



AFRICAN HERITAGE CONSULTANTS CC

2001/077745/23

DR. UDO S KÜSEL

Tel/fax: (012) 567 6046

Cell: 082 498 0673

E-mail: udo.heritage@absamail.co.za

P.O. Box 652

Magalieskruin

0150

2006 08 01

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ON THE FARM KAFFERSKRAAL 475 JR CULLINAN

1. DEFINITION

The broad generic term *Cultural Heritage Resources* refers to any physical and spiritual property associated with past and present human use or occupation of the environment, cultural activities and history. The term includes sites, structures, places, natural features and material of palaeontological, archaeological, historical, aesthetic, scientific, architectural, religious, symbolic or traditional importance to specific individuals or groups, traditional systems of cultural practice, belief or social interaction.

2. PROTECTED SITES IN TERMS OF THE NATIONAL HERITAGE ACT, Act. NO. 25 OF 1999

The following are the most important sites and objects protected by the National Heritage Act:

- Structures or parts of structures older than 60 years
- Archaeological sites and objects
- Palaeontological sites
- Meteorites
- Ship wrecks
- Burial grounds
- Graves of victims of conflict
- Public monuments and memorials

- Structures, places and objects protected through the publication of notices in the Gazette and Provincial Gazette
- Any other places or object which are considered to be of interest or of historical or cultural significance
- Geological sites of scientific or cultural importance
- Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa
- Objects to which oral traditions are attached
- Sites of cultural significance or other value to a community or pattern of South African history

3. METHODOLOGY

The site was visited and inspected on foot. All appropriate documents on the area were studied.

4. RESULTS

After the good rains of the summer the grass and weeds on the farm are in some areas two meter tall which makes the finding of cultural heritage resources extremely difficult. The vegetation is typical High veld grassland. A large portion ($\pm 40\%$) of the proposed development area has been ploughed over a long period of time. Any cultural heritage resources, which might have existed in the ploughed areas, would have been destroyed.

The following cultural heritage resources have been found:

- Cemetery (± 150 graves). A very large cemetery has been found just east of the Eskom premises. Most of the graves are unmarked. The oldest marked grave dates to 1933. The grass in the cemetery is very tall which makes the finding of individual graves very difficult. There are about 150 graves, most probably those of farm workers. Some of the graves have recently been cleared of grass and are still visited by relatives of the deceased (S25° 39' 23.7" and E 28° 32' 26.8") (see photograph 1).
- Cemetery (± 200 graves). This cemetery lies on the eastern boundary of the proposed development area. The site is also overgrown with tall grass. Most graves are unmarked. The oldest graves most probably also date to the 1930s. Some graves have been cleaned recently and are visited by relations of the deceased (S25° 39' 31.8" and E28° 33' 08.6") (see photograph 2).
- Single grave. At S25° 39' 00.1" and E28° 32' 36.7" a single possible grave was found near the ruin of a farm workers home. Though the heap of stones look like a typical African grave it might turn out not to be a grave. This site will need further investigation (see photograph 3).

- Ruins of farm workers settlements and houses were found at the following locations:

S25 39' 00.1"	E28° 32' 51.9"
S25 39' 03.8"	E28° 32' 48.4"
S25 39' 02.8"	E28° 32' 42.5"
S25 39' 00.9"	E28° 32' 38.9"
S25 38' 56.5"	E28° 32' 38.5"
S25 38' 57.5"	E28° 32' 37.4"
S25 39' 36.9"	E28° 32' 01.7"
S25 39' 36.3"	E28° 32' 04.5"

In some cases portions of the walls of the buildings are still standing. In most cases only the foundations are still visible (see photographs 4 and 5).

- Ruin of rondavel. The ruin of a brick and cement built rondavel was found at S25° 39' 31.9" and E28° 33' 08.6" (see photograph 6).

5. CONCLUSION

The proposed development area has been intensively farmed over a long period of time. The graves as well as the ruins of farm workers settlement and houses are an indication that a substantial number of farm workers families have been present on the farm for a long period. No people live on the farm at present and no oral history on the former residents could be recorded. What is important is that the two cemeteries be fenced off and made accessible to the family members of the deceased.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the two cemeteries be fenced in, cleaned of grass and weed and be kept as a feature in the new development. Provision should also be made for easy excess for family members of the deceased to visit the graves. It will be costly and impractical to move all the graves to a new site, though this might be an option.

The possible single grave needs more investigation by a grave relocation specialist.

As far as the ruins of farm workers settlements and homes are concerned it is extremely difficult to determine which of these fall in the sixty years clause of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act No. 25 of 1999. This can only be determined by a phase 2 investigation if specified by the Provincial Resources Authority.

PHOTOGRAPHS



No. 1. Two of the cleared graves in the western cemetery



No. 2. The eastern cemetery



No. 3. The possible single grave



No. 4. Ruin of farm workers house



No. 5. Remains of foundation of farm workers house



No. 6. Remains of rondavel