


P O BOX 456
POLOKWANE
LADANHA
0704



Tel: 015 293 2049
Fax: 015 293 2592
Cell: 083 357 3669/
083 770 2131


VHUFASHU HERITAGE CONSULTANTS CC

Registration No: 2006/119040/23

Tax Reference No: 9672996148

**PHASE 1
HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION OF A PROPOSED
BORROW PIT# 1 ASSOCIATED WITH ROAD P277/1 UPGRADE
FROM GRAVEL TO TAR FROM MAKONDE TO MASISI AREA,
WITHIN THE VHEMBE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, LIMPOPO
PROVINCE.**



Report Prepared for:

Mvulatswinga Social and Environmental consultants

P.O Box 3486

Sibasa,

0970

Fax: 015 9631089

**Survey Conducted and Report Prepared by:
Vhufa Hashu Heritage Consultants**

AUGUST 2008

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

BACKGROUND

Mvulatswina social and Environmental consultants were appointed to handle the environmental aspects of the proposed project. They appointed Vhufa Hashu Heritage Consultants (VHHC) cc to conduct an Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment study as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed road upgrade project and associated one borrow pit (borrow pit 1).

RESOURCE SUMMARY

Member of VHHC heritage specialists conducted a heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed project covering the area to be affected by the proposed development. No archaeological or any other categories of physical cultural heritage resources were identified within the proposed project area.

RESOURCE RECOMMENDATION

No further studies are necessary. However, should any chance archaeological or any other physical cultural resources be discovered subsurface, heritage authorities should be informed. From an archaeological and cultural heritage resources perspective, there are no objections to the proposed borrow pit project and we recommend to South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) authorities to approve the project as planned.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
HISTORICAL REMAINS	5
ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS	5
BURIAL GROUNDS AND GRAVES	5
CULTURE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	5
2. AIM OF STUDY	6
2.1 PROJECT DEVELOPERS AND CONSULTANTS	6
3. TERMS OF REFERENCE	7
4. TERMINOLOGY	8
5. METHODOLOGY	9
6. SITE LOCATION	9
7. SURVEY FINDINGS	10
8. RECOMMENDATIONS	10
9. REFERENCE	11
10. STUDY TEAM	12

1. INTRODUCTION

Road Agency Limpopo commissioned the upgrading of road P 277/1 from gravel to tar from Makonde to Masisi area with associated 1 borrow pit located at Makuya village along side the proposed road upgrade within the Vhembe district municipality . Mvulatswinga Social and Environmental Services were appointed to handle the environmental aspects of the proposed project within the study area. They appointed Vhufa Hashu Heritage Consultants to conduct an Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment study as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed upgrading of a road.

As part of the development process, an application for an Environmental Assessment Authorization must be completed. This report is one of a series of appendices prepared for the impact assessment that is to be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) _environmental assessment office, in support of the application as amended by the National Environmental Management Act no 107 of 1998. The information presented in this report provides the background and the basis for the Heritage Resources component of the Project impact assessment. The heritage resources impact assessment focused on archaeological sites.

The Project proposal constitutes an activity, which may potentially be harmful to heritage resources that may occur in the demarcated area. The National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA - Act No. 25 of 1999) protects all structures and features older than 60 years (section 34), archaeological sites and material (section 35) and graves and burial sites (section 36). In order to comply with the legislation, the Applicant requires information on the heritage resources, and their significance that occur in the demarcated area. This will enable the Applicant to take pro-active measures to limit the adverse effects that the development could have on such heritage resources. In terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (1999) the following is of relevance:

Historical remains

Section 34(1) No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure, which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.

Archaeological remains

Section 35(4) No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority:

- destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite

Burial grounds and graves

Section 36 (3) No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority:

- (i) destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or
- (ii) bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in detection or recovery of metals.

Culture resource management

Section 38(1) Subject to the provisions of subsection (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development:

- must at the very earliest stages of initiating such development notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.

*‘**development**’ means any physical intervention, excavation, or action, other than those caused by natural forces, which may in the opinion of the heritage authority in any way result in a change to the nature, appearance or physical nature of a place, or influence its stability and future well-being, including:

- (i) Construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change of use of a place or a structure at a place;
- (ii) Any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land, and
- (iii) Any removal or destruction of trees, or removal of vegetation or topsoil;

*”**place** means a site, area or region, a building or other structure* ...”


*”**structure** means any building, works, device or other facility made by people and which is fixed to the ground ...”

2. AIM OF STUDY

The aim of this Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Study was to determine the presence or not of heritage resources such as archaeological and historical sites and features, graves and places of religious and cultural significance, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the cultural resources management measures that may be required at the affected site.

2.1 *Project Developers and Consultants*

Developers are encouraged to consider archaeological values in their project planning and design from the outset. This will minimize scheduling and budget difficulties at later stages. As Consultants in the archaeological assessment process, we are responsible for: (see *table 1*)



- ✦ Determining the presence of archaeological sites that may be adversely impacted by the proposed development, and evaluate their significance
- ✦ Identification of potential adverse impacts to archaeological sites protected under the National Heritage Resources Act No. 25 of 1999
- ✦ Assessing of the heritage significance of identified archaeological sites to assist in the development of appropriate mitigation strategies
- ✦ Make recommendations for avoidance or mitigation of protected or otherwise significant archaeological sites
- ✦ Reporting the results of these studies to the Heritage Authorities

Table 1

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The **Terms of Reference** for the study were to:

- (I) Assess the significance of the known cultural resources within the borders of proposed development area, in terms of their historical, social, religious, aesthetic and scientific value.
- (II) Develop mitigation or control measures for impact minimization and cultural resources preservation
- (III) Develop procedures to be implemented if previously unidentified cultural resources are uncovered during the construction.

4. TERMINOLOGY

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

- **Archaeological sites** are places where people lived and left evidence of their presence in the form of artifacts, food remains and other traces such as rock paintings or engravings, burials, fireplaces and structures.
- **Cultural Resources** are all non-physical human-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences that are associated with human activity. These include all sites, structures and artifacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development.
- **Cultural Significance** is the aesthetic, historical, scientific and social value for past, present and future generations.
- **Conservation** means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.
- **Historic** means significant in history.
- **Historical** means belonging to the past.
- ***In Situ* material** means archaeological remains that have not been disturbed.
- **Place** means site, area, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, together with pertinent contents, surroundings and historical and archaeological deposits.
- **Preservation** means protecting and maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration or change, and may include stabilization where necessary.

5. METHODOLOGY

The field study involved the survey and inspection of the proposed borrow pit #1 site at Makuya area. The survey was conducted by walking in transects within the affected site as well as covering the surrounding area. The survey sought to identify archaeological and cultural heritage sites or sacred sites within the project area that may be affected by the proposed project under Vhembe district Municipality. Using GPS recording devices, we traversed the site on foot. The survey also sampled areas, which are disturbed for possible archaeological materials that might be trapped *in situ*.

6. SITE LOCATION

The proposed area is an existing borrow pit situated at Makuya area and is located north of the proposed to be upgraded gravel road. The proposed area is an extension of the existing borrow pit towards South and west. The area is characterized of quarried loose gravel material. Gravel will be extracted from the proposed area and will be utilized for the construction of the proposed tare road.

Proposed borrow pit #1 coordinates (GPS S22°.38. 590 E 30°50.073)



Figure 1: View of the proposed borrow pit #1 at Ha-Makuya area



Figure 2: The horizontal section of the existing borrow pit.

7. SURVEY FINDINGS

No signs of heritage resources such as archaeological sites were found that would be significantly impacted on by the development. However, there is a probability of encountering chance finds during earth-moving and construction activities.

The discovery of previously undetected subsurface heritage remains on the site during earth moving activities must be reported to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) or the archaeologist, and may require further mitigation measures.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

No mitigation measures are recommended for this project. However, the developers should consider possible presence of unmarked burials and archaeological materials that might be discovered during earth moving activities. The proposed project for a borrow pit can proceed from the heritage point of view.

9. REFERENCE

1. The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999)
2. Aldenderfer, Mark S., and Carolyn A. Hale-Pierce 1984 The Small-Scale Archaeological Survey Revisited. *American Archeology* 4(1):4-5.
3. Butler, William 1984 Cultural Resource Management: The No-Collection Strategy in Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 44(4):795-799.
4. Deacon, J. 1996. Archaeology for Planners, Developers and Local Authorities. National Monuments Council. Publication no. PO21E.
5. Deacon, J. 1997. Report: Workshop on Standards for the Assessment of Significance and Research Priorities for Contract Archaeology. In: Newsletter No. 49, Sept. 1998. South African Association of Archaeology.
6. Dincause, Dena F, H. Martin Wobst, Robert J. Hasenstab and David M. Lacy 1984 A Retrospective Assessment of Archaeological Survey Contracts In Massachusetts, 1970-1979. Massachusetts Historical Commission, Survey and Planning Grant 1980. 3 volumes.
7. Dunnell, Robert C., and William S. Dancey 1983 The Siteless Survey: A Regional Scale Data Collection Strategy. In: *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 6:267-287. M.B. Schiffer, ed.
8. Evers, T.M. 1983. Oori or Moloko? The origins of the Sotho/Tswana on the evidence of the Iron Age of the Transvaal. *S. Afr. J. Sci.* 79(7): 261-264.

10. STUDY TEAM



Mr Richard Munyai (Archaeology Hons Cand Univen, BA Arch Univen 2000)



Mr Frans Roodt (BA Hons, MA Archaeology, Post Grad. Dip. Museology; UP)
Principal Investigator.

LOCALITY MAP FOR THE PROPOSED BORROW PITS

