

**Heritage Survey report for the  
DEVELOPMENT OF ROAD K220 IN THE  
CLAYVILLE/OLIFANTSFONTEIN AREA, GAUTENG**

**THE PROJECT:**

Development of the K220 road

**THIS REPORT:**

HERITAGE SURVEY REPORT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ROAD K220 IN THE CLAYVILLE/OLIFANTSFONTEIN AREA, GAUTENG

**Report No:** 2008/JvS/059  
**Status:** Final  
**Revision No:** 0  
**Date:** May 2008

**Prepared for:**

Bokamoso Landscape Architects  
Representative: Ms L Gregory

Postal Address: P O Box 11375, MAROELANA, 0161  
Tel: 012 346 3810  
E-mail: Lizelleg@mweb.co.za

**Prepared by:**

J van Schalkwyk (D Litt et Phil), Heritage Consultant  
Principal Investigator: Iron Age, Colonial Period and Industrial Heritage  
ASAPA Registration No. 164

Postal Address: 62 Coetzer Ave, Monument Park, 0181  
Tel: 076 790 6777  
E-mail: jvschalkwyk@mweb.co.za

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **HERITAGE SURVEY REPORT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ROAD K220 IN THE CLAYVILLE/OLIFANTSFONTEIN AREA, GAUTENG**

A survey was conducted to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural importance found within the boundaries of an area in which it is proposed to develop a regional road, known as the K220, between the R21 and the K109.

A number of sites dating to the historic period are known to exist in the larger region. These range from Anglo Boer War sites to farmsteads and cemeteries. However, none of these are located close to the route of the proposed road. Furthermore, no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified in the study area during the survey. Based on what was found and its evaluation, it is recommended that any development can continue in the area, on condition of acceptance of the following recommendations:

- If construction takes place and archaeological sites are exposed, 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.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	iii
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	iv
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE .....	1
3. DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS .....	1
4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY .....	2
5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT .....	3
6. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSESSMENT .....	5
7. IDENTIFICATION OF RISK SOURCES .....	5
8. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
9. REFERENCES.....	7
APPENDIX 1: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PROJECTS ON HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	8
APPENDIX 2. RELEVANT LEGISLATION .....	10
APPENDIX 3: SURVEY RESULTS .....	11
APPENDIX 4: ILLUSTRATIONS.....	12

**LIST OF FIGURES**

	Page
Fig. 1. Location of the study area indicated as red line in regional context.....	4
Fig. 2. The study area, showing the location of known sites of cultural heritage significance.	11
Fig. 3. Aerial photograph of the study area.....	12
Fig. 4. At the junction with the R21. ....	13
Fig. 5. Area where the road would pass through near the M18.....	14

**GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS****STONE AGE**

Early Stone Age	2 000 000 - 150 000 Before Present
Middle Stone Age	150 000 - 30 000 BP
Late Stone Age	30 000 - until c. AD 200

**IRON AGE**

Early Iron Age	AD 200 - AD 1000
Late Iron Age	AD 1000 - AD 1830

**HISTORIC PERIOD**

Since the arrival of the white settlers - c. AD 1840 in this part of the country

ADRC	Archaeological Data Recording Centre
ASAPA	Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists
EIA	Early Iron Age
ESA	Early Stone Age
LIA	Late Iron Age
LSA	Late Stone Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Agency
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency

## HERITAGE SURVEY REPORT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ROAD K220 IN THE CLAYVILLE/OLIFANTSFONTEIN AREA, GAUTENG

### 1. INTRODUCTION

An independent heritage consultant was appointed Bokamoso Landscape Architects to conduct a survey to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural importance found within the boundaries of an area in which it is proposed to develop a regional road, known as the K220, between the R21 and the K109.

### 2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

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 include:

- 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.

### 3. DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The following aspects have a direct bearing on the survey and the resulting report:

- *Cultural resources* are all non-physical and physical human-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences that are associated with human activity. These include all sites, structures and artefacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development.
- The *significance* of the sites and artefacts are determined by means of their historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific value in relation to their uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. It must be kept in mind that the various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and that the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these.
- Sites regarded as having low significance have already been recorded in full and require no further mitigation. Sites with medium to high significance require further mitigation.

- The latitude and longitude of archaeological sites are to be treated as sensitive information by the developer and should not be disclosed to members of the public.

## 4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

### 4.1 Extent of the Study

This survey and impact assessment covers the area as presented in Section 5 and as illustrated in Figure 1.

### 4.2 Methodology

#### 4.1 Preliminary investigation

##### 4.1.1 Survey of the literature

A survey of the relevant literature was conducted with the aim of reviewing the previous research done and determining the potential of the area. In this regard, various anthropological, archaeological and historical sources were consulted - see the list of references below.

##### 4.1.2 Data bases

The *Heritage Sites Database* and the *Environmental Potential Atlas* was consulted.

##### 4.1.3 Other sources

Historical photographs and topocadastral and other maps were also studied - see the list of references below.

#### 4.2 Field survey

The field survey was done according to generally accepted archaeological practices, and was aimed at locating all possible sites, objects and structures. The area that had to be investigated was identified by Bokamoso by means of maps. As this is a linear development, the route of the road was followed, based on the maps that were supplied. Special attention was given to topographical occurrences such as trenches, holes, outcrops and clusters of trees.

#### 4.3 Documentation

All sites, objects and structures that are identified are documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. Coordinates of individual localities are determined by means of the *Global Positioning System (GPS)*<sup>1</sup> and plotted on a map. This information is added to the description in order to facilitate the identification of each locality.

Map datum used: Hartebeeshoek 94 (WGS84).

#### 4.4 Limitations

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the manufacturer a certain deviation may be expected for each reading. Care was, however, taken to obtain as accurate a reading as possible, and then to correlate it with reference to the physical environment before plotting it on the map.

Sections of the study area are currently overgrown with tall grass, which seriously limit archaeological visibility (Fig. 4).

## **5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

### **5.1 Site location**

The study area consists of a planned road running westwards where it joins up with the R21, to the northeast of the village of Clayville, to a somewhat undetermined point located to the northwest of Clayville. It crosses the following farms: Olifantsfontein 402JR and Sterkfontein 401JR. As such it falls in the Pretoria and Kempton Park magisterial districts of Gauteng (see Fig. 1 & 2).

### **5.2 Site description**

The geology is made up of dolomite and the original vegetation is classified as Rocky Highveld Grassland. However, most of the study area has been impacted on by the farming activities and urbanisation (see Fig. 3). The area is relatively flat and no features (e.g. hills, outcrops, streams or rock shelters) that usually drew people to settle in its vicinity, occurs in the study area.

### **5.3 Regional overview**

A number of sites of cultural heritage significance are known to exist in the region. The closest sites dating to the Stone Age are found in the Rietvlei Dam Nature Reserve, and far to the west in the Halfway House area.

Iron Age sites are known from north and east of the Rietvlei Dam Nature Reserve.

A number of sites dating to the historic period are known to exist in the larger region. These range from Anglo Boer War sites to farmsteads and cemeteries.






Fig. 1. Location of the study area indicated as red line in regional context.

#### 5.4 Identified sites

#### 5.4.1 Stone Age

No sites, features or objects of cultural heritage significance dating to the Stone Age were identified.

#### 5.4.2 Iron Age

No such sites, objects or features of cultural heritage significance dating to the Iron Age were identified.

#### 5.4.3 Historic period

No sites, objects or features of cultural heritage significance dating to historic times were identified.

## 6. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSESSMENT

### 6.1 Statement of significance

Impact analysis of cultural resources under threat of the proposed development, are based on the present understanding of the development.

The **significance** of a heritage site and artefacts is determined by its historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific value in relation to the uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. It must be kept in mind that the various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and that the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these.

Sites regarded as having low significance are viewed as being recorded in full after identification and would require no further mitigation. Impact from the development would therefore be judged to be low. Sites with a medium to high significance would therefore require mitigation. Mitigation, in most cases the excavation of a site, is in essence destructive and therefore the impact can be viewed as high and as permanent.

- **No sites, objects or features of cultural significance were identified in the study area.**

### 6.2 Impact assessment

As no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified in the study area, there would be no impact resulting from the proposed development.

## 7. IDENTIFICATION OF RISK SOURCES

A Heritage Impact Assessment is focused on two phases of a proposed development: **the construction and operation phases**. However, from a cultural heritage perspective, this distinction does not apply. Heritage sites are fixed features in the environment, occurring within specific spatial confines. Any impact upon them is permanent and non-reversible.

Those resources that cannot be avoided and that are directly impacted by the development can be excavated/recorded and a management plan can be developed for future action. Those sites that are not impacted, can be written into the management plan, whence they can be avoided or cared for in the future.

The following project actions may impact negatively on archaeological sites and other features of cultural importance. The actions are most likely to occur during the construction phase of a project.

#### Construction phase:

Possible Risks	Source of the risk
Actually identified risks	
- damage to sites	Construction work
Anticipated risks	
- looting of sites	Curious workers

#### Operation phase:

Possible Risks	Source of the risk
Actually identified risks	
- damage to sites	Not keeping to management plans
Anticipated risks	
- damage to sites	Unscheduled construction/developments
- looting of sites	Visitors removing objects as keepsakes

## 8. RECOMMENDATIONS

A survey was conducted to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural importance found within the boundaries of an area in which it is proposed to develop a regional road, known as the K220, between the R21 and the K109.

A number of sites dating to the historic period are known to exist in the larger region. These range from Anglo Boer War sites to farmsteads and cemeteries. However, none of these are located close to the route of the proposed road. Furthermore, no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified in the study area during the survey. Based on what was found and its evaluation, it is recommended that any development can continue in the area, on condition of acceptance of the following recommendations:

- If construction takes place and archaeological sites are exposed, 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.

## 9. REFERENCES

### 9.1 Data bases

Environmental Potential Atlas, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism.

Heritage Sites Database, Pretoria.

### 9.2 Literature

Acocks, J.P.H. 1975. *Veld Types of South Africa*. Memoirs of the Botanical Survey of South Africa, No. 40. Pretoria: Botanical Research Institute.

Van Schalkwyk, J. 2000. *A survey of cultural resources at the proposed Glen Erasmia development, Kempton Park, Gauteng*. Unpublished report 2000KH06. Pretoria: National Cultural History Museum.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2004. *Heritage impact assessment of a section of Road D781, Pretoria District, Gauteng Province*. Unpublished report 2004KH27. Pretoria: National cultural History Museum.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2006. *Heritage impact assessment for a portion of the farm Olifantsfontein 402JR*. Unpublished report 2006KH048. Pretoria: National Cultural History Museum.

Van Schalkwyk, J. & De Jong, R. 1997. *A survey of cultural resources in the Midrand Municipal area, Gauteng Province*. Unpublished report 1997KH21. Pretoria: National Cultural History Museum.

### 9.3 Maps

1: 50 000 Topocadastral maps – 2528CC, 2528CD

## APPENDIX 1: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PROJECTS ON HERITAGE RESOURCES

### Significance

The *significance* of the sites and artefacts are determined by means of their historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific value in relation to their uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. It must be kept in mind that the various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and that the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these.

Matrix used for assessing the significance of each identified site/feature

<b>1. Historic value</b>					
Is it important in the community, or pattern of history					
Does it have strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in history					
Does it have significance relating to the history of slavery					
<b>2. Aesthetic value</b>					
It is important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group					
<b>3. Scientific value</b>					
Does it have potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of natural or cultural heritage					
Is it important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period					
<b>4. Social value</b>					
Does it have strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons					
<b>5. Rarity</b>					
Does it possess uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage					
<b>6. Representivity</b>					
Is it 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.					
<b>7. Sphere of Significance</b>			High	Medium	Low
International					
National					
Provincial					
Regional					
Local					
Specific community					
<b>8. Significance rating of feature</b>					
1.	Low				
2.	Medium				
3.	High				

**Significance of impact:**

- low where the impact will not have an influence on or require to be significantly accommodated in the project design
- medium where the impact could have an influence which will require modification of the project design or alternative mitigation
- high where it would have a “no-go” implication on the project regardless of any mitigation

**Certainty of prediction:**

- Definite: More than 90% sure of a particular fact. Substantial supportive data to verify assessment
- Probable: More than 70% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of that impact occurring
- Possible: Only more than 40% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of an impact occurring
- Unsure: Less than 40% sure of a particular fact, or the likelihood of an impact occurring

**Recommended management action:**

For each impact, the recommended practically attainable mitigation actions which would result in a measurable reduction of the impact, must be identified. This is expressed according to the following:

- 1 = no further investigation/action necessary
- 2 = controlled sampling and/or mapping of the site necessary
- 3 = preserve site if possible, otherwise extensive salvage excavation and/or mapping necessary
- 4 = preserve site at all costs

**Legal requirements:**

Identify and list the specific legislation and permit requirements which potentially could be infringed upon by the proposed project, if mitigation is necessary.

## APPENDIX 2. RELEVANT LEGISLATION

All archaeological and palaeontological sites, and meteorites are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act (Act no 25 of 1999) as stated in Section 35:

(1) Subject to the provisions of section 8, the protection of archaeological and palaeontological sites and material and meteorites is the responsibility of a provincial heritage resources authority: Provided that the protection of any wreck in the territorial waters and the maritime cultural zone shall be the responsibility of SAHRA.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (8)(a), all archaeological objects, palaeontological material and meteorites are the property of the State. The responsible heritage authority must, on behalf of the State, at its discretion ensure that such objects are lodged with a museum or other public institution that has a collection policy acceptable to the heritage resources authority and may in so doing establish such terms and conditions as it sees fit for the conservation of such objects.

(3) Any person who discovers archaeological or palaeontological objects or material or a meteorite in the course of development or agricultural activity must immediately report the find to the responsible heritage resources authority, or to the nearest local authority offices or museum, which must immediately notify such heritage resources authority.

(4) No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority-

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

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act no 25 of 1999) stipulates the assessment criteria and grading of archaeological sites. The following categories are distinguished in Section 7 of the Act:

- **Grade I:** Heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance;
- **Grade II:** Heritage resources which, although forming part of the national estate, can be considered to have special qualities which make them significant within the context of a province or a region; and
- **Grade III:** Other heritage resources worthy of conservation, and which prescribes heritage resources assessment criteria, consistent with the criteria set out in section 3(3), which must be used by a heritage resources authority or a local authority to assess the intrinsic, comparative and contextual significance of a heritage resource and the relative benefits and costs of its protection, so that the appropriate level of grading of the resource and the consequent responsibility for its management may be allocated in terms of section 8.

### APPENDIX 3: SURVEY RESULTS

See Appendix 1 for an explanation of the conventions used in assessing the cultural remains.

Map datum used: Hartebeeshoek 94 (WGS84).




Fig. 2. The study area, showing the location of known sites of cultural heritage significance. (Maps 2528CC, 2528CD: Chief Directorate Survey and Mapping)

- **Sites identified that would be impacted on by the proposed development: Nil**



**APPENDIX 4: ILLUSTRATIONS**




Fig. 3. Aerial photograph of the study area.



Fig. 4. At the junction with the R21.



Fig. 5. Area where the road would pass through near the M18.