

Comprehensive and Professional Solutions for all Heritage Related Matters
CK 2006/014630/23 VAT NO.: 4360226270

**PHASE 1 HIA REPORT FOR PROPOSED TOWNSHIP DEVELOPMENT ON PORTION 54 OF THE
FARM MMABATHO TOWN AND TOWNLANDS NO. 301-JO
MAFIKENG LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, NORTH WEST PROVINCE**

For:

***Maxim Planning Solutions
P.O. Box 6848
Flamwood
2572***

REPORT: **APAC021/78**

by:

***A.J. Pelser
Accredited member of ASAPA***

Assisted by A. Matabane: Reach Archaeology

September 2021

**P.O.BOX 73703
LYNNWOOD RIDGE
0040
Tel: 083 459 3091
Fax: 086 695 7247
Email: apac.heritage@gmail.com**

Member: AJ Pelser BA (UNISA), BA (Hons) (Archaeology), MA (Archaeology) [WITS]

©Copyright

APELSE ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSULTING

The information contained in this report is the sole intellectual property of APELSE Archaeological Consulting. It may only be used for the purposes it was commissioned for by the client.

DISCLAIMER:

Although all efforts are made to identify all sites of cultural heritage (archaeological and historical) significance during an assessment of study areas, the nature of archaeological and historical sites are as such that it is always possible that hidden or subterranean sites, features or objects could be overlooked during the study. APELSE Archaeological Consulting can't be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result thereof.

Clients & Developers should not continue with any development actions until SAHRA or one of its subsidiary bodies has provided final comments on this report. Submitting the report to SAHRA is the responsibility of the Client unless required of the Heritage Specialist as part of their appointment and Terms of Reference

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'A. El' or similar, located at the bottom center of the page.

SUMMARY

APelser Archaeological Consulting (APAC) was appointed by Maxim Planning Solutions to conduct a Phase 1 HIA for proposed township development in Mmabatho on Portion 54 of the farm Mmabatho Town and Townlands No. 301-JO (Mafikeng Local Municipality).

The project is conducted on instruction from King and Associates Engineering and Project Managers (Pty) Ltd (Registration No: 2017/209189/07) in their capacity as Programme Management Unit of the Department of Local Government and Human Settlements (North West) and in association with the Mafikeng Local Municipality.

Background research indicates that there are some cultural heritage sites and features in the larger geographical area within which the study area falls. The assessment of the study area identified a number of sites, features or material of cultural heritage (archaeological and/or historical) origin or significance located here. This report discusses the results of both the background research and physical assessment and provides recommendations on the required mitigation measures. The fieldwork was undertaken during the 27th and 28th of August 2021, APAC cc being assisted by a Specialist from Reach Archaeology.

It is recommended that the proposed development be allowed to continue, taking into consideration the recommendations put forward at the end of the report.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	5
3. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....	5
4. METHODOLOGY	8
5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA	9
6. DISCUSSION.....	14
7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	26
8. REFERENCES	27
APPENDIX A: DEFINITION OF TERMS:.....	29
APPENDIX B: DEFINITION/ STATEMENT OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.....	30
APPENDIX C: SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATING:	31
APPENDIX D: PROTECTION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES:.....	32
APPENDIX E: HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT PHASES.....	33

1. INTRODUCTION

APelser Archaeological Consulting (APAC) was appointed by Maxim Planning Solutions to conduct a Phase 1 HIA for proposed township development in Mmabatho on Portion 54 of the farm Mmabatho Town and Townlands No. 301-JO (Mafikeng Local Municipality).

The project is conducted on instruction from King and Associates Engineering and Project Managers (Pty) Ltd (Registration No: 2017/209189/07) in their capacity as Programme Management Unit of the Department of Local Government and Human Settlements (North West) and in association with the Mafikeng Local Municipality.

Background research indicates that there are some cultural heritage sites and features in the larger geographical area within which the study area falls. The assessment of the study area identified a number of sites, features or material of cultural heritage (archaeological and/or historical) origin or significance located here. This report discusses the results of both the background research and physical assessment and provides recommendations on the required mitigation measures.

The client indicated the location and boundaries of the study area and the assessment concentrated on this portion.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference for the study was to:

1. Identify all objects, sites, occurrences and structures of an archaeological or historical nature (cultural heritage sites) located on the portion of land that will be impacted upon by the proposed development;
2. Assess the significance of the cultural resources in terms of their archaeological, historical, scientific, social, religious, aesthetic and tourism value;
3. Describe the possible impact of the proposed development on these cultural remains, according to a standard set of conventions;
4. Propose suitable mitigation measures to minimize possible negative impacts on the cultural resources;
5. Review applicable legislative requirements;

3. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Aspects concerning the conservation of cultural resources are dealt with mainly in two Acts. These are the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998).

3.1. The National Heritage Resources Act

According to the Act the following is protected as cultural heritage resources:

- a. Archaeological artifacts, structures and sites older than 100 years
- b. Ethnographic art objects (e.g. prehistoric rock art) and ethnography
- c. Objects of decorative and visual arts
- d. Military objects, structures and sites older than 75 years
- e. Historical objects, structures and sites older than 60 years
- f. Proclaimed heritage sites
- g. Grave yards and graves older than 60 years
- h. Meteorites and fossils
- i. Objects, structures and sites of scientific or technological value.

The National Estate includes the following:

- a. Places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance
- b. Places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage
- c. Historical settlements and townscapes
- d. Landscapes and features of cultural significance
- e. Geological sites of scientific or cultural importance
- f. Sites of Archaeological and paleontological importance
- g. Graves and burial grounds
- h. Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery
- i. Movable objects (e.g. archaeological, paleontological, meteorites, geological specimens, military, ethnographic, books etc.)

A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is the process to be followed in order to determine whether any heritage resources are located within the area to be developed as well as the possible impact of the proposed development thereon. An Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) only looks at archaeological resources. An HIA must be done under the following circumstances:

- a. The construction of a linear development (road, wall, power line, canal etc.) exceeding 300m in length
- b. The construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length
- c. Any development or other activity that will change the character of a site and exceed 5 000m² or involve three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof
- d. Re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m²
- e. Any other category provided for in the regulations of SAHRA or a provincial heritage authority

Structures

Section 34 (1) of the Act states that no person may demolish any structure or part thereof which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.

A structure means any building, works, device or other facility made by people and which is fixed to land, and includes any fixtures, fittings and equipment associated therewith.

Alter means any action affecting the structure, appearance or physical properties of a place or object, whether by way of structural or other works, by painting, plastering or the decoration or any other means.

Archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites

Section 35(4) of the Act deals with archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites. The act states that no person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority (national or provincial)

- a. destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or paleontological site or any meteorite;
- b. destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or paleontological material or object or any meteorite;
- c. trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or paleontological material or object, or any meteorite; or
- d. bring onto or use at an archaeological or paleontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment that assists in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and paleontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.
- e. alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years as protected.

The above mentioned may only be disturbed or moved by an archaeologist, after receiving a permit from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA). In order to demolish such a site or structure, a destruction permit from SAHRA will also be needed.

Human remains

Graves and burial grounds are divided into the following:

- a. ancestral graves
- b. royal graves and graves of traditional leaders
- c. graves of victims of conflict
- d. graves designated by the Minister
- e. historical graves and cemeteries
- f. human remains

In terms of Section 36(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act, no person may, without a permit issued by the relevant heritage resources authority:

- a. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position of otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;
- b. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or
- c. bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are subject to provisions of the Human Tissue Act (Act 65 of 1983) and to local regulations. Exhumation of graves must conform to the standards set out in the **Ordinance on Excavations (Ordinance no. 12 of 1980)** (replacing the old Transvaal Ordinance no. 7 of 1925).

Permission must also be gained from the descendants (where known), the National Department of Health, Provincial Department of Health, Premier of the Province and local police. Furthermore, permission must also be gained from the various landowners (i.e. where the graves are located and where they are to be relocated to) before exhumation can take place.

Human remains can only be handled by a registered undertaker or an institution declared under the **Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983 as amended)**.

3.2. The National Environmental Management Act

This Act states that a survey and evaluation of cultural resources must be done in areas where development projects, that will change the face of the environment, will be undertaken. The impact of the development on these resources should be determined and proposals for the mitigation thereof are made.

Environmental management should also take the cultural and social needs of people into account. Any disturbance of landscapes and sites that constitute the nation's cultural heritage should be avoided as far as possible and where this is not possible the disturbance should be minimized and remedied.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. Survey of literature

A survey of available literature was undertaken in order to place the development area in an archaeological and historical context. The sources utilized in this regard are indicated in the bibliography.

4.2. Field survey

The field assessment section of the study was conducted according to generally accepted HIA practices and aimed at locating all possible objects, sites and features of heritage significance in the area of the proposed development. The location/position of all sites, features and objects is determined by means of a Global Positioning System (GPS) where possible, while detail photographs are also taken where needed.

The assessment was undertaken on foot (walk down) in accessible locations. Where physical safety was a concern, certain areas were avoided. Areas of interest were initially marked during the web-based geo-spatial review using high-definition site maps, and digital photographs as well as satellite imagery. Areas with the potential of containing archaeological features and other interest sites were focused on during the walk down. This included rocky outcrops, erosion dongas and unnatural clumps of trees and other vegetation.

4.3. Oral histories

People from local communities are sometimes interviewed in order to obtain information relating to the surveyed area. It needs to be stated that this is not applicable under all circumstances. When applicable, the information is included in the text and referred to in the bibliography. An oral interview with a community leader was done during the 27th of August 2021 (Day 1) telephonically and physically, and on the 28th of August (Day 2) a physical survey of the site was undertaken with the community leader present.

4.4. Documentation

All sites, objects, features and structures identified are documented according to a general set of minimum standards. Co-ordinates of individual localities are determined by means of the Global Positioning System (GPS). The information is added to the description in order to facilitate the identification of each locality.

5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

The study area & proposed development is located on Portion 54 of the farm Mmabatho Town and Townlands No. 301-JO in the Mahikeng Local Municipality of the North-West Province. The nearby rural development housing village of Lokaleng is located west and adjacent to the project area. The larger area consists of a transformed urban landscape with the central business district of Mahikeng nearby. The study area has an electrical servitude running across its northern region. The area is accessed via a gravel road from the R503 to the east of the N14 highway, with the North West University Agricultural Research Farm directly north of the access entrance on Molelwane Farm. The National Department of Justice (J Tac HQ North West) also has its public administrative building on the periphery of the larger farm portion in the north-eastern section of the proposed development area.

The topography of the larger study area is generally flat and open, with grassy plains and grazing fields. There are some areas with large trees and large grazing pasture dominates the sites. Most of the area is undisturbed, largely maintaining its natural and original vegetation. Visibility in general was fair, although in certain sections this was hampered by dense vegetation. Recent historical developments, including farming/agriculture, other infrastructural developments such as residential (rural villages and informal settlement), roads, power lines, dirt roads, footpaths and site destruction has impacted on the area and many sites and features that might have existed here in the past, would have been disturbed and/or destroyed to a large degree as a result. Despite this a fairly large number of sites of varying of significance are known to exist in the area, with a number identified and recorded during the field survey.

The larger area is currently being used for various illegal/informal activities that include the following:

- quarrying for building material, with the soil from the area being dug by shovel and hand by locals, and being sold for building material
- illegal dumping of sewerage and bio-waste material
- illegal dumping of building rubble and residential refuse
- the area is used for grazing livestock (cattle, goats, donkeys)
- a Railway line is located along the western boundary of the area
- Family members/descendants of individuals buried on the property visit the grave sites to conduct rituals



Figure 1: The location of the study area and proposed development footprint (Google Earth 2021).



Figure 2: General view of the study area (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 3: Eskom Powerlines has impacted on the area (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 4: Another general view of the study area (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 5: The area is extensively quarried by hand for sand/soil sold for building material (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 6: The informal dumping of building rubble and refuse occurs throughout the area (courtesy Reach Archaeology).

6. DISCUSSION

The Stone Age is the period in human history when lithic (stone) material was mainly used to produce tools. In South Africa the Stone Age can be divided basically into three periods. It is however important to note that dates are relative and only provide a broad framework for interpretation. A basic sequence for the South African Stone Age (Lombard et.al 2012) is as follows:

Earlier Stone Age (ESA) up to 2 million – more than 200 000 years ago

Middle Stone Age (MSA) less than 300 000 – 20 000 years ago

Later Stone Age (LSA) 40 000 years ago – 2000 years ago

It should also be noted that these dates are not a neat fit because of variability and overlapping ages between sites (Lombard et.al 2012: 125).

The LSA is represented in the area by a site called Thaba Sione approximately 60km southwest of Mafikeng. The site has a lithic tool industry and rock engravings and is still used as an ancestral site by the Zion Christian Church (Hutten 2012: 8). Stone Age tools were also found by Van Vollenhoven & Pelsler during a Phase 1 HIA for the Marang Estate Development in Mafikeng (Van Vollenhoven et.al. 2008: 10), while Hutten found a LSA site during his 2012 assessment for the Mafikeng Solar Park (p.14).

No Stone Age sites or material were identified in the study area during the August 2021 assessment. If any were to be present in the area it would be single or small scatters of stone tools.

The Iron Age is the name given to the period of human history when metal was mainly used to produce artifacts. In South Africa it can be divided in two separate phases (Bergh 1999: 96-98), namely:

Early Iron Age (EIA) 200 – 1000 A.D.

Late Iron Age (LIA) 1000 – 1850 A.D.

Huffman (2007: xiii) indicates that a Middle Iron Age should be included. His dates, which are widely accepted in archaeological circles, are:

Early Iron Age (EIA) 250 – 900 A.D.

Middle Iron Age (MIA) 900 – 1300 A.D.

Late Iron Age (LIA) 1300 – 1840 A.D.

A survey of the Groot Marico area to the north-east of Mafikeng documented more than 100 LIA sites adding to the well-known sites such as stone-walled complexes of Buispoort and Braklaagte, the Mmakgame megasite, the 18th century capital of the Hurusthwe at Kaditshwene and the copper mines of Dwarsberg in the Madikwe Game Reserve. All these sites are dated to between the 15th and 19th Centuries AD (Hutten 2012:8-9).

Although no significant Iron Age sites, features or material were identified in the study areas during the August 2021 fieldwork, one small undecorated piece of Iron Age-type pottery was recorded.

The historical age started with the first recorded oral histories in the area. The earliest European groups and travelers that moved through this part of the Northwest Province and Botswana included the Reverend John Campbell in 1820, David Hume, Centilivres Chase and James Collins in 1825, Robert Scoon and William McLuckie in 1827 and 1829 and Dr. Robert Moffat and Reverend James Archbell in 1829 (Bergh 1999: 12, 117-119).

Later the area was visited by Piet Meyer and Hans Dons de Lange and also David Hume in 1830. Hume again visited the area in 1832 with Hugh Millen. This was followed by Andrew Geddes Bain in 1834, the expedition of Dr. Andrew Smith in 1835 and William Cornwallis Harris in 1836 (Bergh 1999: 13, 119-122). The Voortrekkers moved into this area in the 1830's (Bergh 1999: 14). On 17 January 1837 the Battle of Mosega between the Voortrekkers and Mzilikazi occurred, just south of Zeerust (Bergh 1999: 14, 126). The country around Mafikeng started to be inhabited by European farmers between 1841 and 1850 (Bergh 1999: 15).

Information from Wikipedia

Mafikeng is the headquarters of the Barolong Boo Ratshidi people. The town was founded by Molema Tawana (c. 1822 – January 1882. Born in Khunwana during the difaqane period, Molema was the son of Kgosi Tawana of the Tshidi Barolong. Molema's brother and close confidant, Montshiwa, later became chief. During the period that the Tshidi Barolong resided at Thaba Nchu, where they found refuge during the difaqane, Molema was converted to Christianity by the Wesleyan missionaries based there. Molema's son and heir, Silas Molema, was educated at Healdtown College.

In 1857 Molema led an advance guard to scout out the area along the Molopo River. This was a familiar area as they had previously lived in nearby Khunwana. Molema settled at Mafikeng (known in its early years as "Molema's town"), while the main body of the Barolong under Montshiwa followed. But Montshiwa did not feel safe at Mafikeng due to the close presence and encroachment of the Boers in the Transvaal. He led his followers to Moshaneng in the territory of the Bangwaketse in present-day Botswana. Molema remained at Mafikeng to ensure that the Barolong retained a presence there. Several of Montshiwa's other brothers were also stationed at crucial sites in the proximity of the Molopo. Molema had to use all his diplomatic skills on several occasions to prevent Boer incursion and settlement near Mafikeng. He has been described as a man of "strong personality and exceptional gifts...and Montshiwa's chief counselor in vital matters". After negotiations with Molema, Montshiwa decided to return to Mafikeng in 1876.

Molema was a firm believer in Western education, having attended Healdtown; he opened a school for the Barolong once they had settled in the district. Molema became a farmer and businessman, as well as advising his brother Montshiwa. He died in 1882. One of his sons, Silas Molema, became a Doctor and historian of the Barolong.. The settlement was

named Mafikeng, a Setswana name meaning "place of stones". Later British settlers spelled the name as "Mafeking". The Jameson Raid started from Pitsani Pothlugo (or Potlogo) 24 miles (39 km) north of Mafeking on December 29, 1895. At the outbreak of the Second Boer War in 1899, the town was besieged. The Siege of Mafeking lasted 217 days from October 1899 to May 1900, and turned Robert Baden-Powell into a national hero. In September 1904, Lord Roberts unveiled an obelisk at Mafeking bearing the names of those who fell in defense of the town. In all, 212 people were killed during the siege, with more than 600 wounded. Boer losses were significantly higher.

Although it was outside the protectorate's borders, Mafeking served as capital of the Bechuanaland Protectorate from 1894 until 1965, when Gaborone was made the capital of what was to become Botswana. Mafeking also briefly served as capital of the pre-independence Bantustan of Bophuthatswana in the 1970s, before the adjoining town of Mmabatho was established as capital. Following a local referendum on the issue, Mafeking joined Bophuthatswana in 1980, three years after Bophuthatswana was awarded independence, and was renamed Mafikeng, and treated as a suburb of Mmabatho. Following the end of apartheid in 1994, the merged Mafikeng and Mmabatho was instated as capital of the new North-West Province under the name Mafikeng.

The town's name was first spelt by British settlers as Mafeking, but the name reverted to Mafikeng in 1980 following its incorporation into Bophuthatswana. In February 2010, Lulu Xingwana, the Minister of Arts and Culture, approved the town's name to be changed again to Mahikeng. Despite this the town's ANC-run local government and most local residents still refer to the town as Mafikeng both informally and formally.

A number of historical sites, features or material were identified during the study area assessment. Details on these are discussed below

Results of the August 2021 Study Area Assessment

Over and above the single undecorated piece of Iron Age-type pottery found, numerous historical sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the recent historic period were identified in the study area. These included destroyed, dilapidated and run down houses and structures of brick, mortar and stone. No other structures or features were noted beyond those mapped. Four (4) burial grounds were also identified in the study and proposed development area footprint.




Figure 7: The location of dilapidated or destroyed structural remains within the general area of interest identified in the desktop survey, relative to the identified Grave Sites 1-4 (Google Earth 2021 – courtesy Reach Archaeology).

Seven (7) sites with the remains of houses and other structures were identified in the area. None of these are however deemed of any heritage significance.




Figure 8: Map showing location of remains of structures and houses (Google Earth 2021 – courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 9: The remains of one of the houses in the area at Site 1 (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 10: Site 2 remains of house (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 11: Remains at Site 3 (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 12: Piece of undecorated Iron Age-type pottery found in the area (courtesy Reach Archaeology).

Four (4) burial grounds/cemeteries were identified in the study and proposed development area footprint.




Figure 13: The location of the 4 burial grounds/cemeteries in the area (Google Earth 2021 – courtesy Reach Archaeology)

Grave Site 1

Grave Site 1 contains 10 visible Graves. The graves are demarcated with stones and none has any headstones. No grave goods were visible. The graves have a south-west alignment. The age of the graves are unknown and could be older than 60 years of age. The site is not fenced-in. According to information provided the site is visited by descendants and the graves are linked to the Ramarumo family.

Grave Site 2

There are 5 visible Graves at Site 2. Once again the graves are only demarcated with stones without any headstones, while no grave goods were identified at the site. The graves are also linked to the Ramarumo family whose descendants do visit the site. Some of the graves have been destroyed by people digging them up for the obtaining of skeletal remains for use in traditional medicines since 2020. The age of the graves are not known and could be older than 60 years of age. The site is not fenced-in and the graves also have a south-west alignment.

Grave Site 3

Site 3 has 6 visible Graves. The graves are stone-packed without any headstones and are also in a south-west alignment. No grave goods could be seen. Again, the site is not fenced-in, but is well maintained by descendants visiting the site from time to time. The age of the graves are not known.

Grave Site 4

Site 4 contains 9 visible Graves. Most of the graves are only demarcated with stones, but two with granite headstones are situated here as well. Some of the unmarked graves could be older than 60 years of age. The graves have a south-west alignment and the site is not fenced-in.



Figure 14: A view of Grave Site 1 (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 15: A view of Grave Site 2 (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 16: One of the graves at Grave Site 2 (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 17: One of the excavated/vandalized graves at Site 2 (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 18: A view of Grave Site 3 (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 19: A view of Grave Site 4 (courtesy Reach Archaeology).



Figure 20: Some of the more formally demarcated graves at Grave Site 4 (courtesy Reach Archaeology).

Summary of Findings

The table below presents a brief summary of the findings observed during the field assessment.

Table 1: Heritage Findings

FEATURE ID	CO-ORDINATES	DESCRIPTION
Potsherd	25°48'34.82"S 25°37'3.75"E	Broken, undecorated, potsherd
Grave Site 1	25°48'29.45"S 25°37'34.15"E	Burial ground with 10 visible graves
Grave Site 2	25°48'37.79"S 25°37'2.99"E	Burial Ground with 5 visible graves
Grave Site 3	25°48'16.95"S 25°36'44.81"E	Burial Ground with 6 visible graves
Grave Site 4	25°47'42.14"S 25°36'21.80"E	Burial Ground with 9 visible graves
Dilapidated Structure 1	25°48'39.75"S 25°36'59.57"E	Destroyed house, evidenced building material, rubble bricks, foundation. Not heritage building
Dilapidated Structure 2	25°48'27.83"S 25°37'4.90"E	Destroyed house, evidenced building material, rubble bricks, foundation. Not heritage building
Dilapidated Structure 3	25°48'26.88"S 25°37'5.85"E	Destroyed house, evidenced building material, rubble bricks, foundation. Not heritage building
Dilapidated Structure 4	25°48'25.70"S 25°37'10.12"E	Destroyed house, evidenced building material, rubble bricks, foundation. Not heritage building
Dilapidated Structure 5	25°48'15.13"S 25°37'7.28"E	Destroyed house, evidenced building

		material, rubble bricks, foundation. Not heritage building
Dilapidated Structure 6	25°48'30.91"S 25°37'0.61"E	Destroyed house, evidenced building material, rubble bricks, foundation. Not heritage building
Dilapidated Structure 7	25°48'27.64"S 25°36'53.56"E	Destroyed house, evidenced building material, rubble bricks, foundation. Not heritage building

The sites recorded indicate that the area had a recent historic settlement. The occupants also had designated burial grounds, with some currently being maintained. Grave Site 2 is in need of urgent intervention to mitigate the 4 disturbed and destroyed graves. There are no fencing or formal demarcation of the burial grounds. Locals know the descendants and families of the deceased buried here as well as the individuals buried. The former occupants of the houses and structures found in the area have relocated outside of the immediate area into the larger Mahikeng town.

Based on the field assessment and background research it is recommended that the proposed township development be allowed to continue taking into consideration the mitigation measures provided below.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

APelser Archaeological Consulting (APAC) was appointed by Maxim Planning Solutions to conduct a Phase 1 HIA for proposed township development in Mmabatho on Portion 54 of the farm Mmabatho Town and Townlands No. 301-JO (Mafikeng Local Municipality).

The project is conducted on instruction from King and Associates Engineering and Project Managers (Pty) Ltd (Registration No: 2017/209189/07) in their capacity as Programme Management Unit of the Department of Local Government and Human Settlements (North West) and in association with the Mafikeng Local Municipality.

Background research indicates that there are some cultural heritage sites and features in the larger geographical area within which the study area falls. The assessment of the study area identified a number of sites, features or material of cultural heritage (archaeological and/or historical) origin or significance located here.

Over and above the single undecorated piece of Iron Age-type pottery found, numerous historical sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the recent historic period were identified in the study area. These included destroyed, dilapidated and run down houses and structures of brick, mortar and stone. No other structures or features were noted beyond those mapped. Four (4) burial grounds were also identified in the study and proposed development area footprint.

The following mitigation measures are recommended:

- That a “Chance find Protocol” to be implemented and adhered to should any cultural heritage structures, objects, materials, features or graves of significance be uncovered during earth-moving activities in the construction phase of the project.
- That a Public Participation and/Stakeholder Engagement process to be undertaken for the possible relocation of the graves/burial grounds identified on the site prior to construction and development commencing. If the Grave Sites can be avoided by the proposed development then their in situ conservation to protect them against any negative impacts is highly recommended
- The urgent and immediate application for a rescue permit application from SAHRA for the graves located at Grave Site 2 which is at a high risk of further destruction. Some graves have been disturbed and destroyed and their conservation and protection needs to be prioritized.

It should be noted that although all efforts are made to locate, identify and record all possible cultural heritage sites and features (including archaeological remains) there is always a possibility that some might have been missed as a result of grass cover and other factors. The subterranean nature of these resources (including low stone-packed or unmarked graves) should also be taken into consideration. Should any previously unknown or invisible sites, features or material be uncovered during any development actions then an expert should be contacted to investigate and provide recommendations on the way forward.

Finally, from a Cultural Heritage point of view the proposed township development on Portion 54 of Mmabatho Town & Townlands 301JO should be allowed to continue taking into consideration the mitigation measures put forward above.

8. REFERENCES

General view of study & development area location and footprint and Sites Recorded:
Google Earth 2021.

Bergh, J.S. (red.). 1999. **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies**. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. Handbook to the Iron Age: **The Archaeology of Pre-Colonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa**. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Hutten, M. 2012. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Mafikeng Solar Park at Mafikeng, Northwest Province. Unpublished Report Compiled for AGES. April 2012.

Knudson, S.J. 1978. **Culture in retrospect**. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Lombard, M., L. Wadley, J. Deacon, S. Wurz, I. Parsons, M. Mohapi, J. Swart & P. Mitchell. 2012. **South African and Lesotho Stone Age Sequence Updated (I)**. South African Archaeological Bulletin 67 (195): 120–144, 2012.

Republic of South Africa. 1999. **National Heritage Resources Act** (No 25 of 1999). Pretoria: the Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 1998. **National Environmental Management Act** (no 107 of 1998). Pretoria: The Government Printer.

Van Vollenhoven, Dr.A.C & Pelsler, A.J. 2008. **A Report on Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed development of Marang Estates located in Mafikeng, Northwest Province**. Unpublished Report Archaetnos cc AE823. For: K2M Technologies. June 2008.

Wikipedia: www.wikipedia.com.

APPENDIX A: DEFINITION OF TERMS:

Site: A large place with extensive structures and related cultural objects. It can also be a large assemblage of cultural artifacts, found on a single location.

Structure: A permanent building found in isolation or which forms a site in conjunction with other structures.

Feature: A coincidental find of movable cultural objects.

Object: Artifact (cultural object).

(Also see Knudson 1978: 20).

APPENDIX B: DEFINITION/ STATEMENT OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

Historic value: Important in the community or pattern of history or has an association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance in history.

Aesthetic value: Important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group.

Scientific value: Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of natural or cultural history or is important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement of a particular period

Social value: Have a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons.

Rarity: Does it possess uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage.

Representivity: Important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of natural or cultural places or object or a range of landscapes or environments characteristic of its class or of human activities (including way of life, philosophy, custom, process, land-use, function, design or technique) in the environment of the nation, province region or locality.

APPENDIX C: SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATING:

Cultural significance:

- Low: A cultural object being found out of context, not being part of a site or without any related feature/structure in its surroundings.
- Medium: Any site, structure or feature being regarded less important due to a number of factors, such as date and frequency. Also any important object found out of context.
- High: Any site, structure or feature regarded as important because of its age or uniqueness. Graves are always categorized as of a high importance. Also any important object found within a specific context.

Heritage significance:

- Grade I: Heritage resources with exceptional qualities to the extent that they are of national significance
- Grade II: Heritage resources with qualities giving it provincial or regional importance although it may form part of the national estate
- Grade III: Other heritage resources of local importance and therefore worthy of conservation

Field ratings:

- i. National Grade I significance: should be managed as part of the national estate
- ii. Provincial Grade II significance: should be managed as part of the provincial estate
- iii. Local Grade IIIA: should be included in the heritage register and not be mitigated (high significance)
- iv. Local Grade IIIB: should be included in the heritage register and may be mitigated (high/medium significance)
- v. General protection A (IV A): site should be mitigated before destruction (high/medium significance)
- vi. General protection B (IV B): site should be recorded before destruction (medium significance)
- vii. General protection C (IV C): phase 1 is seen as sufficient recording and it may be demolished (low significance)

APPENDIX D: PROTECTION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES:

Formal protection:

National heritage sites and Provincial heritage sites – Grade I and II

Protected areas - An area surrounding a heritage site

Provisional protection – For a maximum period of two years

Heritage registers – Listing Grades II and III

Heritage areas – Areas with more than one heritage site included

Heritage objects – e.g. Archaeological, palaeontological, meteorites, geological specimens, visual art, military, numismatic, books, etc.

General protection:

Objects protected by the laws of foreign states

Structures – Older than 60 years

Archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites

Burial grounds and graves

Public monuments and memorials

APPENDIX E: HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT PHASES

1. Pre-assessment or Scoping Phase – Establishment of the scope of the project and terms of reference.
2. Baseline Assessment – Establishment of a broad framework of the potential heritage of an area.
3. Phase I Impact Assessment – Identifying sites, assess their significance, make comments on the impact of the development and makes recommendations for mitigation or conservation.
4. Letter of recommendation for exemption – If there is no likelihood that any sites will be impacted.
5. Phase II Mitigation or Rescue – Planning for the protection of significant sites or sampling through excavation or collection (after receiving a permit) of sites that may be lost.
6. Phase III Management Plan – For rare cases where sites are so important that development cannot be allowed.