld Press, 2009.
- KÜSEL, U.S., *Survey of Heritage sites in the Olifants Catchment area*, 2009.
- MAKHURA, T., Early Inhabitants, in Delius, P. (ed)., *Mpumalanga: History and Heritage*. Natal University Press, 2007.
- VAN WARMELO, N.J., *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, Pretoria, 1935.
- VOIGHT, E., *Guide to the Archaeological sites in the Northern and Eastern Transvaal*. Transvaal Museum, 1981.
- WEBB, H. S., The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld, in *Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*. Cape Times Limited. 1954.
- ZIERVOGEL, D. *The Eastern Sotho: A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey with Ethnographical notes on the Pai, Kutswe and Pulana Bantu Tribes*. Pretoria, 1953.

### **ELECTRONIC INFORMATION SOURCES**

- Siyabuswa Mpumalanga, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siyabuswa\\_Mpumalanga](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siyabuswa_Mpumalanga)

### **PERSONAL INFORMATION**

- Mr. Aubrey Mabunda, 2012-05-19.
- Danie van der Walt: Biologists, Waterval Boven, 0726231845, 2012-06-12.
- JP Cilliers, Archaeologist, Lydenburg Museum, 2012-05-25.

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

- Sisonke Development Planners: Background Information document (BID), Township establishment on Portion 7, Kameelrivier 160JR, Dr. J.S. Moroka Local Municipality, 2012.