

# HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

(REQUIRED UNDER SECTION 38(8) OF THE NHRA (No. 25 OF 1999))

## FOR PROPOSED SAGEWOOD FILLING STATION, GAUTENG PROVINCE

**Type of development:**

Filling Station

**Client:**

Lokisa Environmental

**Environmental Impact Practitioner information:**

Elaine Minnaar

**E – mail:**

Elaine@lokisa.co.za

**Developer:**

Eris Property Group



**HCAC - Heritage Consultants**

Private Bag X 1049

Suite 34

Modimolle

0510

Tel: 082 373 8491

Fax: 086 691 6461

E-Mail: [jaco@heritageconsultants.co.za](mailto:jaco@heritageconsultants.co.za)

Report Author:

Mr. J. van der Walt

Project Reference:

HCAC Project number 2112

Report date:

March 2021

## APPROVAL PAGE

<b>Project Name</b>	Sagewood Filling Station
<b>Report Title</b>	Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Sagewood Filling Station (Erven 1323 and 1324 Sagewood Ext 6), Gauteng Province
<b>Authority Reference Number</b>	TBC
<b>Report Status</b>	Final Report
<b>Applicant Name</b>	Eris Property Group

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Qualifications and Certifications</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Archaeologist</b>	Jaco van der Walt	MA Archaeology ASAPA #159 APHP #114	March 2021

**DOCUMENT PROGRESS****Distribution List**

Date	Report Reference Number	Document Distribution	Number of Copies
25 March 2021	2112	Lokisa Environmental Consulting	Electronic Copy

**Amendments on Document**

Date	Report Reference Number	Description of Amendment

**INDEMNITY AND CONDITIONS RELATING TO THIS REPORT**

The findings, results, observations, conclusions and recommendations given in this report are based on the author's best scientific and professional knowledge as well as available information. The report is based on survey and assessment techniques which are limited by time and budgetary constraints relevant to the type and level of investigation undertaken. HCAC reserves the right to modify aspects of the report including the recommendations if and when new information becomes available from ongoing research or further work in this field or pertaining to this investigation.

Although HCAC exercises due care and diligence in rendering services and preparing documents HCAC accepts no liability, and the client, by receiving this document, indemnifies HCAC against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, directly or indirectly by HCAC and by the use of the information contained in this document.

This report must not be altered or added to without the prior written consent of the author. This also refers to electronic copies of this report which are supplied for the purposes of inclusion as part of other reports, including main reports. Similarly, any recommendations, statements or conclusions drawn from or based on this report must make reference to this report. If these form part of a main report relating to this investigation or report, this report must be included in its entirety as an appendix or separate section to the main report.

**COPYRIGHT**

Copyright on all documents, drawings and records, whether manually or electronically produced, which form part of the submission and any subsequent report or project document, shall vest in HCAC.

The client, on acceptance of any submission by HCAC and on condition that the client pays to HCAC the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit:

- The results of the project;
- The technology described in any report; and
- Recommendations delivered to the client.

Should the applicant wish to utilise any part of, or the entire report, for a project other than the subject project, permission must be obtained from HCAC to do so. This will ensure validation of the suitability and relevance of this report on an alternative project.

## REPORT OUTLINE

Appendix 6 of the GNR 326 EIA Regulations published on 7 April 2017 provides the requirements for specialist reports undertaken as part of the environmental authorisation process. In line with this, Table 1 provides an overview of Appendix 6 together with information on how these requirements have been met.

**Table 1. Specialist Report Requirements.**

Requirement from Appendix 6 of GN 326 EIA Regulation 2017	Chapter
(a) Details of - (i) the specialist who prepared the report; and (ii) the expertise of that specialist to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae	Section a Section 12
(b) Declaration that the specialist is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	<i>Declaration of Independence</i>
(c) Indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1
(cA) an indication of the quality and age of base data used for the specialist report	Section 3.4 and 7.1.
(cB) a description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change;	9
(d) Duration, Date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	Section 3.4
(e) Description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process inclusive of equipment and modelling used	Section 3
(f) details of an assessment of the specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the proposed activity or activities and its associated structures and infrastructure, inclusive of site plan identifying site alternatives;	Section 8 and 9
(g) Identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	Section 8 and 9
(h) Map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers	Section 8
(I) Description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge	Section 3.7
(j) a description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity <b>including identified alternatives on the environment</b> or activities;	Section 9
(k) Mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 10.1
(l) Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	Section 10. 1.
(m) Monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 10. 5.
(n) Reasoned opinion - (i) as to whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised; (iA) regarding the acceptability of the proposed activity or activities; and (ii) if the opinion is that the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan	Section 10.3
(o) Description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of preparing the specialist report	Section 6
(p) A summary and copies of any comments received during any consultation process and where applicable all responses thereto; and	Refer to EIR report
(q) Any other information requested by the competent authority	Section 13

**Executive Summary**

Eris Property Group appointed Lokisa Environmental Consultants as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to conduct the BAR process in order to obtain an Environmental Authorisation (EA) for the proposed Sagewood Filling Station located on Erven 1323 and 1324 Sagewood Ext 6, in the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province. HCAC was appointed to conduct a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the project and the study area was assessed on desktop level and by a non-intrusive field survey. Key findings of the assessment include:


- The surrounding area is extensively developed through shopping malls, township and road developments that would have impacted on surface indicators of heritage sites if any ever existed in the area.
- The study area is fallow for a number of years and after the high rainfall experienced grass cover is high limiting archaeological visibility.
- During the survey, no heritage resources of significance were recorded and no further pre-construction mitigation is required.

The project is in line with surrounding land use and the impact of the project on heritage resources is low and the project can commence based on the adherence to the recommendations in this report and the approval of SAHRA.

**Recommendations:**

- Implementation of a chance find procedure for the project.

**Declaration of Independence**

<b>Specialist Name</b>	Jaco van der Walt
<b>Declaration of Independence</b>	<p>I declare, as a specialist appointed in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No 108 of 1998) and the associated 2014 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, that I:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I act as the independent specialist in this application;</li> <li>• I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant;</li> <li>• I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;</li> <li>• I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this application, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;</li> <li>• I will comply with the Act, Regulations and all other applicable legislation;</li> <li>• I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;</li> <li>• I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;</li> <li>• All the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct; and</li> <li>• I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 48 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act.</li> </ul>
<b>Signature</b>	
<b>Date</b>	03/23/2021

**a) Expertise of the specialist**

Jaco van der Walt has been practising as a CRM archaeologist for 15 years. He obtained an MA degree in Archaeology from the University of the Witwatersrand focussing on the Iron Age in 2012 and is a PhD candidate at the University of Johannesburg focussing on Stone Age Archaeology with specific interest in the Middle Stone Age (MSA) and Later Stone Age (LSA). Jaco is an accredited member of ASAPA (#159) and have conducted more than 500 impact assessments in Limpopo, Mpumalanga, North West, Free State, Gauteng, KZN as well as he Northern and Eastern Cape Provinces in South Africa.

Jaco has worked on various international projects in Zimbabwe, Botswana, Mozambique, Lesotho, DRC Zambia and Tanzania. Through this, he has a sound understanding of the IFC Performance Standard requirements, with specific reference to Performance Standard 8 – Cultural Heritage.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>REPORT OUTLINE</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE</b> .....	<b>6</b>
A) EXPERTISE OF THE SPECIALIST.....	6
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>GLOSSARY</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE:</b> .....	<b>12</b>
1.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	12
1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	13
1.3 ALTERNATIVES .....	13
<b>2 LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>3 METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>18</b>
3.1 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	18
3.2 GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY AND GOOGLE EARTH MONUMENTS.....	18
3.3 PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:.....	18
3.4 SITE INVESTIGATION.....	19
3.5 SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATING.....	21
3.6 IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY.....	22
3.7 LIMITATIONS AND CONSTRAINTS OF THE STUDY .....	23
<b>4 DESCRIPTION OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>5 RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>6 LITERATURE / BACKGROUND STUDY:</b> .....	<b>24</b>
6.1 LITERATURE REVIEW (SAHRIS) .....	24
6.2 BACKGROUND TO THE GENERAL AREA .....	25
6.4 GRAVES AND BURIAL SITES.....	31
<b>7 DESCRIPTION OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>8 FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>9 POTENTIAL IMPACT</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>10 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>35</b>
10.1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONDITION OF AUTHORISATION.....	35
10.2. CHANCE FIND PROCEDURES .....	35



10.3. REASONED OPINION ..... 35

10.4. POTENTIAL RISK ..... 36

10.5. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS ..... 37

10.6. MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR INCLUSION IN THE EMPr ..... 38

10.7. KNOWLEDGE GAPS ..... 39

**11. REFERENCES..... 40**

**12. APPENDICES:..... 41**

CURRICULUM VITAE OF SPECIALIST ..... 41

**LIST OF FIGURES**

FIGURE 1-1. REGIONAL SETTING (1: 250 000 TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP)..... 14

FIGURE 1-2: LOCAL SETTING (1:50 000 TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP)..... 15

FIGURE 1-3. AERIAL IMAGE OF THE DEVELOPMENT FOOTPRINT..... 16

FIGURE 3-1: TRACKLOG OF THE SURVEY IN GREEN..... 20

FIGURE 6-1. 1964 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP INDICATING ROAD DEVELOPMENTS. .... 27

FIGURE 6-2. 1975 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP INDICATING NO DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN THE STUDY AREA ALTHOUGH THE SURROUNDING AREA INCLUDES ROAD DEVELOPMENTS. .... 28

FIGURE 6-3. 1995 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP OF THE STUDY AREA INDICATING INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENTS SURROUNDING THE STUDY AREA..... 29

FIGURE 6-4. 2005 GOOGLE IMAGE OF THE STUDY AREA..... 30

FIGURE 6-5. 2008 GOOGLE IMAGE OF THE STUDY AREA INDICATING SURROUNDING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS AND ROADS. .... 30

FIGURE 6-6. 2015 GOOGLE IMAGE INDICATING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ADJACENT TO THE STUDY AREA. .... 31

FIGURE 7-1. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS WITH HIGH VEGETATION COVER..... 32

FIGURE 7-2. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS WITH HIGH VEGETATION COVER..... 32

FIGURE 7-3. ACCESS ROAD MARKING THE EASTERN BOUNDARY OF THE SITE. .... 32

FIGURE 7-4. SEWAGE FLOWING THROUGH THE STUDY AREA. .... 32

FIGURE 8-1. PALEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY OF THE POWERLINE (YELLOW POLYGON) IS INDICATED AS INSIGNIFICANT. .... 33

**LIST OF TABLES**

TABLE 1. SPECIALIST REPORT REQUIREMENTS.....	4
TABLE 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	13
TABLE 3: INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROJECT ACTIVITIES .....	13
TABLE 4: SITE INVESTIGATION DETAILS .....	19
TABLE 5. HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATINGS.....	22
TABLE 6. STUDIES CONSULTED FOR THE PROJECT .....	24
TABLE 8. IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT.....	34
TABLE 9. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PROJECT.....	37
TABLE 10. HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR EMPR IMPLEMENTATION .....	38

**ABBREVIATIONS**

ASAPA: Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
BGG Burial Ground and Graves
BIA: Basic Impact Assessment
CFPs: Chance Find Procedures
CMP: Conservation Management Plan
CRR: Comments and Response Report
CRM: Cultural Resource Management
DEA: Department of Environmental Affairs
EA: Environmental Authorisation
EAP: Environmental Assessment Practitioner
ECO: Environmental Control Officer
EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment*
EIA: Early Iron Age*
EIA Practitioner: Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner
EMPr: Environmental Management Programme
ESA: Early Stone Age
ESIA: Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
GIS Geographical Information System
GPS: Global Positioning System
GRP Grave Relocation Plan
HIA: Heritage Impact Assessment
LIA: Late Iron Age
LSA: Late Stone Age
MEC: Member of the Executive Council
MIA: Middle Iron Age
MPRDA: Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, 2002 (Act No. 28 of 2002)
MSA: Middle Stone Age
NEMA National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998)
NHRA National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999)
NID Notification of Intent to Develop
NoK Next-of-Kin
PRHA: Provincial Heritage Resource Agency
SADC: Southern African Development Community
SAHRA: South African Heritage Resources Agency

*\*Although EIA refers to both Environmental Impact Assessment and the Early Iron Age both are internationally accepted abbreviations and must be read and interpreted in the context it is used.*

**GLOSSARY**

Archaeological site (remains of human activity over 100 years old)

Early Stone Age (~ 2.6 million to 250 000 years ago)

Middle Stone Age (~ 250 000 to 40-25 000 years ago)

Later Stone Age (~ 40-25 000, to recently, 100 years ago)

The Iron Age (~ AD 400 to 1840)

Historic (~ AD 1840 to 1950)

Historic building (over 60 years old)

## 1 Introduction and Terms of Reference:

HCAC was appointed to conduct a HIA for the proposed development of a filling station to accommodate 115 000 litres of fuel on Erven 1323 and 1324 Sagewood Ext 6, in the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province (Figure 1-1 to 1-4). The report forms part of Basic Assessment (BA) and Environmental Management Programme Report (EMPr) for the development.

The aim of the study is to survey the proposed development footprint to identify cultural heritage sites, document, and assess their importance within local, provincial and national context. It serves to assess the impact of the proposed project on non-renewable heritage resources, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the responsible cultural resources management measures that might be required to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner. It is also conducted to protect, preserve and develop such resources within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act No 25 of 1999). The report outlines the approach and methodology utilized before and during the survey, which includes: Phase 1, review of relevant literature; Phase 2, the physical surveying of the area on foot and by vehicle; Phase 3, reporting the outcome of the study.

During the survey, no heritage features were recorded. General site conditions and features on sites were recorded by means of photographs, GPS locations and site descriptions. Possible impacts were identified and mitigation measures are proposed in the following report. SAHRA as a commenting authority under section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) require all environmental documents, compiled in support of an Environmental Authorisation application as defined by NEMA EIA Regulations section 40 (1) and (2), to be submitted to SAHRA for commenting. Upon submission to SAHRA the project will be automatically given a case number as reference. As such the EIA report and its appendices must be submitted to the case as well as the EMPr, once it's completed by the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP).

### 1.1 Terms of Reference

#### Field study

Conduct a field study to: (a) locate, identify, record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical, or cultural interest; b) record GPS points of sites/areas identified as significant areas; c) determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources affected by the proposed development.

#### Reporting

Report on the identification of anticipated and cumulative impacts the operational units of the proposed project activity may have on the identified heritage resources for all 3 phases of the project, i.e., construction, operation and decommissioning phases. Consider alternatives, should any significant sites be impacted adversely by the proposed project. Ensure that all studies and results comply with the relevant legislation, SAHRA minimum standards and the code of ethics and guidelines of ASAPA.

To assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, and to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act No 25 of 1999).

## 1.2 Project Description

The project comprises the proposed construction of a filling station as described in Table 2 and 3.

**Table 2: Project Description**

<b>Farm and portions</b>	Erven 1323 and 1324 Sagewood Ext 6
<b>Magisterial District</b>	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province
<b>Central co-ordinate of the development</b>	25°56'45.03"S 28° 6'31.46"E

**Table 3: Infrastructure and project activities**

<b>Type of development</b>	Filling Station
<b>Size of development</b>	Less than 5 hectares
<b>Project Components</b>	The proposed project entails the construction of a filling station that is to accommodate 115 000 litres of fuel on site.

## 1.3 Alternatives

No alternatives were provided to be assessed although the extent of the area assessed allows for siting of the development to minimise impacts to heritage resources.




Figure 1-1. Regional setting (1: 250 000 topographical map).




Figure 1-2: Local setting (1:50 000 topographical map).






Figure 1-3. Aerial image of the development footprint.

## 2 Legislative Requirements

The HIA, as a specialist sub-section of the EIA, is required under the following legislation:

- National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), Act No. 25 of 1999
- National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), Act No. 107 of 1998 - Section 23(2)(b)
- Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA), Act No. 28 of 2002 - Section 39(3)(b)(iii)

A Phase 1 HIA is a pre-requisite for development in South Africa as prescribed by SAHRA and stipulated by legislation. The overall purpose of heritage specialist input is to:

- Identify any heritage resources, which may be affected;
- Assess the nature and degree of significance of such resources;
- Establish heritage informants/constraints to guide the development process through establishing thresholds of impact significance;
- Assess the negative and positive impact of the development on these resources; and
- Make recommendations for the appropriate heritage management of these impacts.

The HIA should be submitted, as part of the impact assessment report or EMPr, to the PHRA if established in the province or to SAHRA. SAHRA will ultimately be responsible for the evaluation of Phase 1 HIA reports upon which review comments will be issued. 'Best practice' requires Phase 1 HIA reports and additional development information, as per the impact assessment report and/or EMPr, to be submitted in duplicate to SAHRA after completion of the study. SAHRA accepts Phase 1 HIA reports authored by professional archaeologists, accredited with ASAPA or with a proven ability to do archaeological work.

Minimum accreditation requirements include an Honours degree in archaeology or related discipline and 3 years post-university CRM experience (field supervisor level). Minimum standards for reports, site documentation and descriptions are set by ASAPA in collaboration with SAHRA. ASAPA is based in South Africa, representing professional archaeology in the SADC region. ASAPA is primarily involved in the overseeing of ethical practice and standards regarding the archaeological profession. Membership is based on proposal and secondment by other professional members.

Phase 1 HIA's are primarily concerned with the location and identification of heritage sites situated within a proposed development area. Identified sites should be assessed according to their significance. Relevant conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations should be made. Recommendations are subject to evaluation by SAHRA.

Conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations, as approved by SAHRA, are to be used as guidelines in the developer's decision-making process.

Phase 2 archaeological projects are primarily based on salvage/mitigation excavations preceding development destruction or impact on a site. Phase 2 excavations can only be conducted with a permit, issued by SAHRA to the appointed archaeologist. Permit conditions are prescribed by SAHRA and includes (as minimum requirements) reporting back strategies to SAHRA and deposition of excavated material at an accredited repository.

In the event of a site conservation option being preferred by the developer, a site management plan, prepared by a professional archaeologist and approved by SAHRA, will suffice as minimum requirement.

After mitigation of a site, a destruction permit must be applied for with SAHRA by the applicant before development may proceed.

Human remains older than 60 years are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act, with reference to Section 36. Graves older than 60 years, but younger than 100 years fall under Section 36 of Act 25 of 1999 (National Heritage Resources Act), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and are the jurisdiction of SAHRA. The procedure for Consultation Regarding Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36[5]) of Act 25 of 1999 is applicable to graves older than 60 years that are situated outside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority. Graves in this age category, located inside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority, require the same authorisation as set out for graves younger than 60 years, in addition to SAHRA authorisation. If the grave is not situated inside a formal cemetery, but is to be relocated to one, permission from the local authority is required and all regulations, laws and by-laws, set by the cemetery authority, must be adhered to.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are protected under Section 2(1) of the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance (Ordinance No. 7 of 1925), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and are the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the relevant Provincial Department of Health and must be submitted for final approval to the office of the relevant Provincial Premier. This function is usually delegated to the Provincial MEC for Local Government and Planning; or in some cases, the MEC for Housing and Welfare. Authorisation for exhumation and reinternment must also be obtained from the relevant local or regional council where the grave is situated, as well as the relevant local or regional council to where the grave is being relocated. All local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws must also be adhered to. To handle and transport human remains, the institution conducting the relocation should be authorised under Section 24 of Act 65 of 1983 (Human Tissues Act).

### 3 METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Literature Review

A brief survey of available literature was conducted to extract data and information on the area in question to provide general heritage context into which the development would be set. This literature search included published material, unpublished commercial reports and online material, including reports sourced from the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS).

#### 3.2 Genealogical Society and Google Earth Monuments

Google Earth and 1:50 000 maps of the area were utilised to identify possible places where sites of heritage significance might be located; these locations were marked and visited during the fieldwork phase. The database of the Genealogical Society was consulted to collect data on any known graves in the area.

#### 3.3 Public Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement:

Stakeholder engagement is a key component of any EIA process, it involves stakeholders interested in, or affected by the proposed development. Stakeholders are provided with an opportunity to raise issues of concern (for the purposes of this report only heritage related issues will be included). The aim of the public consultation process was to capture and address any issues raised by community members and other stakeholders during key stakeholder and public meetings. The process involved:

- Placement of advertisements and site notices
- Stakeholder notification (through the dissemination of information and meeting invitations);
- Stakeholder meetings undertaken with I&APs;
- Authority Consultation
- The compilation of Basic Assessment Report (BAR).

### 3.4 Site Investigation

The aim of the site survey was to:

- a) survey the proposed project area to locate, identify, record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interest;
- b) record GPS points of sites/areas identified as significant areas;
- c) determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources recorded in the project area.

**Table 4: Site Investigation Details**

	Site Investigation
Date	25 Feb 2021
Season	Summer- Ground visibility was low due to dense vegetation as well as sewerage and dumping across the study area (Figure 3-1).




Figure 3-1: Tracklog of the survey in green.

### 3.5 Site Significance and Field Rating

Section 3 of the NHRA distinguishes nine criteria for places and objects to qualify as 'part of the national estate' if they have cultural significance or other special value. These criteria are:

- Its importance in/to the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- Its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects;
- Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa;
- Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

The presence and distribution of heritage resources define a 'heritage landscape'. In this landscape, every site is relevant. In addition, because heritage resources are non-renewable, heritage surveys need to investigate an entire project area, or a representative sample, depending on the nature of the project. In the case of the proposed project the local extent of its impact necessitates a representative sample and only the footprint of the areas demarcated for development were surveyed. In all initial investigations, however, the specialists are responsible only for the identification of resources visible on the surface. This section describes the evaluation criteria used for determining the significance of archaeological and heritage sites. The following criteria were used to establish site significance with cognisance of Section 3 of the NHRA:

- The unique nature of a site;
- The integrity of the archaeological/cultural heritage deposits;
- The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site;
- The location of the site in relation to other similar sites or features;
- The depth of the archaeological deposit (when it can be determined/is known);
- The preservation condition of the sites; and
- Potential to answer present research questions.

In addition to this criteria field ratings prescribed by SAHRA (2006), and acknowledged by ASAPA for the SADC region, were used for the purpose of this report. The recommendations for each site should be read in conjunction with section 10 of this report.

**Table 5. Heritage significance and field ratings**

<b>FIELD RATING</b>	<b>GRADE</b>	<b>SIGNIFICANCE</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED MITIGATION</b>
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1	-	Conservation; national site nomination
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2	-	Conservation; provincial site nomination
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3A	High significance	Conservation; mitigation not advised
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3B	High significance	Mitigation (part of site should be retained)
Generally Protected A (GP. A)	-	High/medium significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GP. B)	-	Medium significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GP.C)	-	Low significance	Destruction

### 3.6 Impact Assessment Methodology

The criteria below are used to establish the impact rating on sites:

- The **nature**, which shall include a description of what causes the effect, what will be affected and how it will be affected.
- The **extent**, wherein it will be indicated whether the impact will be local (limited to the immediate area or site of development) or regional, and a value between 1 and 5 will be assigned as appropriate (with 1 being low and 5 being high):
- The **duration**, wherein it will be indicated whether:
  - \* the lifetime of the impact will be of a very short duration (0-1 years), assigned a score of 1;
  - \* the lifetime of the impact will be of a short duration (2-5 years), assigned a score of 2;
  - \* medium-term (5-15 years), assigned a score of 3;
  - \* long term (> 15 years), assigned a score of 4; or
  - \* permanent, assigned a score of 5;
- The **magnitude**, quantified on a scale from 0-10 where; 0 is small and will have no effect on the environment, 2 is minor and will not result in an impact on processes, 4 is low and will cause a slight impact on processes, 6 is moderate and will result in processes continuing but in a modified way, 8 is high (processes are altered to the extent that they temporarily cease), and 10 is very high and results in complete destruction of patterns and permanent cessation of processes.
- The **probability of occurrence**, which shall describe the likelihood of the impact actually occurring. Probability will be estimated on a scale of 1-5 where; 1 is very improbable (probably will not happen), 2 is improbable (some possibility, but low likelihood), 3 is probable (distinct possibility), 4 is highly probable (most likely) and 5 is definite (impact will occur regardless of any prevention measures).
- The **significance**, which shall be determined through a synthesis of the characteristics described above and can be assessed as low, medium or high; and
- the **status**, which will be described as either positive, negative or neutral.
- the degree to which the impact can be reversed.
- the degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources.
- the *degree* to which the impact can be mitigated.

The **significance** is calculated by combining the criteria in the following formula:

$$S=(E+D+M) P$$

S = Significance weighting

E = Extent

D = Duration

M = Magnitude

P = Probability

The **significance weightings** for each potential impact are as follows:

- < 30 points: Low (i.e., where this impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area),
- 30-60 points: Medium (i.e., where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area unless it is effectively mitigated),
- 60 points: High (i.e., where the impact must have an influence on the decision process to develop in the area).

### 3.7 Limitations and Constraints of the study

The authors acknowledge that the brief literature review is not exhaustive on the literature of the area. Due to the nature of heritage resources and pedestrian surveys, the possibility exists that some features or artefacts may not have been discovered/recorded and the possible occurrence of graves and other cultural material cannot be excluded. Similarly, the depth of cultural deposits and the extent of heritage sites cannot be accurately determined due its subsurface nature. This report only deals with the footprint area of the proposed development and consisted of non-intrusive surface surveys. This study did not assess the impact on medicinal plants and intangible heritage as it is assumed that these components would have been highlighted through the public consultation process if relevant. It is possible that new information could come to light in future, which might change the results of this Impact Assessment.

## 4 Description of Socio-Economic Environment

Stats SA provides the following information: According to 2011 census the City of Johannesburg Local Municipality has a total population of 4,4 million of which 76,4% are black African, 12,3% are white people, 5,6% are coloured people, and 4,9% are Indian/Asian. Of those 20 years and older 3,4% have completed primary school, 32,4% have some secondary education, 34,9% have completed matric, 19,2% have some form of higher education, and 2.9% of those aged 20 years and older have no form of schooling. There are 2 261 490 economically active (employed or unemployed but looking for work) people in the City of Johannesburg; of these 25,0% are unemployed. Of the 1 228 666 economically active youth (15–35 years) in the area, 31,5% are unemployed.



## 5 Results of Public Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement:

### 5.1.1 Stakeholder Identification

Adjacent landowners and the public at large were informed of the proposed activity as part of the BA process. Site notices and advertisements notifying interested and affected parties were placed at strategic points and in local newspapers as part of the process.

## 6 Literature / Background Study:

### 6.1 Literature Review (SAHRIS)

Twenty-four sites are on record for the larger geographical area at the Wits database. These sites consist of Stone Age (ESA & LSA), Late Iron Age, engraving sites and cemeteries. None of these sites are located within or close to the project area but provide a background of to the sites that can be expected. The following CRM reports were consulted for this report as outlined in Table 6 highlighting the lack of significant sites in the area:

Table 6. Studies consulted for the project

Author	Year	Project	Findings
Kusel, U.	2007	Cultural Heritage Resources Impact Assessment of Portion 29 Of the Farm Lindley 528 JQ Lanseria Gauteng	No Sites were recorded
Pelser, A.	2011	A Report on A Heritage Impact Assessment for The Proposed Lanseria Commercial Crossing Development on Various Portions of Bultfontein 533 JQ, Nooitgedacht 534 JQ And Nietgedacht 535 JQ, Near Lanseria Gauteng	Informal cemeteries were identified
Kitto, J.	2013	Proposed Establishment of a New Industrial Township on Portions 38 And 39 Of the Farm Bultfontein No. 533-JQ, Lanseria, City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province Heritage Impact Assessment Report.	Modern Structures and graves were recorded
Van Schalkwyk	2013	Basic Cultural Heritage Assessment for The Proposed Bulk Water Supply Pipeline Between Lanseria And Cosmos City, Gauteng Province. Unpublished Report.	No Sites were recorded
Van der Walt, J.	2015 a	Archaeological Impact Assessment for The Proposed Kya Sand Extension 104 Township Development, Gauteng	No Sites were recorded
Van der Walt, J.	2015b	Archaeological Impact Assessment for The Proposed Township Development on Portion 96 Of the Farm Lindley 528 J.Q. Lanseria, Gauteng Province.	No Sites were recorded
Van der Walt, J.	2016	Archaeological impact assessment for the proposed Nietgedacht building waste storage, handling and distribution facility, Gauteng Province	No Sites recorded
Van der Walt, J.	2017	Heritage Impact Assessment Heron Bridge Sports Field Development, Gauteng Province.	No Sites were recorded.
Van der Walt, J.	2018	Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed K33 Upgrade Gauteng Province	Graves, structures
Van der Walt, J.	2018	Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Cedar Road Development. Gauteng Province.	No sites were recorded
Van der Walt, J.	2018	Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Nietgedacht P71 Filling Station. Gauteng Province.	A Stone cairn was recorded.

### 6.1.1 Genealogical Society and Google Earth Monuments

No known grave sites are indicated in the study area.

## 6.2 Background to the general area

### 6.2.1 Archaeology of the area

The archaeological record for the greater study area consists of the Stone Age and Iron Age.

#### 6.2.1.1 Stone Age

South Africa has a long and complex Stone Age sequence of more than 2 million years. The broad sequence includes the Later Stone Age, the Middle Stone Age and the Earlier Stone Age. Each of these phases contain sub-phases or industrial complexes, and within these we can expect regional variation regarding characteristics and time ranges. Excavations by Mason (1997) at the Boulders shopping centre (approximately 12 km to the south west of the current study area) was aimed at interpreting the cultural layering of the Midrand area and provides a good platform for understanding the cultural use of the wider landscape. He identified 7 occupational layers in his excavations that can be broadly divided into Stone Age, Iron Age and historical occupations.

The Stone Age can be divided in three main phases as follows;

- Later Stone Age; associated with Khoi and San societies and their immediate predecessors. Recently to ~30 thousand years ago.
- Middle Stone Age; associated with Homo sapiens and archaic modern humans. 30-300 thousand years ago.
- Earlier Stone Age; associated with early Homo groups such as Homo habilis and Homo erectus. 400 000-> 2 million years ago.

Remains dating to all three of these phases were identified by Mason at the Boulders shopping Centre site, MSA and LSA material was also recorded at Glennferness cave on the farm Witkoppen located 30 km to the west. The Iron Age of the region consists of Tswana speaking people who settled in the area from the early 16<sup>th</sup> century. J. S. Bergh's historical atlas of the four northern provinces of South Africa is a very useful source for the writing of local and regional history. The study area is located about 34 km north east of the Melville Koppies, which is a Middle Stone-Age site. (Bergh 1999: 4) This area was also important to Iron Age communities, since these people had smelted and worked iron ore at the Melville Koppies site since the year 1060, by approximation. (Bergh 1999: 7, 87)

There is evidence of the use of the larger area by Stone Age communities for example along the Kliprivier where ESA and MSA tools were recorded. The greater study area is located in the vicinity of the Linksfield and Primrose Middle Stone Age terrains (Bergh 1999: 4-8). For the Later Stone Age, some petroglyphs occur to the south at Redan as well as along the Vaal River (Bergh 1999).

#### 6.2.1.2 The Iron Age

The Iron Age as a whole represents the spread of Bantu speaking people and includes both the pre-Historic and Historic periods. It can be divided into three distinct periods:

- The Early Iron Age: Most of the first millennium AD.
- The Middle Iron Age: 10th to 13th centuries AD
- The Late Iron Age: 14th century to colonial period.

The Iron Age is characterised by the ability of these early people to manipulate and work Iron ore into implements that assisted them in creating a favourable environment to make a better living.

Regarding the Iron Age, the Smelting Site at Melville Koppies requires further mention. The site was excavated by Professor Mason from the Department of Archaeology of the University of Witwatersrand (WITS) in the 1980's. Extensive stone walled sites are also recorded further south at Klipriviers Berg Nature Reserve belonging to the Late Iron Age period. A large body of research is available on this area. These sites (Taylor's Type N, Mason's Class 2 & 5) are now collectively referred to as Klipriviersberg (Huffman 2007). These settlements are complex in that aggregated settlements are common, the outer wall sometimes includes scallops to mark back courtyards, there are more small stock kraals, and straight walls separate households in the residential zone. These sites date to the 18th and 19th centuries and was built by people in the Fokeng cluster.

In this area, the Klipriviersberg walling would have ended at approximately AD 1823, when Mzilikazi entered the area (Rasmussen 1978). This settlement type may have lasted longer in other areas because of the positive interaction between Fokeng and Mzilikazi.

The Difaqane (Sotho), or Mfekane ("the crushing" in Nguni) was a time of bloody upheavals in Natal and on the Highveld, which occurred around the early 1820's until the late 1830's (Bergh 1999: 10). It came about in response to heightened competition for land and trade, and caused population groups like gun-carrying Griquas and Shaka's Zulus to attack other tribes. (Bergh 1999: 14; 116-119) It seems that, in 1827, Mzilikazi's Ndebele started moving through the area where Johannesburg is located today. This group went on raids to various other areas in order to expand their area of influence (Bergh 1999: 11). In this area, the Klipriviersberg walling would have ended at about AD 1823, when Mzilikazi entered the area (Rasmussen 1978). This settlement type may have lasted longer in other areas because of the positive interaction between Fokeng and Mzilikazi.

### 6.3 Historical Information

During the time of the Difaqane, a northwards migration of white settlers from the Cape was also taking place. Some travellers, missionaries and adventurers had gone on expeditions to the northern areas in South Africa, some already as early as the 1720's. It was however only by the late 1820's that a mass-movement of Dutch speaking people in the Cape Colony started advancing into the northern areas. This was due to feelings of mounting dissatisfaction caused by economical and other circumstances in the Cape. This movement later became known as the Great Trek.

This migration resulted in a massive increase in the extent of that proportion of modern South Africa dominated by people of European descent (Ross 2002: 39). By 1939 to 1940, farm boundaries were drawn up in an area that includes the present-day Johannesburg and Krugersdorp (Bergh 1999: 15).

The first settlers moved in the Midrand area in the 1820s, this included hunters, traders, missionaries and other travellers. Voortrekker farmers such as Frederik Andries Strydom and Johannes Elardus Erasmus established the farms Olifantsfontein and Randjesfontein respectively around the 1840's and this indicated permanent occupation of the area by white settlers. These early white settlers and their descendants were often buried on their farms and formal and informal graves and graveyards can be expected anywhere on the landscape (Van Schalkwyk 1998).

### 6.3.1 Anglo-Boer War

The Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) also impacted the Midrand area. The area was a key focus of the British war effort for a short period of time when the British forces under Lord Roberts advanced through Midrand from Johannesburg while travelling to Pretoria. Pretoria was occupied on 5 June 1900.

Some British military units were stationed close to the study area this includes the Eskom Academy of Learning (approximately 8km southwest) as well as Bibury Grange (17 km to the west). No major battles took place in Midrand. Conflict in the area was defined by the Boer attempts to sabotage the railway line as well as attacks on troop trains. A notable incident was the successful Boer demolition of the railway culvert near the Pinedene Station (Van Schalkwyk 1998).

During the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) there was a skirmish between Boer and British forces near Olifantsfontein, while there was also a Black Concentration Camp built by the British near Olifantsfontein station/railway (Bergh 1999: 51; 55).

### 6.3.2 Cultural Landscape

Land use in the area consist of infrastructure developments (Figure 6-1 – 6-3) indicated on Topographic Maps from 1964 onwards and more intensive residential and commercial developments from 2005 onwards (Figure 6-4 – 6-6).




Figure 6-1. 1964 Topographic map indicating road developments.




Figure 6-2. 1975 Topographic map indicating no developments within the study area although the surrounding area includes road developments.




Figure 6-3. 1995 Topographic map of the study area indicating infrastructure developments surrounding the study area.



Figure 6-4. 2005 Google Image of the study area.



Figure 6-5. 2008 Google image of the study area indicating surrounding residential developments and roads.



Figure 6-6. 2015 Google image indicating the construction of the commercial development adjacent to the study area.

#### 6.4 Graves and Burial Sites

Graves and cemeteries are widely distributed across the landscape and can be expected anywhere.



## 7 Description of the Physical Environment

The study area is currently an open area located in an urban center. The study area is covered with dense knee-high vegetation obscuring visibility. The study area is fallow with raw sewerage draining downslope from the nearby shopping mall.



Figure 7-1. General site conditions with high vegetation cover.



Figure 7-2. General site conditions with high vegetation cover.




Figure 7-3. Access road marking the eastern boundary of the site.



Figure 7-4. Sewage flowing through the study area.

## 8 Findings of the Survey

It is important to note that only the development footprint of the project was surveyed over 1 day. The study area is characterised by high vegetation cover after the recent rains, limiting archaeological visibility. Based on the SAHRA Paleontological map the area (Fig 8-1) is of insignificant paleontological sensitivity and no further studies are required for this aspect. Extensive developments in the area would have impacted on surface evidence of heritage resources if any ever existed within the development site and no heritage features of high significance were noted during the field work.



Colour	Sensitivity	Required Action
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 paleontological studies are required however a protocol for finds is required
GREY	INSIGNIFICANT/ZERO	No palaeontological studies are required
WHITE/CLEAR	UNKNOWN	These areas will require a minimum of a desktop study. As more information comes to light, SAHRA will continue to populate the map.

Figure 8-1. Paleontological Sensitivity of the powerline (yellow polygon) is indicated as insignificant.

## 9 Potential Impact

Based on the current lay-out no direct impact is expected on heritage resources (Table 8).

### 9.1.1 Pre-Construction phase

It is assumed that the pre-construction phase involves the removal of topsoil and vegetation as well as the establishment of infrastructure needed for the construction phase. These activities can have a negative and irreversible impact on heritage features if any occur. Impacts include destruction or partial destruction of non-renewable heritage resources.

### 9.1.2 Construction Phase

During this phase, the impacts and effects are similar in nature but more extensive than the pre-construction phase. Potential impacts include destruction or partial destruction of non-renewable heritage resources.

### 9.1.3 Operation Phase:

Table 7. Impact assessment of the proposed project.

Activity:	Construction and Operation				
Impact:	During the construction and operation phase activities resulting in disturbance of surfaces and/or sub-surfaces may destroy, damage, alter, or remove from its original position archaeological material or objects				
Significance rating:	Duratio n	Extent	Magnitude	Probability	Significance
Pre-Mitigation	5	2	4	2	22
Post-Mitigation	5	1	2	2	16
Is the Impact Reversible?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to heritage resources are irreversible. No recorded features of significance will be impacted on.</li> </ul>				
Mitigation Measures:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of a chance find procedure.</li> </ul>				
Cumulative impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The greater study area has been impacted on by surrounding developments with few heritage resources recorded and the current development will not impact on significant heritage resources and therefore the cumulative impact is low.</li> </ul>				
Residual impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although surface sites can be avoided or mitigated, there is a chance that completely buried sites would still be impacted on, but this cannot be quantified.</li> </ul>				

## 10 Conclusion and recommendations

The proposed project is in an area that has been developed from prior to 1967. The surrounding area has been completely transformed for residential and commercial developments. These activities would have impacted on surface indicators of heritage resources if any ever existed in the study area. The proposed project is in an area that is generally speaking of low heritage significance with few cultural heritage sites on record (e.g., Kusel, 2007, Van Schalkwyk 2013, Van der Walt, 2015 a and b, 2016, 2017 and 2018)

The lack of heritage sites of significance was confirmed during the site survey, and no significant heritage resources were noted. The impact of the project on heritage resources is low and the project can commence based on the adherence to the recommendations in this report and the approval of SAHRA.

### 10.1. Recommendations for condition of authorisation

The following recommendations for Environmental Authorisation apply and the project may only proceed based on approval from SAHRA:

- Implementation of a chance find procedure for the project (as outlined below).

### 10.2. Chance Find Procedures

The possibility of the occurrence of subsurface finds cannot be excluded. Therefore, if during construction any possible finds such as stone tool scatters, artefacts or bone and fossil remains are made, the operations must be stopped, and a qualified archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the find and therefore chance find procedures should be put in place as part of the EMP. A short summary of chance find procedures is discussed below.

This procedure applies to the developer's permanent employees, its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, and service providers. The aim of this procedure is to establish monitoring and reporting procedures to ensure compliance with this policy and its associated procedures. Construction crews must be properly inducted to ensure they are fully aware of the procedures regarding chance finds as discussed below.

- If during the pre-construction phase, construction, operations or closure phases of this project, any person employed by the developer, one of its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, or service provider, finds any artefact of cultural significance or heritage site, this person must cease work at the site of the find and report this find to their immediate supervisor, and through their supervisor to the senior on-site manager.
- It is the responsibility of the senior on-site Manager to make an initial assessment of the extent of the find and confirm the extent of the work stoppage in that area.
- The senior on-site Manager will inform the ECO of the chance find and its immediate impact on operations. The ECO will then contact a professional archaeologist for an assessment of the finds who will notify the SAHRA.

### 10.3. Reasoned Opinion

The overall impact of the project is considered acceptable based on the adherence to the recommendations in this report and approval from SAHRA prior to development. The socio-economic benefits also outweigh the possible impacts of the development if the correct mitigation measures are implemented for the project.

**10.4 Potential risk**

Potential risks to the proposed project are the occurrence of intangible features and unrecorded cultural resources (of which graves are the highest risk). This can cause delays during construction, as well as additional costs involved in mitigation, as well as require additional layout changes.

## 10.5 Monitoring Requirements

Ideally, site monitoring should be conducted by an experienced archaeologist or heritage specialist. Day to day monitoring can be conducted by the Environmental Officers (EO). The EO or other responsible persons should be trained along the following lines:

- *Induction training:* Responsible staff identified by the developer should attend a short course on heritage management and identification of heritage resources.
- *Site monitoring and watching brief:* As most heritage resources occur below surface, all earth-moving activities need to be routinely monitored in case of accidental discoveries. The greatest potential impacts are the initial soil removal and subsequent earthworks during construction. The EO should monitor all such activities daily. If any heritage resources are found, the chance finds procedure must be followed as outlined above.

Table 8. Monitoring requirements for the project

Heritage Monitoring					
Aspect	Area	Responsible for monitoring and measuring	Frequency	Proactive or reactive measurement	Method
Clearing activities and Excavations	Entire project area	EO	Weekly – during construction phase	Proactively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If risks are manifested (accidental discovery of heritage resources) the chance find procedure should be implemented:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cease all works immediately;</li> <li>2. Report incident to the Sustainability Manager;</li> <li>3. Contact an archaeologist to inspect the site;</li> <li>4. Report incident to the competent authority; and</li> <li>5. Employ reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with the requirements of the relevant authorities.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Only recommence operations once impacts have been mitigated.</li> </ul>

## 10.6 Management Measures for inclusion in the EMPr

Table 9. Heritage Management Plan for EMPr implementation

Area	Mitigation measures	Phase	Timeframe	Responsible party for implementation	Target	Performance indicators (monitoring tool)
<b>General project area</b>	Implement chance find procedures in case possible heritage finds are uncovered	Ground clearance, excavations as well as construction and operation	Throughout the project	Applicant EAP	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35, 36 and 38 of NHRA	EO Checklist/Report

### 10.7 KNOWLEDGE GAPS

Due to the subsurface nature of heritage resources and limited archaeological visibility due to high vegetation cover, the possibility of discovery of heritage resources during the construction phase cannot be excluded. This limitation is successfully mitigated with the implementation of a chance find procedure.



## 11. References

- Archaeological Database Wits University Referenced 2009
- Bergh, J.S., (ed.) Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik Uitgewers. 1999.
- Huffman, T.N. 2007. Handbook to the Iron Age: The Archaeology of Pre-Colonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, Scottsville.
- Kitto, J. 2013. Proposed Establishment Of A New Industrial Township On Portions 38 And 39 Of The Farm Bultfontein No. 533-JQ, Lanseria, City Of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province Heritage Impact Assessment Report. Unpublished report.
- Kusel, U. 2007. Cultural Heritage Resources Impact Assessment Of Portion 29 Of The Farm Lindley 528 JQ Lanseria Gauteng. Unpublished report
- Nair, C. 2020. Access Design And Stormwater Management Proposals For The Proposed Filling Station On Portion 179 Of The Farm Nietgedacht 535-Jq (Access Off K33 Provincial Route).
- Pelser, A. 2011. A Report On A Heritage Impact Assessment For The Proposed Lanseria Commercial Crossing Development On Various Portions Of Bultfontein 533 JQ, Nooitgedacht 534 JQ And Nietgedacht 535 JQ, Near Lanseria Gauteng. Unpublished report.
- Rasmussen, R.K. 1978 Migrant kingdom: Mzilikazi's Ndebele in South Africa. London: Rex Collings
- Ross, R. A concise history of South Africa. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. 1999.
- SAHRA Report Mapping Project Version 1.0, 2009
- SAHRIS (Cited 2018)
- Van Schalkwyk, J. 2013. Basic Cultural Heritage Assessment for The Proposed Bulk Water Supply Pipeline Between Lanseria And Cosmos City, Gauteng Province. Unpublished Report.
- Van der Walt, J. 2015. Archaeological Impact Assessment for The Proposed Kya Sand Extension 104 Township Development, Gauteng
- Van der Walt, J. 2015b. Archaeological Impact Assessment for The Proposed Township Development on Portion 96 Of the Farm Lindley 528 J.Q. Lanseria, Gauteng Province.
- Van der Walt, J. 2016. Archaeological impact assessment for the proposed Nietgedacht building waste storage, handling and distribution facility, Gauteng Province
- Van der Walt, J. 2017. Heritage Impact Assessment HeronBridge Sports Field Development, Gauteng Province.
- Van der Walt, J. 2018a. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed filling station on Portion 71 Nietgedacht. Gauteng Province.
- Van der Walt, J. 2018 b. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed K33 Road Development. Gauteng Province.

**12. Appendices:****Appendix A  
Curriculum Vitae of Specialist**

Jaco van der Walt  
Archaeologist

jaco.heritage@gmail.com  
+27 82 373 8491  
+27 86 691 6461

**Education:****Particulars of degrees/diplomas and/or other qualifications:**

<b>Name of University or Institution:</b>	University of Pretoria
<b>Degree obtained</b> :	BA Heritage Tourism & Archaeology
<b>Year of graduation</b> :	2001
<b>Name of University or Institution:</b>	University of the Witwatersrand
<b>Degree obtained</b> :	BA Hons Archaeology
<b>Year of graduation</b> :	2002
<b>Name of University or Institution</b> :	University of the Witwatersrand
<b>Degree Obtained</b> :	MA (Archaeology)
<b>Year of Graduation</b> :	2012
<b>Name of University or Institution</b> :	University of Johannesburg
<b>Degree</b> :	PhD
<b>Year</b> :	Currently Enrolled

**EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:**

2011 – Present:	<b>Owner – HCAC (Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC).</b>
2007 – 2010 :	<b>CRM Archaeologist</b> , Managed the Heritage Contracts Unit at the University of the Witwatersrand.
2005 - 2007:	<b>CRM Archaeologist</b> , Director of Matakoma Heritage Consultants
2004:	<b>Technical Assistant</b> , Department of Anatomy University of Pretoria
2003:	<b>Archaeologist</b> , Mapungubwe World Heritage Site
2001 - 2002:	<b>CRM Archaeologists</b> , For R & R Cultural Resource Consultants, Polokwane
2000:	<b>Museum Assistant</b> , Fort Klapperkop.

**Countries of work experience include:**

Republic of South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Tanzania, The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho and Zambia.

**SELECTED PROJECTS INCLUDE:****Archaeological Impact Assessments (Phase 1)**

Heritage Impact Assessment Proposed Discharge Of Treated Mine Water Via The Wonderfontein Spruit Receiving Water Body Specialist as part of team conducting an Archaeological Assessment for the Mmamabula mining project and power supply, Botswana

Archaeological Impact Assessment Mmamethlake Landfill

Archaeological Impact Assessment Libangeni Landfill

**Linear Developments**

Archaeological Impact Assessment Link Northern Waterline Project At The Suikerbosrand Nature Reserve

Archaeological Impact Assessment Medupi – Spitskop Power Line,

Archaeological Impact Assessment Nelspruit Road Development

**Renewable Energy developments**

Archaeological Impact Assessment Karoshoek Solar Project

**Grave Relocation Projects**

Relocation of graves and site monitoring at Chlookop as well as permit application and liaison with local authorities and social processes with local stakeholders, Gauteng Province.

Relocation of the grave of Rifle Man Maritz as well as permit application and liaison with local authorities and social processes with local stakeholders, Ndumo, Kwa Zulu Natal.

Relocation of the Magolwane graves for the office of the premier, Kwa Zulu Natal

Relocation of the OSuthu Royal Graves office of the premier, Kwa Zulu Natal

**Phase 2 Mitigation Projects**

Field Director for the Archaeological Mitigation For Booyendal Platinum Mine, Steelpoort, Limpopo Province. Principle investigator Prof. T. Huffman

Monitoring of heritage sites affected by the ARUP Transnet Multipurpose Pipeline under directorship of Gavin Anderson.

Field Director for the Phase 2 mapping of a late Iron Age site located on the farm Kameelbult, Zeerust, North West Province. Under directorship of Prof T. Huffman.

Field Director for the Phase 2 surface sampling of Stone Age sites effected by the Medupi – Spitskop Power Line, Limpopo Province

**Heritage management projects**

Platreef Mitigation project – mitigation of heritage sites and compilation of conservation management plan.

---

**MEMBERSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS:**


---

- Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists. Member number 159  
Accreditation:
  - Field Director                      Iron Age Archaeology
  - Field Supervisor                  Colonial Period Archaeology, Stone Age  
Archaeology and Grave Relocation
- Accredited CRM Archaeologist with SAHRA
- Accredited CRM Archaeologist with AMAFA
- Co-opted council member for the CRM Section of the Association of Southern African Association Professional Archaeologists (2011 – 2012)

---

**PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**


---

- A Culture Historical Interpretation, Aimed at Site Visitors, of the Exposed Eastern Profile of K8 on the Southern terrace at Mapungubwe.
  - J van der Walt, A Meyer, WC Nienaber
  - Poster presented at Faculty day, Faculty of Medicine University of Pretoria 2003
- 'n Reddingsondersoek na Anglo-Boereoorlog-ammunisie, gevind by Ifafi, Noordwes-Provinsie. South-African Journal for Cultural History 16(1) June 2002, with A. van Vollenhoven as co-writer.
- Fieldwork Report: Mapungubwe Stabilization Project.
  - WC Nienaber, M Hutten, S Gaigher, J van der Walt
  - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2004
- A War Uncovered: Human Remains from Thabantšho Hill (South Africa), 10 May 1864.
  - M. Steyn, WS Boshoff, WC Nienaber, J van der Walt
  - Paper read at the 12<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Pan-African Archaeological Association for Prehistory and Related Studies 2005
- Field Report on the mitigation measures conducted on the farm Bokfontein, Brits, North West Province .
  - J van der Walt, P Birkholtz, W. Fourie
  - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2007
- Field report on the mitigation measures employed at Early Farmer sites threatened by development in the Greater Sekhukhune area, Limpopo Province. J van der Walt
  - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2008
- Ceramic
- J]nalysis of an Early Iron Age Site with vitrified dung, Limpopo Province South Africa.
  - J van der Walt. Poster presented at SAFA, Frankfurt Germany 2008

- Bantu Speaker Rock Engravings in the Schoemanskloof Valley, Lydenburg District, Mpumalanga (*In Prep*)
  - J van der Walt and J.P Celliers
- Sterkspruit: Micro-layout of late Iron Age stone walling, Lydenburg, Mpumalanga. W. Fourie and J van der Walt. A Poster presented at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2011
- Detailed mapping of LIA stone-walled settlements' in Lydenburg, Mpumalanga. J van der Walt and J.P Celliers
  - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2011
- Bantu-Speaker Rock engravings in the Schoemanskloof Valley, Lydenburg District, Mpumalanga. J.P Celliers and J van der Walt
  - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2011
- Pleistocene hominin land use on the western trans-Vaal Highveld ecoregion, South Africa, Jaco van der Walt.
  - J van der Walt. Poster presented at SAFA, Toulouse, France. Biennial Conference 2016

---

**REFERENCES:**


---

1. Prof Marlize Lombard      Senior Lecturer, University of Johannesburg, South Africa  
E-mail: mlombard@uj.ac.za
2. Prof TN Huffman      Department of Archaeology Tel: (011) 717 6040  
University of the Witwatersrand
3. Alex Schoeman      University of the Witwatersrand  
E-mail: Alex.Schoeman@wits.ac.za