

SPECIALIST REPORT
PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL TOWNSHIP:
EXTENSION 8(4) & 6 OF PORTION 79 (A PORTION OF PORTION 3) OF THE
FARM TWEEFONTEIN, 357JT, BELFAST

MPUMALANGA PROVINCE

REPORT COMPILED FOR
WANDIMA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES cc
MR. MANDLA MBUYANE

P.O. Box 1072,
NELSPRUIT, 1200

Tel: 013 – 7525452 / Fax: 013 – 7526877 / e-mail: mandla@wandima.co.za

FEBRUARY 2012

ADANSONIA HERITAGE CONSULTANTS
ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICAN PROFESSIONAL
ARCHAEOLOGISTS
C. VAN WYK ROWE

E-MAIL: christinevwr@gmail.com

Tel: 0828719553 / Fax: 0867151639

P.O. BOX 75, PILGRIM'S REST, 1290

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) regarding archaeological and other cultural heritage resources was conducted on the footprint for the proposed residential township Extensions 8(4) and 6, situated on portion 79 (a portion of portion 3) of the farm Tweefontein 357JT, Belfast.

The study area is situated on topographical map 1:50 000, 2529DB BELFAST, which is in the Mpumalanga Province. This area falls under the jurisdiction of the Emakhazeni Local municipality, Nkangala district.

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

The Emakhazeni Local Municipality (the current owners of the site), is requesting the township development to meet the growth demand of the existing Siyathuthuka Township. The proposed sites, are Extension 8(4) (9,0334 ha) and Extension 6 (19.361ha) (Information from Wandima Environmental Services).

The area for the proposed township development (28,3944 ha), is currently vacant, zoned as agricultural but extension 6 is in the process of being zoned a township. It was previously divided into small sections and partially used as cultivated lands and commercial blue gum plantations.

This area borders on the eastern side of the existing Siyathuthuka settlement and the locals use the area for collecting firewood, grazing their livestock and dumping of refuse. Mr. Elmon Mabuza (who lived in Siyathuthuka for 13 years) and Ms Senzo Nkosi (who lived there for 12 years) have no knowledge of any graves or ancient settlements in the study area. The survey revealed no archaeological or any other heritage features.

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

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PROJECT	4
• Terms of Reference	5
• Legal requirements	5
B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE STUDY AREA	7
• Literature review, museum databases & previous relevant impact assessments	7
C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT	10
D. LOCALITY	10
• Description of methodology	11
• GPS Co-ordinates of perimeters	12
E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES	12
F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	13
• Summarised identification & cultural significance assessment of affected Heritage resources: General issues of site and context	14
• Summarised recommended impact management interventions	17
G. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE & EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA	19
• Evaluation methods	19
• NHRA	19
H. RECOMMENDATION	20
I. CONCLUSION	20
SOURCES	21
Appendix 1: Topographical map: 2529 DB BELFAST	22
Appendix 2: Google Earth image: Extensions 8(4) & 6 in relation to Extensions 5 & 7	23
Appendix 3: Google Earth image: Perimeter of Extension 8(4)	24
Appendix 4: Google Earth image: Perimeter of Extension 6	25
Appendix 5: Layout plan of proposed Township	26
Appendix 6: Photographs of the study area	27

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL TOWNSHIP:
EXTENSION 8(4) & 6 OF PORTION 79 (A PORTION OF PORTION 3) OF THE
FARM TWEEFONTEIN, 357JT, BELFAST**

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PROJECT

The Emakhazeni Local Municipality, the current owners of Portion 79 (a portion of swportion 3) of the farm Tweefontein 357JT, is requesting the extension of human settlement development to meet the growth demand of the existing Siyathuthuka Township. Housing is at the forefront of the national agenda for delivery and the government is taking overall responsibility for providing houses to all. The total of extension 8(4) (9,0334 ha) & extension 6 (19,361 ha) is approximately 28,3944 ha in extent. Two other portions are also proposed for township development around Siyathuthuka, they are Extension 5 and Extension 7, which are discussed in separate reports.

Adansonia Heritage Consultants were appointed by *WANDIMA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES cc.*, to conduct a Phase 1 heritage impact assessment (HIA) on archaeological and other heritage resources on the study area.

A literature study, relevant to the study area was done, to determine that no archaeological or heritage resources will be impacted upon. (See **Appendix 1**: Topographical Map: 2529DB Belfast).

The aims for this report are to source all relevant information on archaeological and heritage resources in the study area, and to advise the client on sensitive heritage areas as well as where it is viable for the development to take place in terms of the specifications as set out in the National Heritage Resources Act no., 25 of 1999 (NHRA). Recommendations for maximum conservation measures for any heritage resource will also be made. The study area is indicated in **Appendix 1, 2, 3, 4** and photographic evidence is in **Appendix 6**.

- This study forms part of an EIA, Consultant: *WANDIMA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES cc.*, P.O. Box 1072, Nelspruit, 1200, Tel: 013-7525452 / Fax: 013-7526877 / e-mail: mandla@wandima.co.za

- Type of development: Extension 8(4) & 6 totals an area of 28,3944 ha, which are earmarked for residential development, on portion 79 (a portion of portion 3) of the farm Tweefontein 357JT, Belfast, Mpumalanga Province.
- Rezoning of the proposed development is involved as only Extension 6 is currently in the process of being zoned as a township (See **Appendix 5**).
- Location of Province, Magisterial district / Local Authority and Property (farms): The area falls within the Mpumalanga Province under the jurisdiction of the Emakhazeni local municipality. It includes portion 79 (a portion of portion 3) of the farm Tweefontein 357JT.
- Land owners: Emakhazeni Local Municipality, Belfast.
- **Terms of reference:** As specified by section 38 (3) of the NHRA, the following information is provided in this report.
 - a) The identification and mapping of heritage resources where applicable;
 - b) Assessment of the significance of the resources;
 - c) Alternatives given to affected heritage resources by the development;
 - d) Plans for measures of mitigation.

- **Legal requirements:**

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

- **Section 38 of the NHRA**

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

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

Section 38 of the NHRA requires a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to be conducted

by an independent heritage management consultant, for the following development categories:

- Any development or other activity which will change the character of a site:
 - exceeding 5000m² in extent;
 - the rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000m² in extent

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

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

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

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

- **Section 35 of the NHRA**

Section 35 (4) of the NHRA stipulates that no person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA, destroy, damage, excavate, alter or remove from its original position, or collect, any archaeological material or object. This section may apply to any significant

archaeological sites that may be discovered. In the case of such chance finds, the heritage practitioner will assist in investigating the extent and significance of the finds and consult with an archaeologist about further action. This may entail removal of material after documenting the find or mapping of larger sections before destruction. This section does not apply, since no archaeological material was found which might be impacted upon by the proposed development.

- **Section 36 of the NHRA**

Section 36 of the NHRA stipulates that no person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA, destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years, which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority. It is possible that chance burials might be discovered during construction work. This section does not apply since no graves were identified during the survey.

- **Section 34 of the NHRA**

Section 34 of the NHRA stipulates that no person may alter, damage, destroy, relocate etc, any building or structure older than 60 years, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority. This section does not apply since no buildings / structures older than 60 years were identified during the survey.

- **Section 37 of the NHRA**

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

- **NEMA**

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

B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE STUDY AREA

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

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

There are no museums in the town of Belfast which could be consulted, and no historical information was available at the municipality. The closest museum is at Lydenburg, and they confirmed that they do not have any information on Belfast. The author had to rely on the assistance of local people documenting relevant history in the area. The 1974 topographical map 2529DB BELFAST revealed that the study area was entirely disturbed before, and utilized for agricultural as well as commercial plantation purposes. Visibility during the survey was good, although the grass was lush, extensive livestock grazing is taking place and the grass is short. The area is further divided into small sections, connected by distinct roads which made the survey fairly easy and accessible. (See **Appendix 1, 3 & 4**).

Very little contemporary research has been done on prehistoric African settlements in the study area. According to Bergh, there are no recorded sites that date from the Stone Age, (including Rock paintings or engravings), or Early Iron Age. It can be confirmed that none of the above mentioned sites were encountered during the survey. The section falls within the general zone of Late Iron Age stone walled settlements,¹ although none were encountered during the survey.

The Belfast area was very sparsely populated during the 19th century, and only a few Late Iron Age settlements are known in the direct vicinity (Dullstroom), by the author. Bergh² does not indicate any cultural group specific to the Belfast area, and even ethnographical and linguistic studies by early researchers such as D. Ziervogel and N.J. Van Warmelo, does not include this area. It may be assumed that some of the *Ndzundza abaga* (Ndebele), and various tribes of the *baSotho* (baKôpa, baPedi),³ inhabited this area as they do occur extensively towards Stofberg and Middelburg which

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

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

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

are situated close to Belfast.

The local inhabitants of the Siyathuthuka township currently consists of various groups including Ndebele, Sotho, Swazi and Zulu, according to Mr. Elmon Mabuza who was interviewed during the survey.⁴ This information is confirmed by statistics of Belfast on the internet.⁵

- **AmaNDEBELE**

According to Van Warmelo, the *amaNdebele* are the earliest known offshoot of the *Nguni* group. The Ndebele is divided into two groups, the Southern and the Northern, and they are separated from one another. A certain legendary chief *Msi* or *Musi* heads a list of about twenty-five successive chiefs who lived just north of where Pretoria now stands. His two sons were *Manala* and *Ndzundza* and form the most important tribes of the Southern group. The *abagaNdzundza* moved eastwards and settled near Roos Senekal, approximately 60km north of Belfast, and it is said that some of *Manala's* followers, the *abagaManala*, settled in the Witbank district. The tribes slowly broke up after the days of the Republic.⁶

- **CENTRAL SOTHO**

The tribes in this group were at one time largely under the rule of the baPedi, who's last independent king was *Sekhukhune*, who's stronghold was to the north of Belfast (Steelpoort area), although his domain was extremely large.⁷ Great numbers of *baSotho* who belong to the above group, who still speak *sePedi* but which became detribalized, live in the districts of Middelburg, Lydenburg, Witbank and Springs. They mingled freely with other groups such as the Zulu, Swazi and Tonga.

- **HISTORY OF BELFAST**

Belfast, also known as eMakhazeni, on the Highveld, is today renowned for its excellent trout fishing conditions. Sheep and dairy farming take place here as well as maize, potatoes and timber are produced. Coal and black granite are mined around Belfast. Belfast is 2025m above sea level and one of the coldest and highest towns in South Africa. Belfast has a subtropical highland climate with mild summers sand chilly, dry

⁴ Personal communication: Mr. Elmon Mabuza, 18 Feb 2012.

⁵ Belfast Mpumalanga, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Belfast,_Mpumalanga

⁶ N.J. Van Warmelo, *A preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p. 87.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

winters. The average annual precipitation is 674mm with most rainfall occurring mainly during summer. The town was named after Richard O’Niell from *Belfast*, Northern Ireland, who owned the farm on which the town was built.⁸

During the Anglo-Boer War several battles and skirmishes took place in and around the town. The British built a concentration camp here during the Boer War to house Boer women and children. Several Victoria Crosses were awarded for action at *Monument Hill* which is on the edge of the town.⁹

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

The proposed project will involve the following:

- Approximately 28,3944 ha, is earmarked for residential township development;

D. LOCALITY

The proposed project site is located approximately 3-4 km northwest of the town of Belfast. The site falls under the Emakhazeni Local Municipal jurisdiction, which in turn falls within Nkangala District Municipality, in the Mpumalanga Province (**Appendix 1: Topographical Map & Appendix 2, 3 & 4**, Google images of sites).

The proposed areas for development is situated on portion 79 (a portion of portion 3) of the farm Tweefontein 357JT and are currently vacant land which belongs to the Emakhazeni Local Municipality, and are zoned as agricultural. Extension 6 is in the process of being zoned a township (See **Appendix 5**).

The general study area is disturbed by cultivated land and commercial plantations, of which large sections still exist. The study area is bordered by the current Siyathuthuke Township to the west, open vacant land and a dam and river to the east and south. A soil sample revealed that the soil and rocks consist of slates and quartzite. The Belfast dam is further north of the site, and further south is a coal mine.

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

⁸ Belfast Mpumalanga, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Belfast,_Mpumalanga

⁹ Belfast Mpumalanga, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Belfast,_Mpumalanga

- **Description of methodology:**

The topographical Map, (**Appendix 1**), and Google images of the site (**Appendix 2, 3 & 4**), indicate the study area of the proposed development. These were intensively studied to assess the current and historic disturbed areas and infrastructure. In order to reach a comprehensive conclusion regarding the cultural heritage resources in the study area, the following methods were used:

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

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

-Archaeological database of the National Cultural History Museum were consulted.

- The fieldwork and survey was conducted extensively on foot and with a vehicle, with two people.
- The entire area was previous cultivated land, and / or commercial plantations, which is now used for cattle grazing and collecting of firewood.
- The terrain was even and accessible and visibility was good. The grass was mostly short because of cattle grazing.
- The relevant data was located with a GPS instrument (Garmin Etrex) datum WGS 84, and plotted. Co-ordinates were within 4-6 meters of identified sites.
- Evaluation of the resources which might be impacted upon by the footprint, was done within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 (1999);
- Personal communication with relevant stakeholders on the specific study area, were held, such as the ecologist, Mr. Danie van der Walt and archaeologist, Mr. JP Cilliers (archaeologist) of Lydenburg Museum, and local inhabitants of Siyathuthuka, Elmon Mabuza and Senzo Nkosi.

- **GPS: Co-ordinates of the perimeters of the study area** (Co-ordinates provided by Mr. Danie van der Walt):

CO-ORDINATES		
Extension 6	LONG	LAT
6 - 1	30° 00' 26.3" E	25° 40' 32.9" S
6 - 2	30° 00' 37.9" E	25° 40' 38.2" S
6 - 3	30° 00' 33.6" E	25° 40' 49.5" S
6 - 4	30° 00' 17.3" E	25° 40' 44.9" S
Extension 8(4)		
8(4) - 1	30° 00' 37.0" E	25° 40' 52.0" S
8(4) - 2	30° 00' 16.9" E	25° 40' 45.3" S
8(4) - 3	30° 00' 04.1" E	25° 41' 02.3" S
8(4) - 4	30° 00' 26.4" E	25° 41' 06.5" S

E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES

All comments should be studied in conjunction with the appendices, which indicate the areas, and which corresponds with the summary below. Photographs in **Appendix 6**, show the general view of the study area. Visibility was good.

Extension 8(4):

The study area was extensively surveyed on foot and per vehicle for any remains of archaeological or historical nature. Visibility was good and footpaths as well as gravel roads divide the area into smaller sections which made access very easy (See **Appendix 3**). Extension 8(4) is directly south of extension 6, and for all practical purposes forms a single unit (See **Appendix 6**, Fig. 1 – 6).

The inhabitants of the Siyathuthuka township utilizes the area for harvesting of firewood, livestock grazing and dumping of refuse. Mr. Elmon Mabuza who lived in the Siyathuthuka township for 13 years, and who often harvests firewood in this section, was interviewed and confirmed that there are no graves or stone walls in this area¹⁰. The graves are to the south of the formal township, outside the study area. An underground pipeline runs parallel to the southern boundary of the study area, and concrete manholes are visible. The area consists mostly of highveld grassland with a wetland closer to the dam on the eastern and southern sections.

The survey revealed no archaeological or historical remains of any kind.

¹⁰ Personal communication: Elmon Mabuza, 2012-02-18.

Extension 6:

The study area was extensively surveyed on foot and per vehicle for any remains of archaeological or historical nature. Visibility was good and footpaths as well as gravel roads divide the area into smaller sections which made access very easy (See **Appendix 4**). This section consists of grassland with previously disturbed commercial blue gum plantations, of which the trees are currently small due to over-harvesting by the local inhabitants. Extension 6 is directly north of extension 8(4), and for all practical purposes forms a single unit (**Appendix 6**: Extension 6, Fig. 1 – 4).

The inhabitants of the Siyathuthuka township utilizes the area for harvesting of firewood, and livestock grazing, dumping of refuse, and informal shacks (**Appendix 6**, Extension 6: Fig. 2). Ms Senzo Nkosi who lived in the Siyathuthuka township for 12 years, collects firewood on a regular basis in the study area. She has no knowledge of graves or stone walls or any historic structure in this section.¹¹ She is aware of graves to the south-west, but they do not form part of the study area.

The survey revealed no archaeological or historical remains of any kind.

F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

<i>ACT</i>	<i>COMPONENT</i>	<i>IMPLICATION</i>	<i>RELEVANCE</i>	<i>COMPLIANCE</i>
NHRA	S 34	Impact on buildings and structures older than 60 years	None present	None
NHRA	S35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	None present	None
NHRA	S36	Impact on graves	None present	None
NHRA	S37	Impact on public monuments	None present	None
NHRA	S38	Developments requiring an HIA	Development is a listed activity	HIA done
NEMA	EIA regulations	Activities requiring an EIA	Development is subject to an EIA	HIA is part of EIA

¹¹ Personal communication: Ms. S. Nkosi, 2012-02-18.

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

Context		
Urban environmental context	No	NA
Rural environmental context	No	Vacant land
Natural environmental context	No	Highly disturbed area by previous cultivation and commercial plantations
Formal protection (NHRA)		
(S. 28) Is the property part of a protected area?	No	NA
(S. 31) Is the property part of a heritage area?	No	NA
Other		
Is the property near to or visible from any protected heritage sites	No	NA
Is the property part of a conservation area of special area in terms of the Zoning scheme?	No	NA
Does the site form part of a historical settlement or townscape?	No	NA
Does the site form part of a rural cultural landscape?	No	NA
Does the site form part of a natural landscape of cultural significance?	No	NA
Is the site adjacent to a scenic route?	No	NA
Is the property within or adjacent to any other area which has special environmental or heritage protection?	No	NA
Does the general context or any adjoining properties have cultural significance?	No	NA

Property features and characteristics		
Have there been any previous development impacts on the property?	Yes	The 2 sites (Ext 8(4) & 6) were previously cultivated farmland and commercial plantations; harvesting of the plantation still takes place as well as livestock grazing. It is bordering a current established residential township.
Are there any significant landscape features on the property?	No	NA
Are there any sites or features of geological significance on the property?	No	NA
Does the property have any rocky outcrops on it?	No	A small rocky outcrop on the north eastern point of Ext 8(4).
Does the property have any fresh water sources (springs, streams, rivers) on or alongside it?	Yes	A dam with streams to the east and south of the study area.

Heritage resources on the property		
Formal protection (NHRA)		
National heritage sites (S. 27)	No	NA
Provincial heritage sites (S. 27)	No	NA
Provincial protection (S. 29)	No	NA
Place listed in heritage register (S. 30)	No	NA
General protection (NHRA)		
Structures older than 60 years (S. 34)	No	NA
Archaeological site or material (S. 35)	No	NA
Palaeontological site or material (S. 35)	No	NA
Graves or burial grounds (S. 36)	No	NA
Public monuments or memorials (S. 37)	No	NA

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

NHRA S (3)2 Heritage resource category	ELE- MENTS	INDICATORS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE										RISK	
		Histo rical	Rare	Sci enti fic	Typi cal	Techno logical	Aes thetic	Pers on / com munit y	Land mark	Mate rial con dition	Sust aina bility		
Buildings / structures of cultural significance	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	-
Areas attached to oral traditions / intangible heritage	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	-
Historical settlement/ townscapes	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Landscape of cultural significance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NHRA	ELE-	INDICATORS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE										RISK	
Geological site of scientific/cultural importance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Archaeological / palaeontological sites	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grave / burial grounds	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Areas of significance related to labour history	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Movable objects	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

- **Summarised recommended impact management interventions**

NHRA S (3)2 Heritage resource category	SITE	IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE Cultural significance rating		Impact management	Motivation
		Cultural significanc	Impact significanc		
Buildings / structures of cultural significance	No	No	None	-	-
Areas attached to oral traditions / intangible heritage	No	None	None	-	-
Historical settlement/ townscape	No	None	None	-	-

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

ACT	COMPONENT	IMPLICATION	RELEVANCE	COMPLIANCE
NHRA	S 34	Impact on buildings and structures older than 60 years	None present	None
NHRA	S35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	None present	None
NHRA	S36	Impact on graves	None present	None
NHRA	S37	Impact on public monuments	None present	None
NHRA	S38	Developments requiring an HIA	Development is a listed activity	Full HIA

ACT	COMPO- NENT	IMPLICATION	RELEVANCE	COMPLIANCE
NEMA	EIA regulations	Activities requiring an EIA	Development is subject to an EIA	HIA is part of EIA

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

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

• Evaluation methods

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

• National Heritage Resources Act

The National Heritage Resources Act no. 25, 1999 (NHRA) aims to promote good management of the national estate, and to enable and encourage communities to conserve their legacy so that it may be bequeathed to future generations. Heritage is unique and it cannot be renewed, and contributes to redressing past inequities.¹² It promotes previously neglected research areas.

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

- (a) its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- (c) its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- (g) its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;

¹²National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. p. 2.

(h) its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa.¹³

Please note: All graves are rated as *High* and are of outstanding significance as specified by the NHRA. However, no graves were observed in the study area and therefore it is not discussed here in detail.

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

Site no	Cultural Heritage features	Significance	Measures of mitigation
NA	No archaeological or other heritage features or graves were encountered during the survey	None	None

H. RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed extensions 8(4) & 6 on Portion 79 (a portion of portion 3) of the farm Tweefontein 357 JT is situated in an already entirely highly disturbed, cultivated, agricultural area. No archaeological or other heritage features were identified during the extensive survey, therefore Adansonia Heritage Consultants, have no compelling reasons that may prevent the proposed residential township development to continue.

I. CONCLUSION

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

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

¹³National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. pp. 12-14

SOURCES

NATIONAL LEGISLATION

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

LITERARY SOURCES

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

ELECTRONIC INFORMATION SOURCES

Belfast Mpumalanga, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Belfast,_Mpumalanga

PERSONAL INFORMATION

- JP Cilliers, Archaeologists, Lydenburg Museum, 2010-02-21
- Mr. Elmon Mabuza, Resident, Siyathuthuka, 2012-02-18.
- Ms. Senzo Nkosi, resident, Siyathuthuka, 2012-02-18.
- Danie van der Walt: Ecologists, Waterval Boven, 0726231845.