



wits enterprise

**Wits Commercial Enterprise
(Pty) Limited**

(Registration No: 2002/008461/07)
5th floor, Senate House, Jorissen Street,
2001 Braamfontein
Private Bag 3, 2050 Wits
South Africa

**Wandima
Environmental
Services**

**HERITAGE
ASSESSMENT**

**Marite Shopping
Centre, Marite,
Bushbuck Ridge,
Limpopo Province**

Version 1

11 October 2007

Service provider



MATAKOMA - ARM
HERITAGE CONTRACTS UNIT

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND
SCHOOL OF GEOGRAPHY, ARCHAEOLOGY AND
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES
PRIVATE BAG 3, P O WITS 2050
TEL: +27 82 851 3575 / +27 82 373 8491,
FAX: +27 717 6578
EMAIL: INFO@MATAKOMA.CO.ZA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT

CLIENT:

Wandima Environmental Services

CONTACT PERSON:

Mandla Mbuyane, Project Management,
Wandima Environmental Services,
Tel: 013 752 5452, Fax: 013 752 6877,
Cell: 082 558 7391,
E-mail: wandma@telkomsa.net

SIGNATURE:

LEADING CONSULTANT:

MATAKOMA-ARM Heritage Contracts Unit
for Wits Commercial Enterprise (Pty) Ltd

CONTACT PERSON:

Wouter Fourie

SIGNATURE:

Copyright

Copyright in 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 MATAKOMA-ARM. None of the documents, drawings or records may be used or applied in any manner, nor may they be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means whatsoever for or to any other person, without the prior written consent of MATAKOMA-ARM.

The Client, on acceptance of any submission by MATAKOMA-ARM and on condition that the Client pays to MATAKOMA-ARM the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit and for the specified project only:

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As we know from legislation the surveying, capturing and management of heritage resources is an integral part of the greater management plan laid down for any major development or historic existing operation. With the proclamation of the National Heritage Resources Act 1999 (Act 25 of 1999), this process has been laid down clearly. This legislation aims to underpin the existing legislation, which only addresses this issue at a glance, and gives guidance to developers and existing industries to the management of their Heritage Resources.

This document forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed Marite Shopping Centre, Marite, Bushbuck Ridge, Limpopo.

The following outline the findings of the report:

During the survey, seven cemeteries with 31 graves were identified.

The relocation of the graves in the seven cemeteries must be followed along the prescribed guidelines required for the granting of permits by the different Provincial Departments involved with such a relocation process.

The process must contain:

- Complete social consulting;
- Approval by families for relocation of the graves;
- Prescribed advertisements on site and in local newspapers;
- Permits applied for with the relevant Departments;
- Exhumation of the remains, according to acceptable standards and guidelines.

It is always prudent to use qualified persons and companies, with a proven track record, to complete the whole relocation process. MATAKOMA-ARM can be contacted on the process, and completion of such a process.

General

If during construction any possible finds are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist be contacted for an assessment of the find.

A heritage resources management plan must be developed for managing the heritage resources in the study area during construction and operation of the development. This includes

- ***basic training for construction staff on possible finds,***
- ***action steps for mitigation measures, surface collections, excavations and***
- ***communication routes to follow in the case of a discovery.***

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 6 |
| 2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY | 6 |
| 2.1 PHYSICAL SURVEYING | 7 |
| 3. WORKING WITH LEGISLATION | 7 |
| 4. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA | 8 |
| 4.1 IMPACT..... | 9 |
| 4.1.1 Nature and existing mitigation | 9 |
| 4.2 EVALUATION..... | 9 |
| 4.2.1 Site Significance..... | 9 |
| 4.2.2 Impact Rating | 10 |
| 4.2.3 Certainty | 11 |
| 4.2.4 Duration..... | 12 |
| 5. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF AREA | 13 |
| 5.1 STONE AGE..... | 13 |
| 5.2 IRON AGE..... | 13 |
| 5.3 HISTORIC TIMEFRAME | 14 |
| 6. SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE..... | 14 |
| 6.1 SITE 1 | 14 |
| 6.2 SITE 2 | 17 |
| 6.3 SITE 3 | 19 |
| 6.4 SITE 4 | 21 |
| 6.5 SITE 5 | 23 |
| 6.6 SITE 6..... | 25 |
| 6.7 SITE 7 | 27 |
| 7. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS | 29 |
| 8. LEGAL AND POLICY REQUIREMENTS | 29 |
| 9. ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 30 |
| 10. LIST OF PREPARES..... | 32 |
| 11. REFERENCES | 32 |

ANNEXURE

Annexure A – Locality Map

Annexure B – Map of Heritage Sites

FIGURES

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Figure 1: Route Alignment..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 2: Known archaeological sites in area..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 3: German Missions circa 1880..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 4: Grave in cemetery | 15 |
| Figure 5: Southern view of bridge | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 6: Memorial plaque on bridge..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 7: Grave in cemetery | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 8: Grave in cemetery | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 9: Grave in cemetery | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 10: Exposed sherds through animal activity | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 11: Grave in cemetery | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Figure 12: Stone cairn in middle with open air church to right. | Error! Bookmark not defined. |

1. INTRODUCTION

MATAKOMA-ARM Heritage Contracts Unit was contracted by Wandima Environmental Services to conduct an Heritage Assessment for the proposed Marite Shopping Centre, Marite, Bushbuck Ridge, Limpopo.

The aim of the study is to identify all heritage sites, document, and assess their importance within Local, Provincial and national context. From this we aim to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, in order to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the Kwazulu-Natal Heritage Act, 1997 (Act No. 10 of 1997).

The report outlines the approach and methodology utilised before and during the survey, which includes in Phase 1: Information collection from various sources and public consultations; Phase 2: Physical surveying of the area on foot and by vehicle; and Phase 3: Reporting the outcome of the study.

During the survey, seven cemeteries with 31 graves were identified. General site conditions and features on sites were recorded by means of photos, GPS location, and description. Possible impacts were identified and mitigation measures are proposed in the following report.

This report must also be submitted to SAHRA provincial office for scrutiny.

2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The aim of the study is to extensively cover all data available to compile a background history of the study area; this was accomplished by means of the following phases.

2.1 PHYSICAL SURVEYING

Due to the nature of cultural remains, the majority that occur below surface, a physical walk through of the route alignment was conducted. Matakoma - ARM Heritage Contract Unit were appointed to conduct a survey of the footprint of the proposed Marite Shopping Centre, Marite, Bushbuck Ridge, Limpopo. The study area (6ha) was surveyed over one day, by means of vehicle and extensive surveys on foot.

Aerial photographs and 1:50 000 maps of the area were consulted and literature of the area were studied before undertaking the survey. The purpose of this was to identify topographical areas of possible historic and pre-historic activity. All sites discovered both inside and bordering the proposed development area was plotted on 1:50 000 maps and their GPS co-ordinates noted. 35mm photographs on digital film were taken at all the sites.

3. WORKING WITH LEGISLATION

It is very important that cultural resources be evaluated according to the National Heritage Recourse Act. In accordance with the Act, we have found the following:

These sites are classified as important based on evaluation of the National Heritage Recourses Act 1999 (Act No 25 of 1999) section 3 (3).

A place or object is to be considered part of the national estate if it has cultural significance or other special value because of-

- (a) its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- (b) its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- (c) its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;

- (d) its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects;
- (e) its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- (f) its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- (g) its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- (h) its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa; and
- (i) sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

(Refer to Section 9 of this document for assessment)

These sites should be managed through using the National Heritage Recourses Act 1999 (Act No 25 of 1999) sections 4,5 and 6 and sections 39-47.

Please refer to Section 9 for Management Guidelines.

4. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

This chapter describes the evaluation criteria used for the sites listed below.

The significance of archaeological sites was based on four main criteria:

- **site integrity** (i.e. primary vs. secondary context),
- **amount of deposit, range of features** (e.g., stonewalling, stone tools and enclosures),
- **uniqueness** and
- **potential** to answer present research questions.

Management actions and recommended mitigation, which will result in a reduction in the impact on the sites, will be expressed as follows:

- A** - No further action necessary;
- B** - Mapping of the site and controlled sampling required;
- C** - Preserve site, or extensive data collection and mapping of the site; and
- D** - Preserve site

Impacts on these sites by the development will be evaluated as follows

4.1 IMPACT

The potential environmental impacts that may result from the proposed development activities.

4.1.1 Nature and existing mitigation

Natural conditions and conditions inherent in the project design that alleviate (control, moderate, curb) impacts. All management actions, which are presently implemented, are considered part of the project design and therefore mitigate against impacts.

4.2 EVALUATION

4.2.1 Site Significance

Site significance classification standards prescribed by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (2006) and approved by the Association for Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) for the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region, were used for the purpose of this report.

| FIELD RATING | GRADE | SIGNIFICANCE | RECOMMENDED MITIGATION |
|------------------------------|---------|-------------------|--|
| National Significance (NS) | Grade 1 | - | Conservation; National Site nomination |
| Provincial Significance (PS) | Grade 2 | - | Conservation; Provincial Site nomination |
| Local Significance | Grade | High Significance | Conservation; Mitigation |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|----------------------------|--|
| (LS) | 3A | | 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 |

4.2.2 Impact Rating

VERY HIGH

These impacts would be considered by society as constituting a major and usually permanent change to the (natural and/or social) environment, and usually result in **severe** or **very severe** effects, or **beneficial** or **very beneficial** effects.

Example: The loss of a species would be viewed by informed society as being of VERY HIGH significance.

Example: The establishment of a large amount of infrastructure in a rural area, which previously had very few services, would be regarded by the affected parties as resulting in benefits with a VERY HIGH significance.

HIGH

These impacts will usually result in long term effects on the social and/or natural environment. Impacts rated as HIGH will need to be considered by society as constituting an important and usually long term change to the (natural and/or social) environment. Society would probably view these impacts in a serious light.

Example: The loss of a diverse vegetation type, which is fairly common elsewhere, would have a significance rating of HIGH over the long term, as the area could be rehabilitated.

Example: The change to soil conditions will impact the natural system, and the impact on affected parties (in this case people growing crops on the soil) would be HIGH.

MODERATE

These impacts will usually result in medium- to long-term effects on the social and/or natural environment. Impacts

rated as MODERATE will need to be considered by society as constituting a fairly important and usually medium term change to the (natural and/or social) environment. These impacts are real but not substantial.

Example: The loss of a sparse, open vegetation type of low diversity may be regarded as MODERATELY significant.

Example: The provision of a clinic in a rural area would result in a benefit of MODERATE significance.

LOW

These impacts will usually result in medium to short term effects on the social and/or natural environment. Impacts rated as LOW will need to be considered by the public and/or the specialist as constituting a fairly unimportant and usually short term change to the (natural and/or social) environment. These impacts are not substantial and are likely to have little real effect.

Example: The temporary change in the water table of a wetland habitat, as these systems are adapted to fluctuating water levels.

Example: The increased earning potential of people employed as a result of a development would only result in benefits of LOW significance to people who live some distance away.

NO SIGNIFICANCE

There are no primary or secondary effects at all that are important to scientists or the public.

Example: A change to the geology of a particular formation may be regarded as severe from a geological perspective, but is of NO significance in the overall context.

4.2.3 Certainty

DEFINITE: More than 90% sure of a particular fact. Substantial supportive data exist to verify the assessment.

PROBABLE: Over 70% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of impact occurring.

POSSIBLE: Only over 40% sure of a particular fact or of the likelihood of an impact occurring.

UNSURE: Less than 40% sure of a particular fact or likelihood of an impact occurring.

4.2.4 Duration

SHORT TERM: 0 to 5 years

MEDIUM: 6 to 20 years

LONG TERM: more than 20 years

DEMOLISHED: site will be demolished or is already demolished

Example

Evaluation

| Impact | Impact Significance | Heritage Significance | Certainty | Duration | Mitigation |
|----------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| Negative | Moderate | Grade GP.B | Possible | Short term | B |

5. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF AREA

As heritage surveys deal with the locating of heritage resources in a prescribed cartographic landscape, the study of archival and historical data, and especially cartographic material, can represent a very valuable supporting tool in finding and identifying such heritage resources.

The historical background and timeframe can be divided into the Stone Age, Iron Age and Historical timeframe. These can be divided as follows:

5.1 STONE AGE

The Stone Age is divided in Early; Middle and Late Stone Age and refers to the earliest people of South Africa who mainly relied on stone for their tools.

Earlier Stone Age: The period from \pm 2.5 million yrs - \pm 250 000 yrs ago. Acheulean stone tools are dominant.

Middle Stone Age: Various lithic industries in SA dating from \pm 250 000 yrs – 22 000 yrs before present.

Later Stone Age: The period from \pm 22 000-yrs before present to the period of contact with either Iron Age farmers or European colonists.

5.2 IRON AGE

The Iron Age as a whole represents the spread of Bantu speaking people and includes both the Pre-Historic and Historic periods. Similar to the Stone Age it can be divided into three 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.

5.3 HISTORIC TIMEFRAME


17th Century to present AD (1600 – 2000)

The historic timeframe intermingles with the later parts of the Stone and Iron Age, and can loosely be regarded as times when written and oral recounts of incidents became available.

6. SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE

6.1 SITE 1


| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Description of Site: Site Number | | | |
| Map reference | Topo-sheet number | Number of Map report in Annexure B | |
| | | | |
| GPS coordinates: <i>Indicate Model and datum - WGS 84</i> | X | Y | |
| Garmin 38, WGS 84 | Refer to Table 1 | | |
| Site Data | Description | | |
| Type of site (e.g. open scatter; shell midden, cave /shelter); | Cemetery consisting of 3 graves. The family contact is Junice Letlapa, contact number: 0768868970 | | |
| Site categories (e.g. Earlier Stone Age, Late Iron Age); | Recent historic | | |
| Context (i.e. primary or secondary); | Primary | | |
| <i>Cultural affinities, approximate age and significant features of the site;</i> | Associated with the Letlapa family. | | |
| Estimation or measurement of the extent (maximum dimensions) and orientation of the | The cemetery is approximately 10mx10m | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| site(s); | |
| Depth and stratification of the site (where shovel test permits have been given), both in the text and through photographs of the sections; | None visible |
| Possible sources of information about past environments, such as stalactites/ stalagmites, flowstone, dassie middens, peat or organic rich deposits. | None |
| Photographs and diagrams (Figure numbers) |  <p>• Figure 1: Grave in cemetery</p> |
| Statement of Significance (Heritage Value) | The site is of high heritage significance. As it is linked to early settler communities of the area |
| Field Rating (Recommended grading or field significance) of the site: | Generally protected (GP.A) |
| Impact Evaluation of development on site | Impact on site is seen as possibly High negative |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Recommendations <i>including:</i> | Refer to Section 9 | | | | |
| Summary | | | | | |
| Field Rating | Impact | Impact Significance | Certainty | Duration | Mitigation |
| Grade GP.A | Negative | High | Possible | Long term | C |


6.2 SITE 2

| | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--|
| Description of Site: | | | |
| Site Number | | | |
| Map reference | Topo-sheet number | Number of Map in report | |
| | | Annexure B | |
| GPS coordinates: <i>Indicate Model and datum - WGS 84</i> | X | Y | |
| Garmin 38, WGS 84 | Refer to Table 1 | | |
| Site Data | Description | | |
| Type of site (e.g. open scatter; shell midden, cave /shelter); | Cemetery consisting of 5 graves. The family contact is Bishop Mtombeni living on site | | |
| Site categories (e.g. Earlier Stone Age, Late Iron Age); | Recent historic | | |
| Context (i.e. primary or secondary); | Primary | | |
| <i>Cultural affinities, approximate age and significant features of the site;</i> | Associated with the Mtombeni family. | | |
| Estimation or measurement of the extent (maximum dimensions) and orientation of the site(s); | The cemetery is approximately 10mx10m | | |
| Depth and stratification of the site (where shovel test permits have been given), both in the text and through photographs of the sections; | None visible | | |
| <i>Possible sources of information about past environments, such as stalactites/ stalagmites, flowstone, dassie middens, peat or organic rich deposits.</i> | None | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Photographs and diagrams (Figure numbers)</p> |  <p>• Figure 2: Grave in cemetery</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Statement of Significance (Heritage Value)</p> | <p>The site is of high heritage significance. As it is linked to early settler communities of the area</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating (Recommended grading or field significance) of the site:</p> | <p>Generally protected (GP.A)</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Impact Evaluation of development on site</p> | <p>Impact on site is seen as possibly High negative</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Recommendations including:</p> | <p>Refer to Section 9</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Summary</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating</p> | <p>Impact</p> | <p>Impact Significance</p> | <p>Certainty</p> | <p>Duration</p> | <p>Mitigation</p> | |
| <p>Grade GP.A</p> | <p>Negative</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>Possible</p> | <p>Long term</p> | <p>C</p> | |


6.3 SITE 3

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Description of Site: | | | |
| Site Number | | | |
| Map reference | Topo-sheet number | Number of Map in report | |
| | | Annexure B | |
| GPS coordinates: <i>Indicate Model and datum - WGS 84</i> | X | Y | |
| Garmin 38, WGS 84 | Refer to Table 1 | | |
| Site Data | Description | | |
| Type of site (e.g. open scatter; shell midden, cave /shelter); | Cemetery consisting of 2 graves. The family contact is Manzini on site | | |
| Site categories (e.g. Earlier Stone Age, Late Iron Age); | Recent historic | | |
| Context (i.e. primary or secondary); | Primary | | |
| <i>Cultural affinities, approximate age and significant features of the site;</i> | Associated with the Manzini family. | | |
| Estimation or measurement of the extent (maximum dimensions) and orientation of the site(s); | The cemetery is approximately 10mx10m | | |
| Depth and stratification of the site (where shovel test permits have been given), both in the text and through photographs of the sections; | None visible | | |
| <i>Possible sources of information about past environments, such as stalactites/ stalagmites, flowstone, dassie middens, peat or organic rich deposits.</i> | None | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>Photographs and diagrams (Figure numbers)</p> |  <p>• Figure 3: Grave in cemetery</p> | | | | |
| <p>Statement of Significance (Heritage Value)</p> | <p>The site is of high heritage significance. As it is linked to early settler communities of the area</p> | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating (Recommended grading or field significance) of the site:</p> | <p>Generally protected (GP.A)</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact Evaluation of development on site</p> | <p>Impact on site is seen as possibly High negative</p> | | | | |
| <p>Recommendations including:</p> | <p>Refer to Section 9</p> | | | | |
| <p>Summary</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating</p> | <p>Impact</p> | <p>Impact Significance</p> | <p>Certainty</p> | <p>Duration</p> | <p>Mitigation</p> |
| <p>Grade GP.A</p> | <p>Negative</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>Possible</p> | <p>Long term</p> | <p>C</p> |


6.4 SITE 4

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Description of Site: | | | |
| Site Number | | | |
| Map reference | Topo-sheet number | Number of Map in report | |
| | | Annexure B | |
| GPS coordinates: <i>Indicate Model and datum - WGS 84</i> | X | Y | |
| Garmin 38, WGS 84 | Refer to Table 1 | | |
| Site Data | Description | | |
| Type of site (e.g. open scatter; shell midden, cave /shelter); | Cemetery consisting of 12 graves. The family contact is Sergeant Matsane, contact number: 0826888610 | | |
| Site categories (e.g. Earlier Stone Age, Late Iron Age); | Recent historic | | |
| Context (i.e. primary or secondary); | Primary | | |
| <i>Cultural affinities, approximate age and significant features of the site;</i> | Associated with the Matsane and Brown families. | | |
| Estimation or measurement of the extent (maximum dimensions) and orientation of the site(s); | The cemetery is approximately 20mx20m | | |
| Depth and stratification of the site (where shovel test permits have been given), both in the text and through photographs of the sections; | None visible | | |
| <i>Possible sources of information about past environments, such as stalactites/ stalagmites, flowstone, dassie middens, peat or organic rich deposits.</i> | None | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Photographs and diagrams (Figure numbers)</p> |  <p>• Figure 4: Grave in cemetery</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Statement of Significance (Heritage Value)</p> | <p>The site is of high heritage significance. As it is linked to early settler communities of the area</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating (Recommended grading or field significance) of the site:</p> | <p>Generally protected (GP.A)</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Impact Evaluation of development on site</p> | <p>Impact on site is seen as possibly High negative</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Recommendations including:</p> | <p>Refer to Section 9</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Summary</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating</p> | <p>Impact</p> | <p>Impact Significance</p> | <p>Certainty</p> | <p>Duration</p> | <p>Mitigation</p> | |
| <p>Grade GP.A</p> | <p>Negative</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>Possible</p> | <p>Long term</p> | <p>C</p> | |


6.5 SITE 5

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Description of Site: | | | |
| Site Number | | | |
| Map reference | Topo-sheet number | Number of Map in report | |
| | | Annexure B | |
| GPS coordinates: <i>Indicate Model and datum - WGS 84</i> | X | Y | |
| Garmin 38, WGS 84 | Refer to Table 1 | | |
| Site Data | Description | | |
| Type of site (e.g. open scatter; shell midden, cave /shelter); | Cemetery consisting of 1 grave. The family contact is Sebata Mnisi, contact number: 0728550686 | | |
| Site categories (e.g. Earlier Stone Age, Late Iron Age); | Recent historic | | |
| Context (i.e. primary or secondary); | Primary | | |
| <i>Cultural affinities, approximate age and significant features of the site;</i> | Associated with the Matsane and Mnisi family. | | |
| Estimation or measurement of the extent (maximum dimensions) and orientation of the site(s); | The cemetery is approximately 10mx10m | | |
| Depth and stratification of the site (where shovel test permits have been given), both in the text and through photographs of the sections; | None visible | | |
| <i>Possible sources of information about past environments, such as stalactites/ stalagmites, flowstone, dassie middens, peat or organic rich deposits.</i> | None | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Photographs and diagrams (Figure numbers)</p> |  <p>• Figure 5: Grave in cemetery</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Statement of Significance (Heritage Value)</p> | <p>The site is of high heritage significance. As it is linked to early settler communities of the area</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating (Recommended grading or field significance) of the site:</p> | <p>Generally protected (GP.A)</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Impact Evaluation of development on site</p> | <p>Impact on site is seen as possibly High negative</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Recommendations including:</p> | <p>Refer to Section 9</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Summary</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating</p> | <p>Impact</p> | <p>Impact Significance</p> | <p>Certainty</p> | <p>Duration</p> | <p>Mitigation</p> | |
| <p>Grade GP.A</p> | <p>Negative</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>Possible</p> | <p>Long term</p> | <p>C</p> | |

6.6 SITE 6

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Description of Site: | | | |
| Site Number | | | |
| Map reference | Topo-sheet number | Number of Map in report | |
| | | Annexure B | |
| GPS coordinates: <i>Indicate Model and datum - WGS 84</i> | X | Y | |
| Garmin 38, WGS 84 | Refer to Table 1 | | |
| Site Data | Description | | |
| Type of site (e.g. open scatter; shell midden, cave /shelter); | Cemetery consisting of 1 grave. The family contact is Sebata Mnisi, contact number: 0728550686 | | |
| Site categories (e.g. Earlier Stone Age, Late Iron Age); | Recent historic | | |
| Context (i.e. primary or secondary); | Primary | | |
| <i>Cultural affinities, approximate age and significant features of the site;</i> | Associated with the Matsane and Mnisi family. | | |
| Estimation or measurement of the extent (maximum dimensions) and orientation of the site(s); | The cemetery is approximately 10mx10m | | |
| Depth and stratification of the site (where shovel test permits have been given), both in the text and through photographs of the sections; | None visible | | |
| <i>Possible sources of information about past environments, such as stalactites/ stalagmites, flowstone, dassie middens, peat or organic rich deposits.</i> | None | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Photographs and diagrams (Figure numbers)</p> |  <p>• Figure 6: Grave in cemetery</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Statement of Significance (Heritage Value)</p> | <p>The site is of high heritage significance. As it is linked to early settler communities of the area</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating (Recommended grading or field significance) of the site:</p> | <p>Generally protected (GP.A)</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Impact Evaluation of development on site</p> | <p>Impact on site is seen as possibly High negative</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Recommendations including:</p> | <p>Refer to Section 9</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Summary</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating</p> | <p>Impact</p> | <p>Impact Significance</p> | <p>Certainty</p> | <p>Duration</p> | <p>Mitigation</p> | |
| <p>Grade GP.A</p> | <p>Negative</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>Possible</p> | <p>Long term</p> | <p>C</p> | |

6.7 SITE 7

| | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--|
| Description of Site: | | | |
| Site Number | | | |
| Map reference | Topo-sheet number | Number of Map in report | |
| | 2930CB | Annexure B | |
| GPS coordinates: <i>Indicate Model and datum - WGS 84</i> | X | Y | |
| Garmin 38, WGS 84 | Refer to Table 1 | | |
| Site Data | Description | | |
| Type of site (e.g. open scatter; shell midden, cave /shelter); | Cemetery consisting of 7 graves. The family contact is Anici Fakude, contact number: 0733329341 | | |
| Site categories (e.g. Earlier Stone Age, Late Iron Age); | Recent historic | | |
| Context (i.e. primary or secondary); | Primary | | |
| <i>Cultural affinities, approximate age and significant features of the site;</i> | Associated with the Matshabe and Fakude families. | | |
| Estimation or measurement of the extent (maximum dimensions) and orientation of the site(s); | The cemetery is approximately 10mx10m | | |
| Depth and stratification of the site (where shovel test permits have been given), both in the text and through photographs of the sections; | None visible | | |
| <i>Possible sources of information about past environments, such as stalactites/ stalagmites, flowstone, dassie middens, peat or organic rich deposits.</i> | None | | |


| | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>Photographs and diagrams (Figure numbers)</p> |  <p>• Figure 7: Grave in cemetery</p> | | | | |
| <p>Statement of Significance (Heritage Value)</p> | <p>The site is of high heritage significance. As it is linked to early settler communities of the area</p> | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating (Recommended grading or field significance) of the site:</p> | <p>Generally protected (GP.A)</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact Evaluation of development on site</p> | <p>Impact on site is seen as possibly High negative</p> | | | | |
| <p>Recommendations including:</p> | <p>Refer to Section 9</p> | | | | |
| <p>Summary</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Field Rating</p> | <p>Impact</p> | <p>Impact Significance</p> | <p>Certainty</p> | <p>Duration</p> | <p>Mitigation</p> |
| <p>Grade GP.A</p> | <p>Negative</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>Possible</p> | <p>Long term</p> | <p>C</p> |

Table 1 – Family contacts

| Site Number | Number of graves | X | Y | Family Contact | Contact number |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Site 1 | 3 | -24.95682308 | 31.12996459 | Junice Letlapa | 0768868970 |
| Site 2 | 5 | -24.95708593 | 31.12984121 | Bishop Mtombeni | |
| Site 3 | 2 | -24.95657631 | 31.12904727 | Manzini | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|----|--------------|-------------|------------------|------------|
| Site 4 | 12 | -24.95452174 | 31.12868786 | Sergeant Matsane | 0826888610 |
| Site 5 | 1 | -24.95335766 | 31.12905800 | Sebata Mnisi | 072855068 |
| Site 6 | 1 | -24.95380827 | 31.12901509 | Sebata Mnisi | 072855068 |
| Site 7 | 7 | -24.95340594 | 31.12996459 | Anici Fakude | 0733329341 |

7. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Due to the nature of cultural remains that occur, in most cases, below surface, the possibility remains that some cultural remains may not have been discovered during the survey. Although MATAKOMA-ARM surveyed the area as thorough as possible, it is incumbent upon the developer to inform the relevant heritage agency should further cultural remains be unearthed or laid open during the process of development.

8. LEGAL AND POLICY REQUIREMENTS

In areas where there has not yet been a systematic survey to identify conservation worthy places, a permit is required to alter or demolish any structure older than 60 years. This will apply until a survey has been done and identified heritage resources are formally protected.

Archaeological and palaeontological sites, materials, and meteorites are the source of our understanding of the evolution of the earth, life on earth and the history of people. In the new legislation, permits are required to damage, destroy, alter, or disturb them. People who already possess material are required to register it.

The management of heritage resources are integrated with environmental resources and this means that before development takes place heritage resources are assessed and, if necessary, rescued.

In addition to the formal protection of culturally significant graves, all graves, which are older than 60 years and are not in a cemetery (such as ancestral graves in rural areas), are

protected. The legislation protects the interests of communities that have interest in the graves: they may be consulted before any disturbance takes place.

The graves of victims of conflict and those associated with the liberation struggle will be identified, cared for, protected and memorials erected in their honour.

Anyone who intends to undertake a development must notify the heritage resource authority and if there is reason to believe that heritage resources will be affected, an impact assessment report must be compiled at the developer's cost. Thus developers will be able to proceed without uncertainty about whether work will have to be stopped if a heritage resource is discovered.

9. ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*A map of Heritage Sites is provided in **Annexure A***

A summary of the recommendations for the cemeteries identified

During the survey seven cemeteries were found within foot print of the development area.

The relocation of the graves in the seven cemeteries must be followed along the prescribed guidelines required for the granting of permits by the different Provincial Departments involved with such a relocation process.

The process must contain:

- Complete social consulting;
- Approval by families for relocation of the graves;
- Prescribed advertisements on site and in local newspapers;
- Permits applied for with the relevant Departments;
- Exhumation of the remains, according to acceptable standards and guidelines.

It is always prudent to use qualified persons and companies, with a proven track record, to complete the whole

relocation process. MATAKOMA-ARM can be contacted on the process and completion of such a process.

General

If during construction any possible finds are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist be contacted for an assessment of the find.

A heritage resources management plan must be developed for managing the heritage resources in the study area during construction and operation of the development. This includes

- ***basic training for construction staff on possible finds,***
- ***action steps for mitigation measures, surface collections, excavations and***
- ***communication routes to follow in the case of a discovery.***

10. LIST OF PREPARES

Wouter Fourie, BA (Hon) Archaeology (UP)

11. REFERENCES

Australia ICOMOS. The Burra Charter (The Australian ICOMOS charter for places of cultural significance). 2002.

Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. 1994.

International Council of Monuments & Site Documents. Conventions, Charters and Guidelines. 2002.

Documents on Cultural Heritage Protection. 2002.

International Council of Monuments & Site Documents. Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy. 1985.

International Council of Monuments & Site Documents. Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance. 1984.

Australian Historic Themes. A Framework for use in Heritage Assessment and Management. Australian Heritage Commission. 2001.

ANNEXURE A:

Site Map

