

# Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report

---

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE  
PROPOSED NEW TOWNSHIP DEVELOPMENT :  
MAYFIELD EXTENSION 52, EKURHULENI  
METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY,  
GAUTENG PROVINCE.

PREPARED BY:



PREPARED FOR:



# CREDIT SHEET

## Project Director

STEPHAN GAIGHER (BA Hons, Archaeology, UP)

Principal Investigator for G&A Heritage

Member of ASAPA (Site Director Status)

Tel: (015) 516 1561

Cell: 073 752 6583

E-mail: [stephan@gaheritage.co.za](mailto:stephan@gaheritage.co.za)

Website: [www.gaheritage.co.za](http://www.gaheritage.co.za)

## Report Author

STEPHAN GAIGHER

**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. G&A Heritage and its personnel will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result of such oversights.

## Statement of Independence

As the duly appointed representative of G&A Heritage, I Stephan Gaigher, hereby confirm my independence as a specialist and declare that neither I nor G&A Heritage have any interests, be it business or otherwise, in any proposed activity, application or appeal in respect of which the Environmental Consultant was appointed as Environmental Assessment Practitioner, other than fair remuneration for work performed on this project.

SIGNED OFF BY: STEPHAN GAIGHER



# MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

**Site name and location:** Proposed new township development: Mayfield Extension 52, located on the farm Putfontein 26 IR, Portions 117, 118, 124, 132 and 248, near Daveyton.

**Municipal Area:** Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province.

**Developer:** Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality

**Consultant:** G&A Heritage, PO Box 522, Louis Trichardt, 0920, South Africa  
38A Vorster St, Louis Trichardt, 0920

**Date of Report:** 3 January 2020

The purpose of the management summary is to distil the information contained in the report into a format that can be used to give specific results quickly and facilitate management decisions. It is not the purpose of the management summary to repeat in shortened format all the information contained in the report, but rather to give a statement of results for decision making purposes.

This study focuses on the proposed new township development: Mayfield Extension 52 located on the farm Putfontein 26 IR, Portions 117, 118, 124, 132 and 248 near Daveyton in the Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province.

This study encompasses the heritage impact investigation. A preliminary layout has been supplied to lead this phase of this study.

## Scope of Work

A Heritage Impact Assessment (including Archaeological, Cultural heritage, Built Heritage and Paleontological Impact Assessment (PIA) to determine the impacts on heritage resources within the study area.

The following are the required to perform the assessment:

- A desk-top investigation of the area;
- A site visit to the proposed development site;
- Identify possible archaeological, cultural, historic, built and paleontological sites within the proposed development area;
- Evaluate the potential impacts of construction and operation of the proposed development on archaeological, cultural, historical resources; built and paleontological resources; and
- Recommend mitigation measures to ameliorate any negative impacts on areas of archaeological, cultural, historical, built and paleontological importance.

The purpose of this study is to determine the possible occurrence of sites with cultural heritage significance within the study area. The study is based on archival and document combined with fieldwork investigations.

## Findings & Recommendations

The area was investigated during a field visit and through archival studies.

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) will be required as per the *PalaeoSensitivity* Map on the SAHRIS Database. The site has however undergone severe alternations and limited development in the past and as a result impacts are expected to be limited.

The site was found to be devoid of any heritage sites with significance. It is recommended that obscured, subterranean sites be managed, if they are encountered.

2020/01/03

**Fatal Flaws**

No fatal flaws were identified.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction .....	10
2. Background Information .....	13
2.1 Project Location .....	13
2.2 GPS Trackpath .....	14
3. Regional Cultural Context .....	15
3.1 Paleontology .....	15
3.2 Stone Age .....	16
3.3 Iron Age.....	17
3.4 The Historic Era .....	18
3.5 Historical Maps .....	20
3.6 Previous Studies.....	27
3.7 Cultural & Natural Landscape .....	28
4. Findings .....	28
5. Methodology .....	34
5.1 Inventory.....	34
5.2 Evaluating Heritage Impacts .....	34
5.3 Fieldwork.....	35
6. Measuring Impacts .....	35
6.1 Type of Resource .....	35
6.2 Type of Significance .....	35
6.2.1 Historic Value.....	35
6.2.2 Aesthetic Value.....	36
6.2.3 Scientific Value .....	36
6.2.4 Social Value / Public Significance.....	37
6.2.5 Ethnic Significance .....	37
6.2.6 Economic Significance .....	37

6.2.7 Scientific Significance .....	37
6.2.8 Historic Significance .....	38
6.2.9 Public Significance .....	38
6.2.10 Other .....	38
6.3 Degrees of Significance .....	38
6.3.1 Significance Criteria.....	38
6.3.2 Rarity .....	39
6.3.3 Representivity .....	39
7. Assessment of Heritage Potential.....	40
7.1 Assessment Matrix (Determining Archaeological Significance).....	40
7.2 Assessing site value by attribute.....	41
7.3 Impact Statement (Assessment of Impacts) .....	41
7.4 Indicators of Impact Severity .....	42
7.5 Post-Contact Sites .....	42
7.6 Built Environment.....	43
7.7 Historic Significance .....	43
7.8 Architectural Significance .....	43
7.9 Spatial Significance .....	44
8. Impact Evaluation .....	44
8.1 Determination of Significance of Impacts .....	44
8.2 Impact Rating System .....	44
8.3 Rating System Used to Classify Impacts .....	45
9. Anticipated Impact of the Development.....	48
9.1 Subterranean or Unmarked Sites .....	48
9.4 Assessing Visual Impact .....	48
9.5 Assumptions and Restrictions.....	49
10. Assessment of Impacts (Impact Statement) .....	49
10.1 Cultural Landscape.....	49
11. Chance Finds Protocol.....	51

2020/01/03

12. Conclusion .....	51
13. References Cited & Researched .....	52

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Location Map of the Study Area .....	13
Figure 2. Bing Aerial © Map of the Study Area .....	14
Figure 3. Google Earth © Image: Mayfield X 52 Trackpath .....	14
Figure 4. <i>PalaeoSensitivity</i> Map.....	15
Figure 5. (1) handaxe on flake; (2) thick discoidal core; (3) polyhedral core (Pollarolo, Kuman, Bruxelles, 2010) .....	16
Figure 6. (1,2) Handaxes with large side removal; (3-6) handaxes (Pollarolo, Susino, Kuman, Bruxelles, 2010) .....	17
Figure 7. Benoni Gold Reefs 1895 .....	19
Figure 8. Typographical Map 2628AB_1939 .....	21
Figure 9. Typographical Map 2628AB_1957 .....	22
Figure 10. Typographical Map 2628AB_1976 .....	23
Figure 11. Typographical Map 2628AB_1983 .....	24
Figure 12. Topographical Map 2628AB_1995 .....	25
Figure 13. Typographical Map 2628AB_2002 .....	26
Figure 14. Typographical Map 2628AB_2010 .....	27
Figure 15. Remnants of a concrete sidewalk .....	28
Figure 16. Dilapidated buildings.....	29
Figure 17. Signs of an abandoned project .....	29
Figure 18. Gravel roads.....	30
Figure 19. Gravel road (view towards Daveyton).....	30
Figure 20. Gravel roads.....	31
Figure 21. Foundations of a suspected reservoir.....	31
Figure 22. Dilapidated buildings.....	32
Figure 23. Building rubble.....	32
Figure 24. Perimeter fence .....	33
Figure 25. Perimeter fence .....	33

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Bp .....	Before Present
EIA.....	Early Iron Age
ESA .....	Early Stone Age
Fm .....	Femtometre ( $10^{-15}\text{m}$ )
GPS.....	Geographic Positioning System
HIA .....	Heritage Impact Assessment
LIA .....	Late Iron Age
LSA .....	Late Stone Age
MYA .....	Million Years Ago
MSA .....	Middle Stone Age
NHRA.....	National Heritage Resources Act no 22 of 1999
SAHRA.....	South African Heritage Resource Agency
S&EIR .....	Scoping & Environmental Impact Reporting
Um.....	Micrometre ( $10^{-6}\text{ m}$ )
WGS 84 .....	World Geodetic System for 1984

## HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

### HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED NEW TOWNSHIP DEVELOPMENT : MAYFIELD EXTENSION 52.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### Legislation and methodology

G&A Heritage was appointed by Galago Environmental to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed new township development: Mayfield Extension 52, located on the farm Putfontein 26 IR, Portions 117, 118, 124, 132 and 248, Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province.

Section 38(1) of the South African Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) requires that a heritage study is undertaken for:

- (a) Construction of a road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300 m in length;
- (b) Construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50 m in length; and
- (c) Any development, or other activity which will change the character of an area of land, or water –
  - (1) Exceeding 10 000 m<sup>2</sup> in extent;
  - (2) Involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or
  - (3) Involving three or more erven, or subdivisions thereof, which have been consolidated within the past five years; or
- (d) The costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations; or
- (e) Any other category of development provided for in regulations.

While the above describes the parameters of developments that fall under this Act., Section 38 (8) of the NHRA is applicable to this development. This section states that;

- (8) *The provisions of this section do not apply to a development as described in subsection (1) if an evaluation of the impact of such development on heritage resources is required in terms of the Environment Conservation Act, 1989 (Act 73 of 1989), or the integrated environmental management guidelines issued by the Department of Environment Affairs and Tourism, or the Minerals Act, 1991 (Act 50 of 1991), or any other legislation: Provided that the consenting authority must ensure that the evaluation fulfils the requirements of the relevant heritage resources authority in terms of subsection (3), and any comments and recommendations of the relevant heritage resources authority with regard to such development have been taken into account prior to the granting of the consent.*

In regards to a development such as this that falls under Section 38 (8) of the NHRA, the requirements of Section 38 (3) applies to the subsequent reporting, stating that;

- (3) *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.*
  - (1) Ancestral graves,
  - (2) Royal graves and graves of traditional leaders,
  - (3) Graves of victims of conflict (iv) graves of important individuals,
  - (4) Historical graves and cemeteries older than 60 years, and
  - (5) Other human remains which are not covered under the Human Tissues Act, 1983 (Act No.65 of 1983 as amended);
- (h) Movable objects, including ;
  - (1) Objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa including archaeological and paleontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens;
  - (2) Ethnographic art and objects;
  - (3) Military objects;
  - (4) Objects of decorative art;
  - (5) Objects of fine art;
  - (6) Objects of scientific or technological interest;
  - (7) Books, records, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic, film or video material or sound recordings; and
  - (8) Any other prescribed categories, but excluding any object made by a living person;
- (i) Battlefields;
- (j) Traditional building techniques.

A **'place'** is defined as:

- (a) A site, area or region;
- (b) A building or other structure (which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such building or other structure);
- (c) 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); and (d) 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.

**'Structures'** means any building, works, device, or other facility made by people and which is fixed to land and any fixtures, fittings and equipment associated therewith older than 60 years.

**'Archaeological'** means:

- (a) Material remains resulting from human activity which are in a state of disuse and are in or on land and are older than 100 years, including artefacts, human and hominid remains and artificial features and structures;
- (b) Rock art, being a 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 is older than 100 years including any area within 10 m of such representation; and
- (c) Wrecks, being any vessel or aircraft, or any part thereof, which was wrecked in South Africa, whether on land or in the maritime cultural zone referred to in section 5 of the Maritime Zones Act 1994 (Act 15 of 1994), and any cargo, debris or artefacts found or associated therewith, which are older than 60 years or which in terms of national legislation are considered to be worthy of conservation;
- (d) Features, structures and artefacts associated with military history which are older than 75 years and the sites on which they are found.

**'Paleontological'** means any fossilised remains or fossil trace of animals or plants which lived in the geological past, other than fossil fuels or fossiliferous rock intended for industrial use, and any site which contains such fossilised remains or trace.

**‘Grave’** means a place of interment and includes the contents, headstone or other marker of and any other structures on or associated with such place. The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) will only issue a permit for the alteration of a grave if it is satisfied that every reasonable effort has been made to contact and obtain permission from the families concerned.

The removal of graves is subject to the following procedures as outlined by the SAHRA:

- Notification of the impending removals (using English, Afrikaans and local language media and notices at the grave site);
- Consultation with individuals or communities related or known to the deceased;
- Satisfactory arrangements for the curation of human remains and / or headstones in a museum, where applicable;
- Procurement of a permit from the SAHRA;
- Appropriate arrangements for the exhumation (preferably by a suitably trained archaeologist) and re-interment (sometimes by a registered undertaker, in a formally proclaimed cemetery);
- Observation of rituals or ceremonies required by the families.

The limitations and assumptions associated with this heritage impact assessment are as follows:

- Field investigations were performed on foot and by vehicle where access was readily available.
- Sites were evaluated by means of description of the cultural landscape, direct observations and analysis of written sources and available databases.
- It was assumed that the site layout as provided by Galago Environmental is accurate.
- We assumed that the public participation process performed as part of the Basic Assessment process was sufficiently encompassing not to be repeated in the Heritage Assessment Phase.

Table 1. Impacts on the NHRA Sections

Act	Section	Description	Possible Impact	Action
National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA)	34	Preservation of buildings older than 60 years	No impact	None
	35	Archaeological, paleontological and meteor sites	No impact	None
	36	Graves and burial sites	Possible impact	Management Plan
	37	Protection of public monuments	No impact	None
	38	Does activity trigger a HIA?	Yes	HIA

Table 2. NHRA Triggers

Action Trigger	Yes/No	Description
Construction of a road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other linear form of development or barrier exceeding 300m in length.	No	N/A
Construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length.	No	N/A
Development exceeding 5000 m <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Proposed new township development: Mayfield Extension 52
Development involving more than 3 erven or sub divisions	No	N/A
Development involving more than 3 erven or sub divisions that have been consolidated in the past 5 years	No	N/A
Re-zoning of site exceeding 10 000 m <sup>2</sup>	No	N/A



Any other development category, public open space, squares, parks or recreational grounds	No	N/A
---	----	-----

## 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### 2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed new township development: Mayfield Extension 52 is located on the farm Putfontein 26 IR, Portions 117, 118, 124, 132 and 248 near Daveyton in the Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality of the Gauteng Province.




Figure 1. Location Map of the Study Area





Figure 2. Bing Aerial © Map of the Study Area

## 2.2 GPS TRACKPATH



Figure 3. Google Earth © Image: Mayfield X 52 Trackpath

## Chapter 2

# FINDINGS

## HERITAGE INDICATORS WITHIN THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT

### 3. REGIONAL CULTURAL CONTEXT

#### 3.1 PALEONTOLOGY

The study area falls within the red and green demarcation on the *PalaeoSensitivity* Map. SAHRA states that in this case a field assessment and a protocol for finds is required.




Figure 4. *PalaeoSensitivity* Map

Table 3. Palaeontological Sensitivity Classification

Colour	Sensitivity	Action Required
RED	VERY HIGH	Field assessment and protocol for finds is required.
ORANGE / YELLOW	HIGH	Desktop study is required and based on the outcome of the desktop study, a field assessment is likely.
GREEN	MODERATE	Desktop study is required.
BLUE	LOW	No Palaeontological studies are required however, a protocol for finds is required.
GREY	INSIGNIFICANT / ZERO	No Palaeontological studies are required.
WHITE / CLEAR	UNKNOWN	These area will require a minimum of a desktop study. As more information comes to light, SAHRA will continue to populate the map.

### 3.2 STONE AGE

No substantial number of Stone Age sites from any period of the Stone Age is known to exist in this area – primarily as a result of a lack of research and general ignorance amongst the layman in recognizing stone tools that often may occur. However, it is possible that the first humans in the area may have been preceded by *Homo erectus*, who roamed large parts of the world during the Acheulian period of the Early Stone Age, 500 000 years ago. The predecessors of *Homo erectus*, *Australopithecus*, which is considered to be the earliest ancestor of modern humans, lived in the Blaauwbank Valley around Krugersdorp (today part of the Cradle of Humankind – a World Heritage Site) several million years ago.

During the Middle Stone Age, 200 000 years ago, modern man or *Homo sapiens* emerged, manufacturing a wider range of tools, with technologies more advanced than those from earlier periods. This enabled skilled hunter-gatherer bands to adapt to different environments. From this time onwards, rock shelters and caves were used for occupation and reoccupation over very long periods of time (Mitchell 2002). Two Middle Stone Age sites at the Withoek Spruit (Brakpan) were researched 17 years ago, but no information on this discovery has been published.



Figure 5. (1) handaxe on flake; (2) thick discoidal core; (3) polyhedral core (Pollarolo, Kuman, Bruxelles, 2010)






Figure 6. (1,2) Handaxes with large side removal; (3-6) handaxes (Pollarolo, Susino, Kuman, Bruxelles, 2010)

The Late Stone Age, considered to have started some 20 000 years ago, is associated with the predecessors of the San and Khoi Khoi. San hunter-gatherer bands with their small (microlithic) stone tools may have lived in Eastern Gauteng, as a magnificent engraving site near Duncanville attests to their presence in Vereeniging, south of, but close to Ekurhuleni. Stone Age hunter-gatherers lived well into the 19th century in some places in SA but may not have been present in Brakpan when the first European colonists crossed the Vaal River during the early part of the 19th century. Stone Age sites may occur all over the area where an unknown number may have been obliterated by mining activities, urbanization, industrialization, agriculture and other development activities during the past decades (Morris 2004).

Reverent Patterson discovered some Stone Age deposits in Benoni during 1933, close to the train station. These were probably from the Middle to Late Stone Age.

### 3.3 IRON AGE

A considerable number of Late Iron Age, stone walled sites, dating from the 18th and the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries (some of which may have been occupied as early as the 16th century), occur along and on top of the rocky ridges of the eastern part of the Klipriviersberg towards Alberton. These settlements and features in these sites, such as huts, were built with dry stone, reed and clay available from the mountain and the Klip River (Mason 1968, 1986).

The Late Iron Age sites within Ekurhuleni's south-eastern border are a 'spill-over' from a larger concentration which are located further towards the west, in the Witwatersrand, while large concentrations of stone walled sites are also located directly to the south of Johannesburg, in the mountainous area around the Suikerbosrand in Heidelberg. The stone walled settlements are concentrated in clusters of sites and sometimes are dispersed over large areas making them vulnerable to developments of various kinds. A

site consists of a circular or elliptical outer wall that is composed of a number of scalloped walls facing inwards towards one or more enclosures. Whilst the outer scalloped walls served as dwelling quarters for various family groups, cattle, sheep and goat were stocked in the centrally located enclosures. Huts with clay walls and floors were built inside the dwelling units. Pottery and metal items are common on the sites. However, iron and copper were not produced locally on these sites (Killick 2004).

*Some 100 years earlier, African farmers in the Fokeng cluster built stonewalled settlements in the Tshwane area that emphasised the centre/side axis. From the air, these earlier settlements resemble a 'fried egg'; that is, a smooth outer ring about 60 metres across enclosed in a central cattle byre about 20 metres in diameter. When these early BaFokeng people moved north across the Vaal River, they met the ancestors of Southwest Sotho-Tswana, such as BaRolong and BaThlaping. Their interaction helped to create a new type of stonewalling called Klipriviersburg. Besides Johannesburg, Klipriviersburg walling is also found around Pretoria. All of these people were mixed farmers; that is, they herded cattle as well as sheep and goats, and they cultivated sorghums, millets and various beans and peas. They were also capable of making metal tools and jewellery.*

*The earliest evidence of metal working in the region comes from the site Broederstroom west of Pretoria. Archaeologists have uncovered the remains of at least two stratified villages there that date back to between AD 550 and 700, each with evidence of iron forging. Two major technological steps characterise ancient iron production: smelting and forging. Technically, iron ore is reduced in a furnace to create a bloom. During this smelting process, silica in the host rock melts, flowing off as slag leaving the bloom behind. The bloom has to be forged in an oxidised atmosphere, usually in an open hearth. In both smelting and forging, bellows attached to clay pipes help the operators reach the necessary high temperatures. Culturally, Bantu-speaking people in the recent past compared the smelting process to childbirth, a private and sacred affair. Consequently, the smelter was usually secluded outside the settlement. Forging, in contrast, was comparable to raising the child; and so the forge was located in a public area in the centre of the homestead. The forges at Broederstroom follow this pattern. (<http://www.sahistory.org.za/topic/prehistory-pretoria>)*

### 3.4 THE HISTORIC ERA

The first inhabitants of this area were Stone Age hunter-gatherers who roamed here some 50 000 years ago. Remnants of their weapons were found in the Rynfield area and near Cranbourne Station many years ago.

The first Voortrekker parties crossed the Vaal River and started occupying the area in the 1830's. Farmers started moving into the area and declared farms for themselves, especially after the signing of the Sand River convention in 1852. The part of land that was to become Benoni, was not inhabited and did not fall within any demarcated farms, thus was referred to as "uitvalgrond". In the 1880's, the Surveyor-General, Johan Rissik, was tasked with mapping the farms and to provide names to the pieces of "uitvalgrond" so that it could be leased or sold. He named the area Benoni, a Biblical name meaning "my son of sorrow", after the son of Jacob and Rachel.

Gold had been discovered in Witwatersrand and prospectors were flooding the area in search of fortune. Mr. Noyce's lease contract contained a clause that stated that if gold were discovered on the land, his contract would be cancelled. However, Mr. Noyce then became one of the directors of the Benoni Gold Mining Company which pegged claims on the farm and became promulgated as a company in September 1887 to become the first registered mine in the area. The mine succumbed to poor payability of the gold reef in 1889 and was sold to the Florence Gold Mining Company. The ownership of the mine changed hands a couple more times until the merger with Benoni Consolidated in 1908, but finally closed in 1912 and the claims were taken over by The New Kleifontein. Col. Sir George Herbert Farrar established himself in Johannesburg. Here he became one of the leading figures in the mining sector on the East Rand. His main creation was forming the East Rand Proprietary Mine, remaining chairman of the company throughout his life.




Figure 7. Benoni Gold Reefs 1895

The 1895 map above shows the known extent of the gold-reefs at that time (in Red) and the Rand Tram railway-line serving the coalfields at Brakpan and Springs. (Source: Benoni History, Benoni City Times).

During the Boer War Sir George Farrar raised two regiments of South African Horse, and on 1 December 1900 was appointed Major in the Kaffrarian Rifles. He saw service in the Orange River Colony, took part in the defence of Wepener and saw action at Wittebergen, south of the Orange River. He was mentioned in despatches and was awarded the Queen's South Africa Medal with 4 clasps, a DSO for his military service during the Boer War and was knighted in 1902.

In 1922, the Rand Revolt (or 1922 Strike) broke out throughout the mines on the Witwatersrand and thousands of white miners went on strike. The strike was partly led by the South African Communist Party and was not well received by the South African Government so soon after the Russian Communist Revolution of 1917. The strike quickly degenerated into open revolt, with armed miners fighting the South African police and army in the streets. The revolt lasted for about a year and the miners were bombed by the newly formed South African Air Force (SAAF) during this time. Some of the SAAF aeroplanes were shot down by groundfire from the miners. During the revolt, Benoni was used as one of the headquarters of the miners and much fighting took place in and around the area.

During the Apartheid Era (1948 to 1994), it was the discriminatory racial segregation (*apartheid*) legislation, enacted by the Nationalist Party (after coming to power in 1948) that extensively transformed the land-use. Citizens were separated into different townships according to their race with buffer strips of at least 100m wide or by environmental buffer zones.

Kgalema Petrus Motlanthe was born on 19 July 1949 at the Boksburg-Benoni Hospital. Motlanthe's maternal grandfather, Kgalema Marcus Madingoane and his grandmother, Louisa Mmope Sehole lived in Apex, a squatter camp on Benoni Old Location where they moved to in search of work. Here, Madingoane became involved in community affairs and eventually became a Councillor in Apex. He was instrumental in founding the township of Daveyton in 1955 where he ran a funeral parlour and a general dealership.

Daveyton was established in 1955 as a model township as a means of providing proper accommodations with access to electricity and plumbing to the inhabitants of the Apex squatter camp near Benoni, who were

living in squalid conditions. The “site and service” scheme was implemented in Daveyton and the movement of the families were voluntary.

Daveyton achieved municipal status in 1983. In 1986, the film "Bopha!" (directed by Morgan Freeman and starring Danny Glover) was produced in Daveyton.

One person was killed and about sixty injured (nine seriously) in an explosion in the Wimpy Restaurant in Benoni in 1988. Four men, Tebogo Kebotlhale, Molwedi Mokoena, Phumzile Sigasa and Elgas Mabore Ndhlovu who declared themselves as ANC members, applied for amnesty to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) for the bombing in Benoni and an ambush outside Lindela Hostel in Katlehong. They alleged that they had targeted the Wimpy, because they believed it was a regular meeting place of police officers. The four men were granted amnesty in 1999.

#### Sources:

Geoffrey Wheatcroft. The Randlords – The Men Who Made South Africa (Jonathan Ball 1986).

Standard Encyclopaedia of South Africa (vol 4) (NASOU 1971)

John Pinfold. “Farrar, Sire George Herbert, baronet (1859-1915)” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, online edition, Oxford University Press, October 2007.

Benoni City Times.

<http://www.sacp.org.za/docs/history/fifty3.html>

<http://www.historyworld.net/wrldhis/PlainTextHistories.asp?ParagraphID=otw>

[http://cals.ukzn.ac.za/Libraries/General\\_Docs/Mbulelo\\_Mzamane.sflb.ashx](http://cals.ukzn.ac.za/Libraries/General_Docs/Mbulelo_Mzamane.sflb.ashx)

<http://www.sahistory.org.za/people/david-wilcox-bopape>

<http://www.liferattle.ca/radio/podcast20110213.html>

Global.Britannica.com/Brakpan

Historyworld.net

SA History Online

SA History Online/Consumer Boycotts

SA Military History.org

Mbulelo Vizikhungo Mzamane, “Children of Paradise”

### 3.5 HISTORICAL MAPS

Especially during the evaluation of historic structures, the use of archived historic maps is very handy. They give a direct chronological reference for such sites and also lead the investigation on the ground.

The following historic map sets are relevant for this study (in chronological order);

- 2628AB\_1939
- 2628AB\_1957
- 2628AB\_1976
- 2628AB\_1983
- 2628AB\_1995
- 2628AB\_2002
- 2628AB\_2010






Figure 8. Typographical Map 2628AB\_1939

No sites of any heritage significance were noted near the study area on the typographical map 2628AB\_1939.




Figure 9. Topographical Map 2628AB\_1957

On the topographical map 2628AB\_1957, a grave/graves is/are indicated to the west, outside of the study area and will thus not be impacted upon.






Figure 10. Typographical Map 2628AB\_1976

No sites of any heritage significance were noted near the study area on the topographical map 2628AB\_1976.






Figure 11. Typographical Map 2628AB\_1983

No sites of any heritage significance were noted near the study area on the topographical map 2628AB\_1983.






Figure 12. Topographical Map 2628AB\_1995

No sites of any heritage significance were noted near the study area on the topographical map 2628AB\_1995.






Figure 13. Typographical Map 2628AB\_2002

No sites of any heritage significance were noted near the study area on the typographical map 2628AB\_2002.






Figure 14. Typographical Map 2628AB\_2010

No sites of any heritage significance were noted near the study area on the typographical map 2628AB\_2010.

### 3.6 PREVIOUS STUDIES

An extensive research into the SAHRIS database resulted in the identification of the following heritage related studies that have been performed over the last decade in the study area. Only studies within a radius of 50km from the study area were considered.

- Van Schalkwyk, J. 2005. Heritage Impact Assessment: Putfontein Portion 102.
- Gaigher, S. 2015. Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Township Development on Portion 266 of the farm Putfontein 26 IR and the Remainder of the farm Daveyton 730 IR.
- Gaigher, S. 2015. Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Township Development on Portions 52, 53 and 54 of the farm Putfontein 26 IR.
- Gaigher, S. 2015. Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Putfontein 103 Township Development.
- Van der Walt, J. 2008. Proposed township development on portion 30 of the farm Modderfontein 76 IR, Daveyton, Gauteng Province.
- Van der Walt, J. 2008. Archaeological Impact Assessment on the Remainder of Portion 7 of the Farm Modderfontein East 72 IQ, Benoni, Gauteng.
- Van Schalkwyk, J. 2005. Heritage Impact Assessment: Putfontein Portion 102. Van Schalkwyk, J. 2014. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed residential development, Vlakfontein Portion 50, Benoni, Ekurhuleni, Gauteng Province.
- Van Schalkwyk, J. 2014. Cultural heritage impact assessment for the Proposed Residential Development, Portion 57, Benoni 77 IR, Ekurhuleni, Gauteng Province.
- Birkholtz, P. 2008. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Proposed Pipeline between Vlakfontein and Mamelodi Tshwane, Kungwini & Ekurhuleni Municipalities, Gauteng Province.

- Birkholtz, P. 2014. Archaeological mitigation report in terms of eight Late Iron Age sites identified for the project known as the duplication of the Vlakfontein (Benoni) – Mamelodi water supply pipeline with the existing servitude: R5 Phase 2: from the southern boundary of the Rietvlei Nature Reserve to Mamelodi, east of Pretoria, Gauteng Province.
- Van der Walt, J. 2012. Application for exemption from an Archaeological Impact Assessment for the Proposed Morehill Gold Dump Prospecting, Benoni, Gauteng Province.
- Kusel, U. 2007. Cultural Heritage Resources Impact Assessment of the Farm Vlaklaagte 161 Tsakane Benoni Gauteng.
- Van der Walt, J. 2008. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment: Portions 18, 65, 83 and 194 of the farm Rietfontein 115 JR, Portion 23 and remaining extent of Portion 22 of the farm Weltevreden 118 IR, Benoni, Gauteng Province.

### 3.7 CULTURAL & NATURAL LANDSCAPE

The study area is a 22ha piece of gently sloping land running alongside Du Randt road on the farm Putfontein 26 IR, Portions 117, 118, 124, 132 and 248 outside of Daveyton.

Mining, light industries, small holdings and residential developments can be observed in the vicinity surrounding the study area.

## 4. FINDINGS

The site was found to be devoid of any heritage sites with significance.

Some construction for a possible townhouse development had been started a few years ago before the project was abandoned. A large amount of building rubble, dilapidated buildings, the perimeter fence as well as the remains of a road network with gravelled surfaces and concrete sidewalks were observed on site.



Figure 15. Remnants of a concrete sidewalk





Figure 16. Dilapidated buildings



Figure 17. Signs of an abandoned project





Figure 18. Gravel roads



Figure 19. Gravel road (view towards Daveyton)





Figure 20. Gravel roads



Figure 21. Foundations of a suspected reservoir





Figure 22. Dilapidated buildings



Figure 23. Building rubble





Figure 24. Perimeter fence



Figure 25. Perimeter fence

## Chapter 3

# IMPACT ASSESSMENT

## 5. METHODOLOGY

This study defines the heritage component of the EIA process being undertaken for the proposed new township development: Mayfield Extension 52, located on the farm Putfontein 26 IR, Portions 117, 118, 124, 132 and 248, Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province.

It is described as a first phase (HIA). This report attempts to evaluate both the accumulated heritage knowledge of the area as well as information derived from direct physical observations.

### 5.1 INVENTORY

Inventory studies involve the in-field survey and recording of archaeological resources within a proposed development and buffer area. The nature and scope of this type of study is defined primarily by the results of the overview study. In the case of site-specific developments, direct implementation of an inventory study may preclude the need for an overview.

There are a number of different methodological approaches to conducting inventory studies. Therefore, the proponent, in collaboration with the archaeological consultant, must develop an inventory plan for review and approval by the SAHRA prior to implementation (*Dincause, Dena F., H. Martin Wobst, Robert J. Hasenstab and David M. Lacy 1984*).

### 5.2 EVALUATING HERITAGE IMPACTS

A combination of document research as well as the determination of the geographic suitability of areas and the evaluation of aerial photographs determined which areas could and should be accessed.

After plotting of the site on a GPS the areas were accessed using suitable combinations of vehicle access and access by foot.

Sites were documented by digital photography and geo-located with GPS readings using the WGS 84 datum.

Further techniques (where possible) included interviews with local inhabitants, visiting local museums and information centers and discussions with local experts. All this information was combined with information from an extensive literature study as well as the result of archival studies based on the SAHRA (South African Heritage Resource Agency) provincial databases.

This Heritage Impact Assessment relies on the analysis of written documents, maps, aerial photographs and other archival sources combined with the results of site investigations and interviews with effected people. Site investigations are not exhaustive and often focus on areas such as river confluence areas, elevated sites or occupational ruins.

The following documents were consulted in this study;

- South African National Archive Documents
- SAHRIS (South African Heritage Resources Information System) Database of Heritage Studies
- Historic Maps
- 2628AB 1939, 1957, 1976, 1983, 1995, 2002 and 2010 Surveyor General Topographic Map series
- 1952 1:10 000 aerial photo survey
- Google Earth 2019 imagery
- Published articles and books
- JSTOR Article Archive

## 5.3 FIELDWORK

Fieldwork for this study was performed on the 18<sup>th</sup> of December 2019. Most of the areas were found to be accessible by vehicle. Areas of possible significance were investigated on foot. The survey was tracked using GPS and a track file in GPX format is available on request.

Where sites were identified it was documented photographically and plotted using GPS with the WGS 84 datum point as reference. GPX files are available on request from G&A Heritage.

The study area was surveyed using standard archaeological surveying methods. The area was surveyed using directional parameters supplied by the GPS and surveyed by foot. This technique has proven to result in the maximum coverage of an area. This action is defined as;

*'an archaeologist being present in the course of the carrying-out of the development works (which may include conservation works), so as to identify and protect archaeological deposits, features or objects which may be uncovered or otherwise affected by the works'* (DAHGI 1999a, 28).

Standard archaeological documentation formats were employed in the description of sites. Using standard site documentation forms as comparable medium, it enabled the surveyors to evaluate the relative importance of sites found. Furthermore, GPS (Global Positioning System) readings of all finds and sites were taken. This information was then plotted using a **Garmin Colorado** GPS (WGS 84- datum).

Indicators such as surface finds, plant growth anomalies, local information and topography were used in identifying sites of possible archaeological importance. Test probes were done at intervals to determine sub-surface occurrence of archaeological material. The importance of sites was assessed by comparisons with published information as well as comparative collections.

## 6. MEASURING IMPACTS

In 2003 the SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency) compiled the following guidelines to evaluate the cultural significance of individual heritage resources:

### 6.1 TYPE OF RESOURCE

- Place
- Archaeological Site
- Structure
- Grave
- Paleontological Feature
- Geological Feature

### 6.2 TYPE OF SIGNIFICANCE

#### 6.2.1 HISTORIC VALUE

It is important in the community, or pattern of history

- o Important in the evolution of cultural landscapes and settlement patterns.
- o Important in exhibiting density, richness or diversity of cultural features illustrating the human occupation and evolution of the nation, province, region or locality.
- o Important for association with events, developments or cultural phases that have had a significant role in the human occupation and evolution of the nation, province, region or community.
- o Important as an example for technical, creative, design or artistic excellence, innovation or achievement in a particular period.

It has strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in history

- o Importance for close associations with individuals, groups or organisations whose life, works or activities have been significant within the history of the nation, province, region or community.



It has significance relating to the history of slavery

- Importance for a direct link to the history of slavery in South Africa.

### 6.2.2 AESTHETIC VALUE

It is important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group.

- Important to a community for aesthetic characteristics held in high esteem or otherwise valued by the community.
- Importance for its creative, design or artistic excellence, innovation or achievement.
- Importance for its contribution to the aesthetic values of the setting demonstrated by a landmark quality or having impact on important vistas or otherwise contributing to the identified aesthetic qualities of the cultural environs or the natural landscape within which it is located.
- In the case of an historic precinct, importance for the aesthetic character created by the individual components which collectively form a significant streetscape, townscape or cultural environment.

### 6.2.3 SCIENTIFIC VALUE

It has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of natural or cultural heritage

- Importance for information contributing to a wider understanding of natural or cultural history by virtue of its use as a research site, teaching site, type locality, reference or benchmark site.
- Importance for information contributing to a wider understanding of the origin of the universe or of the development of the earth.
- Importance for information contributing to a wider understanding of the origin of life; the development of plant or animal species, or the biological or cultural development of hominid or human species.
- Importance for its potential to yield information contributing to a wider understanding of the history of human occupation of the nation, Province, region or locality.
- It is important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period
- Importance for its technical innovation or achievement.

(a) Does the site contain evidence, which may substantively enhance understanding of culture history, culture process, and other aspects of local and regional prehistory?

- internal stratification and depth
- chronologically sensitive cultural items
- materials for absolute dating
- association with ancient landforms
- quantity and variety of tool type
- distinct intra-site activity areas
- tool types indicative of specific socio-economic or religious activity
- cultural features such as burials, dwellings, hearths, etc.
- diagnostic faunal and floral remains
- exotic cultural items and materials
- uniqueness or representativeness of the site
- integrity of the site

(b) Does the site contain evidence which may be used for experimentation aimed at improving archaeological methods and techniques?

- monitoring impacts from artificial or natural agents
- site preservation or conservation experiments
- data recovery experiments
- sampling experiments



- intra-site spatial analysis

(c) Does the site contain evidence which can make important contributions to paleoenvironmental studies?

- topographical, geomorphological context
- depositional character
- diagnostic faunal, floral data

(d) Does the site contain evidence which can contribute to other scientific disciplines such as hydrology, geomorphology, pedology, meteorology, zoology, botany, forensic medicine, and environmental hazards research, or to industry including forestry and commercial fisheries?

#### 6.2.4 SOCIAL VALUE / PUBLIC SIGNIFICANCE

- It has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons
- Importance as a place highly valued by a community or cultural group for reasons of social, cultural, religious, spiritual, symbolic, aesthetic or educational associations.
- Importance in contributing to a community's sense of place.

(a) Does the site have potential for public use in an interpretive, educational or recreational capacity?

- integrity of the site
- technical and economic feasibility of restoration and development for public use
- visibility of cultural features and their ability to be easily interpreted
- accessibility to the public
  
- opportunities for protection against vandalism
- representativeness and uniqueness of the site
- aesthetics of the local setting
- proximity to established recreation areas
- present and potential land use
- land ownership and administration
- legal and jurisdictional status
- local community attitude toward development

(b) Does the site receive visitation or use by tourists, local residents or school groups?

#### 6.2.5 ETHNIC SIGNIFICANCE

(a) Does the site presently have traditional, social or religious importance to a particular group or community?

- ethnographic or ethno-historic reference
- documented local community recognition or, and concern for, the site

#### 6.2.6 ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE

(a) What value of user-benefits may be placed on the site?

- visitors' willingness-to-pay
- visitors' travel costs

#### 6.2.7 SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

(a) Does the site contain evidence, which may substantively enhance understanding of historic patterns of settlement and land use in a particular locality, regional or larger area?

(b) Does the site contain evidence, which can make important contributions to other scientific disciplines or industry?

#### 6.2.8 HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

(a) Is the site associated with the early exploration, settlement, land use, or other aspect of southern Africa's cultural development?

(b) Is the site associated with the life or activities of a particular historic figure, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to, or impact on, the community, province or nation?

(c) Is the site associated with a particular historic event whether cultural, economic, military, religious, social or political that has made a significant contribution to, or impact on, the community, province or nation?

(d) Is the site associated with a traditional recurring event in the history of the community, province, or nation, such as an annual celebration?

#### 6.2.9 PUBLIC SIGNIFICANCE

(a) Does the site have potential for public use in an interpretive, educational or recreational capacity?

- visibility and accessibility to the public
- ability of the site to be easily interpreted
- opportunities for protection against vandalism
- economic and engineering feasibility of reconstruction, restoration and maintenance
- representativeness and uniqueness of the site
- proximity to established recreation areas
- compatibility with surrounding zoning regulations or land use
- land ownership and administration
- local community attitude toward site preservation, development or destruction
- present use of site

(b) Does the site receive visitation or use by tourists, local residents or school groups?

#### 6.2.10 OTHER

(a) Is the site a commonly acknowledged landmark?

(b) Does, or could, the site contribute to a sense of continuity or identity either alone or in conjunction with similar sites in the vicinity?

(c) Is the site a good typical example of an early structure or device commonly used for a specific purpose throughout an area or period of time?

(d) Is the site representative of a particular architectural style or pattern?

### 6.3 DEGREES OF SIGNIFICANCE

#### 6.3.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

There are several kinds of significance, including scientific, public, ethnic, historic and economic, that need to be taken into account when evaluating heritage resources. For any site, explicit criteria are used to measure these values. These checklists are not intended to be exhaustive or inflexible. Innovative approaches to site evaluation which emphasize quantitative analysis and objectivity are encouraged. The process used to derive a measure of relative site significance must be rigorously documented, particularly the system for ranking or weighting various evaluated criteria.

Site integrity, or the degree to which a heritage site has been impaired or disturbed as a result of past land alteration, is an important consideration in evaluating site significance. In this regard, it is important to recognize that although an archaeological site has been disturbed, it may still contain important scientific information.

Heritage resources may be of scientific value in two respects. The potential to yield information, which, if properly recovered, will enhance understanding of Southern African human history, is one appropriate measure of scientific significance. In this respect, archaeological sites should be evaluated in terms of their potential to resolve current archaeological research problems. Scientific significance also refers to the potential for relevant contributions to other academic disciplines or to industry.

Public significance refers to the potential a site has for enhancing the public's understanding and appreciation of the past. The interpretive, educational and recreational potential of a site are valid indications of public value. Public significance criteria such as ease of access, land ownership, or scenic setting are often external to the site itself. The relevance of heritage resource data to private industry may also be interpreted as a particular kind of public significance.

Ethnic significance applies to heritage sites which have value to an ethnically distinct community or group of people. Determining the ethnic significance of an archaeological site may require consultation with persons having special knowledge of a particular site. It is essential that ethnic significance be assessed by someone properly trained in obtaining and evaluating such data.

Historic archaeological sites may relate to individuals or events that made an important, lasting contribution to the development of a particular locality or the province. Historically important sites also reflect or commemorate the historic socioeconomic character of an area. Sites having high historical value will also usually have high public value.

The economic or monetary value of a heritage site, where calculable, is also an important indication of significance. In some cases, it may be possible to project monetary benefits derived from the public's use of a heritage site as an educational or recreational facility. This may be accomplished by employing established economic evaluation methods; most of which have been developed for valuating outdoor recreation. The objective is to determine the willingness of users, including local residents and tourists, to pay for the experiences or services the site provides even though no payment is presently being made. Calculation of user benefits will normally require some study of the visitor population (*Smith, L.D. 1977*).

### 6.3.2 RARITY

It possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage.

- Importance for rare, endangered or uncommon structures, landscapes or phenomena.

### 6.3.3 REPRESENTIVITY

- It is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of natural or cultural places or objects.
- Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a range of landscapes or environments, the attributes of which identify it as being characteristic of its class.
- Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of human activities (including way of life, philosophy, custom, process, land-use, function, design or technique) in the environment of the nation, province, region or locality.

The table below illustrates how a site's heritage significance is determined

Table 4. Determining Heritage Significance of a Site

Spheres of Significance	High	Medium	Low
International			
National			
Provincial			
Regional			
Local			
Specific Community			

## 7. ASSESSMENT OF HERITAGE POTENTIAL

### 7.1 ASSESSMENT MATRIX (DETERMINING ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE)

In addition to guidelines provided by the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999), a set of criteria based on Deacon (J) and Whitelaw (1997) for assessing archaeological significance has been developed for Eastern Cape settings (Morris 2007a). These criteria include estimation of landform potential (in terms of its capacity to contain archaeological traces) and assessing the value to any archaeological traces (in terms of their attributes or their capacity to be construed as evidence, given that evidence is not given but constructed by the investigator).

#### Estimating site potential

Table 5 (below) is a classification of landforms and visible archaeological traces used for estimating the potential of archaeological sites (after J. Deacon and, National Monuments Council). Type 3 sites tend to be those with higher archaeological potential, but there are notable exceptions to this rule, for example the renowned rock engravings site Driekopseiland near Kimberley which is on landform L1 Type 1 – normally a setting of lowest expected potential. It should also be noted that, generally, the older a site the poorer the preservation, so that sometimes any trace, even of only Type 1 quality, could be of exceptional significance. In light of this, estimation of potential will always be a matter for archaeological observation and interpretation.

Table 5: Classification of landforms and visible archaeological traces for estimating the potential for archaeological sites (after J. Deacon, NMC as used in Morris)

Class	Landform	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
L1	Rocky Surface	Bedrock exposed	Some soil patches	Sandy/grassy patches
L2	Ploughed land	Far from water	In floodplain	On old river terrace
L3	Sandy ground, inland	Far from water	In floodplain or near features such as hill/dune	On old river terrace
L4	Sandy ground, coastal	>1 km from sea	Inland of dune cordon	Near rocky shore
L5	Water-logged deposit	Heavily vegetated	Running water	Sedimentary basin
L6	Developed urban	Heavily built-up with no known record of early settlement	Known early settlement, but buildings have basements	Buildings without extensive basements over known historical sites
L7	Lime/dolomite	>5 myrs	<5000 yrs	Between 5000 yrs and 5 myrs
L8	Rock shelter	Rocky floor	Loping floor or small area	Flat floor, high ceiling
Class	Archaeological traces	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
A1	Area previously excavated	Little deposit remaining	More than half deposit remaining	High profile site
A2	Shell of bones visible	Dispersed scatter	Deposit <0.5 m thick	Deposit >0.5 m thick; shell and bone dense
A3	Stone artefacts or stone walling or other feature visible	Dispersed scatter	Deposit <0.5m thick	Deposit >0.5 m thick

Table 6: Site attributes and value assessment (adopted from Whitelaw 1997 as used in Morris)

Class	Landforms	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
1	Length of sequence /context	No sequence Poor context Dispersed distribution	Limited sequence	Long sequence Favourable context High density of arte / ecofacts
2	Presence of exceptional items (incl. regional rarity)	Absent	Present	Major element
3	Organic preservation	Absent	Present	Major element
4	Potential for future archaeological investigation	Low	Medium	High
5	Potential for public display	Low	Medium	High
6	Aesthetic appeal	Low	Medium	High
7	Potential for implementation of a long-term management plan	Low	Medium	High

## 7.2 ASSESSING SITE VALUE BY ATTRIBUTE

Table 6 is adapted from Whitelaw (1997), who developed an approach for selecting sites meriting heritage recognition status in KwaZulu Natal. It is a means of judging a site's archaeological value by ranking the relative strengths of a range of attributes (given in the second column of the table). While aspects of this matrix remain qualitative, attribute assessment is a good indicator of the general archaeological significance of a site, with Type 3 attributes being those of highest significance.

## 7.3 IMPACT STATEMENT (ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS)

A heritage resource impact may be broadly defined as the net change between the integrity of a heritage site with and without the proposed development. This change may be either beneficial or adverse.

Beneficial impacts occur wherever a proposed development actively protects, preserves or enhances a heritage resource. For example, development may have a beneficial effect by preventing or lessening natural site erosion. Similarly, an action may serve to preserve a site for future investigation by covering it with a protective layer of fill. In other cases, the public or economic significance of an archaeological site may be enhanced by actions, which facilitate non-destructive public use. Although beneficial impacts are unlikely to occur frequently, they should be included in the assessment.

More commonly, the effects of a project on heritage sites are of an adverse nature. Adverse impacts occur under conditions that include:

- (a) destruction or alteration of all or part of a heritage site;
- (b) isolation of a site from its natural setting; and
- (c) introduction of physical, chemical or visual elements that are out-of-character with the heritage resource and its setting.

Adverse effects can be more specifically defined as direct or indirect impacts. Direct impacts are the immediately demonstrable effects of a project which can be attributed to particular land modifying actions. They are directly caused by a project or its ancillary facilities and occur at the same time and place. The immediate consequences of a project action, such as slope failure following reservoir inundation, are also considered direct impacts.

Indirect impacts result from activities other than actual project actions. Nevertheless, they are clearly induced by a project and would not occur without it. For example, project development may induce changes in land use or population density, such as increased urban and recreational development, which may indirectly impact upon heritage sites. Increased vandalism of heritage sites, resulting from improved or newly introduced access, is also considered an indirect impact. Indirect impacts are much more difficult to assess and quantify than impacts of a direct nature.

Once all project related impacts are identified, it is necessary to determine their individual level-of-effect on heritage resources. This assessment is aimed at determining the extent or degree to

which future opportunities for scientific research, preservation, or public appreciation are foreclosed or otherwise adversely affected by a proposed action. Therefore, the assessment provides a reasonable indication of the relative significance or importance of a particular impact. Normally, the assessment should follow site evaluation since it is important to know what heritage values may be adversely affected.

The assessment should include careful consideration of the following level-of-effect indicators, which are defined below:

- magnitude
- severity
- duration
- range
- frequency
- diversity
- cumulative effect
- rate of change

## 7.4 INDICATORS OF IMPACT SEVERITY

### **Magnitude**

The amount of physical alteration or destruction, which can be expected. The resultant loss of heritage value is measured either in amount or degree of disturbance.

### **Severity**

The irreversibility of an impact. Adverse impacts, which result in a totally irreversible and irretrievable loss of heritage value, are of the highest severity.

### **Duration**

The length of time an adverse impact persists. Impacts may have short-term or temporary effects, or conversely, more persistent, long-term effects on heritage sites.

### **Range**

The spatial distribution, whether widespread or site-specific, of an adverse impact.

### **Frequency**

The number of times an impact can be expected. For example, an adverse impact of variable magnitude and severity may occur only once. An impact such as that resulting from cultivation may be of recurring or on-going nature.

### **Diversity**

The number of different kinds of project-related actions expected to affect a heritage site.

### **Cumulative Effect**

A progressive alteration or destruction of a site owing to the repetitive nature of one or more impacts.

### **Rate of Change**

The rate at which an impact will effectively alter the integrity or physical condition of a heritage site. Although an important level-of-effect indicator, it is often difficult to estimate. Rate of change is normally assessed during or following project construction.

The level-of-effect assessment should be conducted and reported in a quantitative and objective fashion. The methodological approach, particularly the system of ranking level-of-effect indicators, must be rigorously documented and recommendations should be made with respect to managing uncertainties in the assessment. (*Zubrow, Ezra B.A., 1984*).

## 7.5 POST-CONTACT SITES

No sites associated with the post-contact era will be affected by the proposed development.

## 7.6 BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Some structures associated with rural living were identified;

- Fences (modern)
- Brick houses (modern)
- Dirt roads (modern)
- Concrete sidewalks (modern)
- Concrete foundations (modern)
- Footpaths

## 7.7 HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

Table 7. Historic Significance

No	Criteria	Significance Rating
1	<b><i>Are any of the identified sites or buildings associated with a historical person or group?</i></b> No	N/A
2	<b><i>Are any of the buildings or identified sites associated with a historical event?</i></b> No	N/A
3	<b><i>Are any of the identified sites or buildings associated with a religious, economic social or political or educational activity?</i></b> No	N/A
4	<b><i>Are any of the identified sites or buildings of archaeological significance?</i></b> No	N/A
5	<b><i>Are any of the identified buildings or structures older than 60 years?</i></b> No	N/A

## 7.8 ARCHITECTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

Table 8. Architectural Significance

No	Criteria	Rating
1	<b><i>Are any of the buildings or structures an important example of a building type?</i></b> No	N/A
2	<b><i>Are any of the buildings or structures outstanding examples of a particular style or period?</i></b> No	N/A
3	<b><i>Do any of the buildings contain fine architectural details and reflect exceptional craftsmanship?</i></b> No	N/A
4	<b><i>Are any of the buildings an example of an industrial, engineering or technological development?</i></b> No	N/A
5	<b><i>What is the state of the architectural and structural integrity of the building or structure?</i></b> N/A	-
6	<b><i>Is the building/structure's current and future use in sympathy with its original use (for which the building was designed)?</i></b> N/A	-
7	<b><i>Were the alterations done in sympathy with the original design?</i></b> N/A	-



8	<b><i>Were the additions and extensions done in sympathy with the original design?</i></b> N/A	-
9	<b><i>Are any of the buildings or structures the work of a major architect, engineer or builder?</i></b> No	N/A

## 7.9 SPATIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Even though each building needs to be evaluated as a single artefact the site still needs to be evaluated in terms of its significance in its geographic area, city, town, village, neighbourhood or precinct. This set of criteria determines the spatial significance.

Table 9. Spatial Significance

No	Criteria	Rating
1	<b><i>Can any of the identified buildings or structures be considered a landmark in the town or city?</i></b> No	-
2	<b><i>Do any of the buildings or structures contribute to the character of the neighborhood?</i></b> No	-
3	<b><i>Do any of the buildings contribute to the character of the square or streetscape?</i></b> No	-
4	<b><i>Do any of the buildings form part of an important group of buildings?</i></b> No	-

## 8. IMPACT EVALUATION

This HIA Methodology assists in evaluating the overall effect of a proposed activity on the heritage environment. The determination of the effect of a heritage impact on a heritage parameter is determined through a systematic analysis of the various components of the impact. This is undertaken using information that is available to the heritage practitioner through the process of heritage impact assessment. The impact evaluation of predicted impacts was undertaken through an assessment of the significance of the impacts.

### 8.1 DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACTS

Significance is determined through a synthesis of impact characteristics, which include context and intensity of an impact. Context refers to the geographical scale i.e. site, local, national or global whereas intensity is defined by the severity of the impact e.g. the magnitude of deviation from background conditions, the size of the area affected, the duration of the impact and the overall probability of occurrence.

Significance is an indication of the importance of the impact in terms of both physical extent and time scale, and therefore indicates the level of mitigation required. The total number of points scored for each impact indicates the level of significance of the impact.

### 8.2 IMPACT RATING SYSTEM

Impact assessment must take account of the nature, scale and duration of effects on the heritage environment whether such effects are positive (beneficial) or negative (detrimental). Each issue / impact is also assessed according to the project stages:

- planning
- construction
- operation



- decommissioning

Where necessary, the proposal for mitigation or optimisation of an impact will be detailed. A brief discussion of the impact and the rationale behind the assessment of its significance has also been included.

### 8.3 RATING SYSTEM USED TO CLASSIFY IMPACTS

The rating system is applied to the potential impact on the receiving environment and includes an objective evaluation of the mitigation of the impact. Impacts have been consolidated into one rating. In assessing the significance of each issue, the following criteria (including an allocated point system) is used:

Table 10. Classification of Impacts

NATURE		
Including a brief description of the impact of the heritage parameter being assessed in the context of the project. This criterion includes a brief written statement of the heritage aspect being impacted upon by a particular action or activity.		
GEOGRAPHICAL EXTENT		
This is defined as the area over which the impact will be expressed. Typically, the severity and significance of an impact have different scales and as such bracketing ranges are often required. This is often useful during the detailed assessment of a project in terms of further defining the determined.		
1	Site	The impact will only affect the site.
2	Local/district	Will affect the local area or district.
3	Province/region	Will affect the entire province or region.
4	International and National	Will affect the entire country.
PROBABILITY		
This describes the chance of occurrence of an impact		
1	Unlikely	The chance of the impact occurring is extremely low (Less than a 25% chance of occurrence).
2	Possible	The impact may occur (Between a 25% to 50% chance of occurrence).
3	Probable	The impact will likely occur (Between a 50% to 75% chance of occurrence).
4	Definite	Impact will certainly occur (Greater than a 75% chance of occurrence).
REVERSIBILITY		
This describes the degree to which an impact on a heritage parameter can be successfully reversed upon completion of the proposed activity.		
1	Completely reversible	The impact is reversible with implementation of minor mitigation measures.
2	Partly reversible	The impact is partly reversible but more intense mitigation measures are required.
3	Barely reversible	The impact is unlikely to be reversed even with intense mitigation measures.

4	Irreversible	The impact is irreversible and no mitigation measures exist.
<b>IRREPLACEABLE LOSS OF RESOURCES</b>		
This describes the degree to which heritage resources will be irreplaceably lost as a result of a proposed activity.		
1	No loss of resource.	The impact will not result in the loss of any resources.
2	Marginal loss of resource	The impact will result in marginal loss of resources.
3	Significant loss of resources	The impact will result in significant loss of resources.
4	Complete loss of resources	The impact is result in a complete loss of all resources.
<b>DURATION</b>		
This describes the duration of the impacts on the heritage parameter. Duration indicates the lifetime of the impact as a result of the proposed activity.		
1	Short term	The impact and its effects will either disappear with mitigation or will be mitigated through natural process in a span shorter than the construction phase (0 – 1 years), or the impact and its effects will last for the period of a relatively short construction period and a limited recovery time after construction, thereafter it will be entirely negated (0 – 2 years).
2	Medium term	The impact and its effects will continue or last for some time after the construction phase but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter (2 – 10 years).
3	Long term	The impact and its effects will continue or last for the entire operational life of the development, but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter (10 – 50 years).
4	Permanent	The only class of impact that will be non-transitory. Mitigation either by man or natural process will not occur in such a way or such a time span that the impact can be considered transient (Indefinite).
<b>CUMULATIVE EFFECT</b>		
This describes the cumulative effect of the impacts on the heritage parameter. A cumulative effect/impact is an effect, which in itself may not be significant but may become significant if added to other existing or potential impacts emanating from other similar or diverse activities as a result of the project activity in question.		
1	Negligible Cumulative Impact	The impact would result in negligible to no cumulative effects.
2	Low Cumulative Impact	The impact would result in insignificant cumulative effects.
3	Medium Cumulative impact	The impact would result in minor cumulative effects.
4	High Cumulative Impact	The impact would result in significant cumulative effects.
<b>INTENSITY / MAGNITUDE</b>		
Describes the severity of an impact.		

1	Low	Impact affects the quality, use and integrity of the system/component in a way that is barely perceptible.
2	Medium	Impact alters the quality, use and integrity of the system/component but system/ component still continues to function in a moderately modified way and maintains general integrity (some impact on integrity).
3	High	Impact affects the continued viability of the system/component and the quality, use, integrity and functionality of the system or component is severely impaired and may temporarily cease. High costs of rehabilitation and remediation.
4	Very high	Impact affects the continued viability of the system/component and the quality, use, integrity and functionality of the system or component permanently ceases and is irreversibly impaired (system collapse). Rehabilitation and remediation often impossible. If possible rehabilitation and remediation often unfeasible due to extremely high costs of rehabilitation and remediation.
<b>SIGNIFICANCE</b>		
<p>Significance is determined through a synthesis of impact characteristics. Significance is an indication of the importance of the impact in terms of both physical extent and time scale, and therefore indicates the level of mitigation required. This describes the significance of the impact on the heritage parameter. The calculation of the significance of an impact uses the following formula:</p> <p><b>(Extent + probability + reversibility + irreplaceability + duration + cumulative effect) x magnitude/intensity.</b></p> <p>The summation of the different criteria will produce a non-weighted value. By multiplying this value with the magnitude/intensity, the resultant value acquires a weighted characteristic which can be measured and assigned a significance rating.</p>		
<b>Points</b>	<b>Impact Significance Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
6 to 28	Negative Low impact	The anticipated impact will have negligible negative effects and will require little to no mitigation.
6 to 28	Positive Low impact	The anticipated impact will have minor positive effects.
29 to 50	Negative Medium impact	The anticipated impact will have moderate negative effects and will require moderate mitigation measures.
29 to 50	Positive Medium impact	The anticipated impact will have moderate positive effects.
51 to 73	Negative High impact	The anticipated impact will have significant effects and will require significant mitigation measures to achieve an acceptable level of impact.
51 to 73	Positive High impact	The anticipated impact will have significant positive effects.



74 to 96	Negative Very high impact	The anticipated impact will have highly significant effects and are unlikely to be able to be mitigated adequately. These impacts could be considered "fatal flaws".
74 to 96	Positive Very high impact	The anticipated impact will have highly significant positive effects.

## 9. ANTICIPATED IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT

### 9.1 SUBTERRANEAN OR UNMARKED SITES

Table 11. Impact Table

IMPACT TABLE FORMAT		
Issue/Impact/Heritage Impact/Nature	<i>Unmarked or buried heritage sites.</i>	
<i>Extent</i>	<i>Provincial (3)</i>	
<i>Probability</i>	<i>Possible (2)</i>	
<i>Reversibility</i>	<i>Partly Reversible (2)</i>	
<i>Irreplaceable loss of resources</i>	<i>Significant loss of resources (3)</i>	
<i>Duration</i>	<i>Medium term (2)</i>	
<i>Cumulative effect</i>	<i>Medium cumulative effect (3)</i>	
<i>Intensity/magnitude</i>	<i>Medium (2)</i>	
<i>Significance Rating of Potential Impact</i>	<i>30 points. The impact will have a medium negative impact rating.</i>	
	Pre-mitigation impact rating	Post mitigation impact rating
Extent	3	2
Probability	2	1
Reversibility	2	2
Irreplaceable loss	3	1
Duration	2	2
Cumulative effect	3	1
Intensity/magnitude	2	1
Significance rating	30 (medium negative)	8 (low negative)
Mitigation measure	<i>Should any unmarked sites or subterranean sites be encountered, the chance finds protocol contained in this report should be followed.</i>	

### 9.4 ASSESSING VISUAL IMPACT

Visual impacts of developments result when sites that are culturally celebrated are visually affected by a development. The exact parameters for the determination of visual impacts have not yet been rigidly defined and are still mostly open to interpretation. CNDV Architects and The Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (2006) have developed some guidelines for the management of the visual impacts of wind turbines in the Western Cape, although these have not yet been

formalised. In these guidelines they recommend a buffer zone of 1km around significant heritage sites to minimise the visual impact.

Due to the fact that the project will mainly involve sub-surface infrastructure it is not anticipated that any visual impacts will be encountered. Pump stations will also be of low profile and will therefore have a minimum of impact.

## 9.5 ASSUMPTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS

- It is assumed that the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) database locations are correct.
- It is assumed that the social impact assessment and public participation process of the Basic Assessment will result in the identification of any intangible sites of heritage potential.

# 10. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS (IMPACT STATEMENT)

## 10.1 CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

The following landscape types were identified during the study.

Table 12. Cultural Landscape

Landscape Type	Description	Occurrence still possible?	Identified on site?
1 Paleontological	Mostly fossil remains. Remains include microbial fossils such as found in Barberton Greenstones	Yes	No
2 Archaeological	Evidence of human occupation associated with the following phases – Early-, Middle-, Late Stone Age, Early-, Late Iron Age, Pre-Contact Sites, Post-Contact Sites	Yes, sub-surface	No
3 Historic Built Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historical townscapes/streetscapes</li> <li>- Historical structures; i.e. older than 60 years</li> <li>- Formal public spaces</li> <li>- Formally declared urban conservation areas</li> <li>- Places associated with social identity/displacement</li> </ul>	No	No
4 Historic Farmland	These possess distinctive patterns of settlement and historical features such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historical farm yards</li> <li>- Historical farm workers villages/settlements</li> <li>- Irrigation furrows</li> <li>- Tree alignments and groupings</li> <li>- Historical routes and pathways</li> <li>- Distinctive types of planting</li> <li>- Distinctive architecture of cultivation e.g. planting blocks, trellising, terracing, ornamental planting.</li> </ul>	No	No
5 Historic rural town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic mission settlements</li> <li>- Historic townscapes</li> </ul>	No	No
6 Pristine natural landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historical patterns of access to a natural amenity</li> <li>- Formally proclaimed nature reserves</li> <li>- Evidence of pre-colonial occupation</li> <li>- Scenic resources, e.g. view corridors, viewing sites, visual edges, visual linkages</li> </ul>	No	No

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historical structures/settlements older than 60 years</li> <li>- Pre-colonial or historical burial sites</li> <li>- Geological sites of cultural significance.</li> </ul>		
7 Relic Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Past farming settlements</li> <li>- Past industrial sites</li> <li>- Places of isolation related to attitudes to medical treatment</li> <li>- Battle sites</li> <li>- Sites of displacement,</li> </ul>	No	No
8 Burial grounds and grave sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-colonial burials (marked or unmarked, known or unknown)</li> <li>- Historical graves (marked or unmarked, known or unknown)</li> <li>- Graves of victims of conflict</li> <li>- Human remains (older than 100 years)</li> <li>- Associated burial goods (older than 100 years)</li> <li>- Burial architecture (older than 60 years)</li> </ul>	Yes	No
9 Associated Landscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sites associated with living heritage e.g. initiation sites, harvesting of natural resources for traditional medicinal purposes</li> <li>- Sites associated with displacement &amp; contestation</li> <li>- Sites of political conflict/struggle</li> <li>- Sites associated with an historic event/person</li> <li>- Sites associated with public memory</li> </ul>	No	No
10 Historical Farmyard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Setting of the yard and its context</li> <li>- Composition of structures</li> <li>- Historical/architectural value of individual structures</li> <li>- Tree alignments</li> <li>- Views to and from</li> <li>- Axial relationships</li> <li>- System of enclosure, e.g. defining walls</li> <li>- Systems of water reticulation and irrigation, e.g. furrows</li> <li>- Sites associated with slavery and farm labour</li> <li>- Colonial period archaeology</li> </ul>	No	No
11 Historic institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historical prisons</li> <li>- Hospital sites</li> <li>- Historical school/reformatory sites</li> <li>- Military bases</li> </ul>	No	No
12 Scenic visual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scenic routes</li> </ul>	No	No
13 Amenity landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- View sheds</li> <li>- View points</li> <li>- Views to and from</li> <li>- Gateway conditions</li> <li>- Distinctive representative landscape conditions</li> <li>- Scenic corridors</li> </ul>	No	No



## Mitigation

It is recommended that the development designs take into account the positive and negative characteristics of the existing cultural landscape type and that they endeavor to promote the positive aspects while at the same time mitigating the negative aspects.

## 11. CHANCE FINDS PROTOCOL

Although unlikely, sub-surface remains of heritage sites could still be encountered during the construction activities associated with the project. Such sites would offer no surface indication of their presence due to the high state of alterations in some areas as well as heavy plant cover in other areas. The following indicators of unmarked sub-surface sites could be encountered:

- Ash deposits (unnaturally grey appearance of soil compared to the surrounding substrate);
- Bone concentrations, either animal or human;
- Ceramic fragments such as pottery shards either historic or pre-contact;
- Stone concentrations of any formal nature.

The following recommendations are given should any sub-surface remains of heritage sites be identified as indicated above:

- All operators of excavation equipment should be made aware of the possibility of the occurrence of sub-surface heritage features and the following procedures should they be encountered.
- All construction in the immediate vicinity (50m radius of the site) should cease.
- The heritage practitioner should be informed as soon as possible.
- In the event of obvious human remains the South African Police Services (SAPS) should be notified.
- Mitigation measures (such as refilling etc.) should not be attempted.
- The area in a 50m radius of the find should be cordoned off with hazard tape.
- Public access should be limited.
- The area should be placed under guard.
- No media statements should be released until such time as the heritage practitioner has had sufficient time to analyze the finds.

## 12. CONCLUSION

The proposed new township development: Mayfield Extension 52, located on the farm Putfontein 26 IR, Portions 117, 118, 124, 132 and 248, Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province was investigated during a field visit and through archival studies. The site was found to be devoid of any heritage sites with significance. It is recommended that obscured, subterranean sites be managed, if they are encountered.

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) will be required as per the *PalaeoSensitivity* Map on the SAHRIS Database. The site has however undergone severe alternations and limited development in the past and as a result impacts are expected to be limited.

Provided the recommendations in this report is followed there is no reason, from a heritage point of view, why this development cannot continue.

## 13. REFERENCES CITED & RESEARCHED

Ahler, S.A. 1977. Functional analysis of nonobsidian chipped stone artefacts: terms, variables and quantification. In: Hayden, B. (ed.). *Lithic use-wear analysis*: 301-328. New York: Academic Press.

Bewsher, P K, & De Jong, R C, (1997), *Ecotourism and cultural resource management*. Document prepared for the SA Wildlife College. Pretoria: Centre for Ecotourism.

Canadian Parks Service, (1989). *Proposed policy*.

Cultural Institutions Act, No 119 of 1998.

De Jong, R.C., (1992). *Draft policy guidelines for cultural resource management in nature conservation and forestry areas in South Africa*. Pretoria: National Cultural History Museum (unpublished)

Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, (1996). *White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage*. Pretoria: SA Communication Service.

DEAT, (1998). *White Paper on environmental management policy for South Africa*. Government Gazette, Vol 395, No 18894, 15 May 1998.

De Jong, R. 1992. *Policy guidelines for cultural resource management in nature conservation and forestry areas in South Africa*.

Department of Public Works, (1998), *White Paper 1997. Public Works towards the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Government Gazette, Vol 391, No 18616, 14 January 1998.

Desmond, C: *The Discarded People*. Penguin, Harmondsworth 1971.

Dreyer, C. 2008. *Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Residential Developments at Namahadi (Frankfort), Free State*.

Entries on towns in the *Standard Encyclopedia of Southern Africa*, published by Nasou, 1970-1976 (11 volumes).

Galla, A, (1996), *Shifting the paradigm. A plan to diversify heritage practice in South Africa*. Cape Town: South African Museums Association.

General Information for archaeologists and palaeontologists on the National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999).

Greenfield, H. J. and van Schalkwyk, L. O. 2003. Intra-settlement social and economic organization of Early Iron Age farming communities in southern Africa: view from Ndondondwane. *Azania*, 38: 121-37.

Government Gazette, Vol 391, No 18616, 14 January 1998.

Hall, C.M. & McArthur, S. (eds), (1996). *Heritage management in Australia and New Zealand*. Draft publication.

Harrison, R. (1994). *Manual of heritage management*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Huffman, T. N. 1993. Broederstroom and the Central Cattle Pattern. *South African Journal of Science*, 89: 220-26.

Huffman, T. N. 2001. The Central Cattle Pattern and interpreting the past. *Southern African Humanities*, 13: 19-35.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age: The archaeology of pre-colonial societies in southern Africa*. Scottsville: University of Kwa-Zulu Natal Press.

Japha, D., Japha, V., Le grange, L & Todeschini, F. *Mission Settlements in South Africa: A Report on their historical background and prospects for conservation*. University of Cape Town.

Jote, K. (1994). *International legal protection of cultural heritage*. Stockholm: Juristförlaget.

Kent, S. 1998. Invisible gender-invisible foragers: hunter-gatherer spatial patterning and the southern African archaeological record. In: Kent, S. (ed.) *Gender in African prehistory*: 39-67. California: Altamira Press.

Killick, D. 2004. Review Essay: "What Do We Know About African Iron Working?" *Journal of African Archaeology*. Vol 2 (1) pp. 135–152

Maggs, T.M. 1976. *Iron Age communities of the southern Highveld*. Pietermaritzburg: Natal Museum.

Maggs, T. O. 1984c. The Iron Age south of the Zambezi. In *Southern African Prehistory and Paleoenvironments* (ed. R. Klein). Rotterdam: Balken, pp. 329-60.

Maggs, T. O. 1995. The Early Iron Age in the extreme south: some patterns and problems. *Azania*, 29/30: 171-8.

McCarthy, T.S. 2006. The Witwatersrand Supergroup. In: Johnson MR, Anhaeusser and Thomas RJ (Eds). *The Geology of South Africa*. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg/Council for Geoscience, Pretoria. pp 155-186.



McCarthy, T.S. and Rubidge, B.S. 2005. The story of Earth and Life – a southern African perspective on the 4.6 billion year journey. Struik Publishers, Cape Town. pp 333.

Mason, R. (1986). Origins of Black People of Johannesburg and the Southern Western Central Transvaal AD350-1880. Occasional Paper No. 16 of the Archaeological Research Unit.

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

Musa, (1994). Museums for South Africa: Intersectoral investigation for national policy. Pretoria: MUSA Secretariat.

National Research Foundation, Nexus database of current and completed research projects.

National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999).

National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999). 2002. Regulations.

Platzky, L.; Walker, C: The Surplus People: Forced Removals in South Africa. Ravan Press, Johannesburg 1985.

Republic of South Africa, (1996). Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996. Government Gazette, Vol 378, No 17678, 18 December 1996.

Ross, M. (1996). Planning and the heritage. Policy and procedures. Second edition. London: E & FN Spon.

SAHRA website <http://www.sahra.org.za>

Sampson, C.G. 1972. The Stone Age Industries of the Orange River Scheme and South Africa. National Museum, Bloemfontein: Memoir no. 6.

Schoeman, K. 1982. Vrystaatse Erfenis: Bouwerk en geboue in die 19e eeu. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau.

Smith, A.B. 1995. Archaeological Observations along the Orange River and its Hinterland. In A.B. Smith (ed.) Einiqua/and, pp. 265 - 300. Rondebosch, UCT Press.

Stark, F, (1986). Germiston: The heart of South Africa. Germiston: Felstar Publishing.

The City of Germiston: Official Guide, (1957). Germiston: Publicity Association.

Theal, G.M. 1915. History of South Africa from 1795 to 1884. Allen & Unwin, London.

Ewer R.F. 1956. *The Dating of the Australopithecinae: Faunal Evidence*. The South African Archaeological Bulletin Vol. 11, No. 42 (Jun., 1956), pp. 41-45

Thorp, C.R. 1996. A preliminary report on evidence of interaction between hunter-gatherers and farmers along a hypothesized frontier in the eastern Free State. The South African Archaeological Bulletin, 51: 57-63.

Val, A; Taru P; Steininger, C; 2014. *NEW TAPHONOMIC ANALYSIS OF LARGE-BODIED PRIMATE ASSEMBLAGE FROM COOPER'S D, BLOUBANK VALLEY, SOUTH AFRICA*. The South African Archaeological Bulletin, Vol. 69, No. 199 (JUNE 2014), pp. 49-58

Webley, L. 1990. The use of stone 'scrapers' by semi-sedentary pastoralist groups in Namaqualand, South Africa. South African Archaeological Bulletin 45:28-32.


Walton, J. 1953. An Early Fokeng-Hlakoana Settlement at Metlaeeng, Basutoland. The South African Archaeological Bulletin, 8 (29): 3 – 11.

Webley, L.; Lanham, J. & Miller, D. March 2010. Scoping Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed prospecting on 20\* farms in the Olifantshoek and Kuruman areas of the Northern Cape.

# ADDENDUM 1

Previous HIA: Van Schalkwyk, J. 2005. Heritage Impact Assessment: Putfontein Portion 102.

14 Feb. '05 11:52 FAX 9/2/205/0001 P. 3



**NATIONAL CULTURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**  
**NASIONALE KULTUURHISTORIESE MUSEUM**

Building/Gebou: **AFRICAN WINDOW**  
149 Visagie Street,  
Pretoria  
P O Box 28088,  
Sunnyside  
0132  
RSA  
Tel. +27 12 324 6082

Our Ref/Ons Verw	Your Ref/U Verw	Contact/Kontak	Date/Datum
2005KH20			1 February 2005

Mr Rhet Smart  
Tswelopele Environmental  
P O Box 2083  
PINEGOWRIE  
2123

Dear Mr Smart

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PUTFONTEIN PORTION 102**

As requested, we have investigated the above portion of the farm Putfontein 261R, located in the Benoni district of Gauteng. The site is located east of the R51 and north of Daveyton (see Figure 1).

The scope of work consisted of conducting a Phase 1 archaeological survey of the site in accordance with the requirements of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999). This included:

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

The objectives were to

- Identify possible archaeological, cultural and historic sites within the proposed development areas;
- Evaluate the potential impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed development on archaeological, cultural and historical resources;
- Recommend mitigation measures to ameliorate any negative impacts on areas of archaeological, cultural or historical importance.

The geology is made up of shale and the original vegetation of the area is classified as Moist Cool Highveld Grassland. The area is currently used as agricultural smallholdings, resulting in a number of homesteads occurring in the area. None of these are older than 60 years, of architectural merit or historical significance. The surrounding open areas have been subjected to agricultural activities (ploughing), which would have negatively impacted on any cultural remains in the area. No features (eg. hills, outcrops or rock shelters) that usually drew people to settle in its vicinity, occurs in the area.

We have found no obvious features, sites or artefacts of cultural significance that would be impacted on by the proposed development. However, the grass cover is currently very dense, making it difficult to identify any possible hidden features. We therefore recommend, from a heritage point of view, that the proposed development can continue and requests that if archaeological sites or graves are exposed during

**NORTHERN FLAGSHIP INSTITUTION/NOORDELIKE VLAGSKIPINSTELLING**  
INCORPORATING/GEINKORPOREER  
National Cultural History Museum/Nasionale Kultuurhistoriese Museum  
Transvaal Museum  
National Museum of Military History/Nasionale Museum vir Militêre Geskiedenis  
Pioneer/Pionier Museum - Kruger Museum - Tswaing Crater/Krater Museum - Sammy Marks Museum -  
Willem Prinsloo Agricultural/Landbou Museum

2020/01/03

14 Feb. '05 11:52

FAX

P. 2


construction work, it should immediately be reported to a museum, preferably one at which an archaeologist is available, so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made

Yours sincerely

J van Schalkwyk

---





14 Feb '05 11:53

FRX

7  
4