



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

**A Final Report for the Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for
Proposed Township Development to the east of Giyani
in the Greater Giyani Local Municipality of Limpopo**

For:

Mang Geoenviro Services
6 Eros Road
Faerie Glen
0004

REPORT: APAC023/37b

by:

A.J. Pelser
Accredited member of ASAPA
Member No. 106
Assisted by Me. Heidi Fivaz & Me. Sky-Lee Fairhurst
Ubique Heritage Consultants

June 2023

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 below the disclaimer text.

SUMMARY

APelser Archaeological Consulting cc (APAC cc) was appointed by Mang Geoviro Services, on behalf of the Giyani Local Municipality, to conduct a Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for proposed Township Development. The study and development area footprint are located to the east of Giyani in the Limpopo Province. As part of the Phase 1 HIA a Desktop-based study was initially undertaken and a report submitted prior to the physical assessment being completed (**APAC023/37**). This Final Phase 1 HIA Report is the result of the June 2023 field-based assessment.

The literature review indicates that there are some cultural heritage (archaeological & historical) sites and features in the larger geographical area within which the study area falls. There is now known cultural heritage sites, features or material in the specific study & development area, but some were identified in the study area during the recent field survey. This report discusses the results of the background literature research and physical assessment and provides recommendations on the way forward at the end.

From a Cultural Heritage point of view, based on both the Desktop Research and Field-based assessment, it is recommended that the proposed Township Development can continue taking into consideration the recommendations provided at the end.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE	5
3. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....	5
4. METHODOLOGY	9
5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA	9
6. DISCUSSION.....	15
7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	25
8. REFERENCES	26
APPENDIX A: DEFINITION OF TERMS:.....	26
APPENDIX B: DEFINITION/ STATEMENT OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.....	27
APPENDIX C: SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATING:.....	29
APPENDIX D: PROTECTION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES:.....	30
APPENDIX E: HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT PHASES.....	31

1. INTRODUCTION

APelser Archaeological Consulting cc was appointed by Mang Geoenviro Services, on behalf of the Giyani Local Municipality, to conduct a Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for proposed Township Development. The study and development area footprint are located to the east of Giyani in the Limpopo Province. As part of the Phase 1 HIA a Desktop-based study was initially undertaken and a report submitted prior to the physical assessment being completed. This Final Phase 1 HIA Report is the result of the June 2023 field-based assessment.

The literature review indicates that there are some cultural heritage (archaeological & historical) sites and features in the larger geographical area within which the study area falls. There is now known cultural heritage sites, features or material in the specific study & development area, but some were identified in the study area during the recent field survey.

The location and boundaries of the study & development area footprint were provided to the Specialist, and the assessment focused on this as well as the larger geographical area within which the proposed development is located.

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 are dealt with mainly in. The National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998) are the two main legislations concerning the conservation of cultural resources, used as guidelines when conducting the Heritage Impact Assessment.

3.1. The National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)

According to the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) (NHRA), 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.)

The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) process is done to determine whether there are any heritage resources located within the area to be developed as well as to determine the possible impacts of the proposed development. An Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) only looks at archaeological resources, such as material remains of human life or activities which are at least 100 years of age, and which are of archaeological interest. A 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 000m²
- 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 that is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.

A structure refers to 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.

To alter means any action taken that affects 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:

- i. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;
- ii. 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
- iii. 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 (No. 107 of 1998)

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.

The specific requirements that specialist studies and reports must adhere to are contained in Appendix 6 of the EIA Regulations.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. Review of literature

A review 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. These include Bergh (1999), Huffman (2007) & Lombard et.al (2012).

4.2. Field survey

The field assessment component 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. Where possible grids are walked in the area where development is proposed.

4.3. 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. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Greater Giyani Local Municipality is proposing the development of a new Township, east of Giyani and just north of the R578 Road. The new township is bordered by existing residential settlements.

6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

The study & proposed Township Development area is located east of Giyani, and directly north of the R578 road in the Limpopo Province. It is situated in the Mopani District Municipality and Greater Giyani Local Municipality.

The type of environment is known as Granite Lowveld. There are a few areas with small rocky granite outcrops and predominantly sandy soils. The area is densely vegetated, with tall thorny shrubs, trees, and dense grass cover. Two dried water sources run north-northwest to south-southeast in the eastern half of the development footprint and on the western boundary. An unnamed road with houses lies east of the development footprint, the R578 bounds the south, a newly made dirt road to the north, and a dried river with an open veldt lies west. Site Access is from the R578. There is minimal natural erosion, predominantly water erosion around the dry river bed. The area has been minimally disturbed, besides road construction on the north, east and south, and some old overgrown

service roads for the existing electricity line. However, the area on the eastern boundary shows some signs of rubbish dumping.

As mentioned earlier, the vegetation is very dense, and the thorn trees and shrubs made traversing the site in regular transects impossible. Instead, the site was surveyed by utilizing old overgrown animal (cattle/livestock) trails.



Figure 1: General location of the study and proposed development area (Google Earth 2023).



Figure 2: Closer view of the study and proposed development area footprint (Google Earth 2023). Note the R578 road bordering the area to its south and the existing residential settlement on its eastern boundary.



Figure 3: The same area in 2003 (Google Earth 2023).



Figure 4: General view showing the very dense vegetation (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 5: Old overgrown tracks were utilized for access and the physical assessment (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 6: Some open sections occurred in parts (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 7: Informal and formal settlement on the eastern boundary of the study area (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 8: Refuse dumping observed in the area (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 9: Dry stream bed in the area (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 10: Another image showing the very dense vegetation in the study area (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).

7. DISCUSSION

7.1 Stone age

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 into three periods as listed below. It is 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).

According to Bergh (1999) the closest known Stone Age sites (MSA) occur to the east of the study area near Polokwane. No Stone Age sites or objects (such as stone tools) were identified in the area, and if any were to be found it would most likely be single, out of context, stone tools. To the south west of the study area excavations at Makapansgat attest to ESA occupation in the region, providing evidence of long occupation, initially by *Australopithecus africanus* from approximately 3.3 million years B.P. The LSA is represented in the wider area by, for example, the presence of San rock paintings and engravings in the

Mohlapiitse River valley in the Wolkberg to the south-west of the study area. Studies in the Kruger National Park to the east have documented numerous Middle and Late Stone Age sites (Fourie 2016). Stone Age sites (including rock art) are also known to occur at a site called Kalkbank in the larger geographical area (Bergh 1999: 4), while known rock art (paintings) sites are located along the Luvuvhu River (Bergh 1999: 5).

There are no known Stone Age sites or material in the study & development area and none was identified during the June 2023 field-based assessment. If any were to be present they would most likely be individual stone tools or low density scatters in open-air surface scatters around the area.

7.2 Iron age

The Iron Age is the name given to the period of human history when metal was mainly used to produce metal artifacts. In South Africa it can be divided in two separate phases (Bergh1999: 96-98), namely:

- Early Iron Age (EIA) 200 – 1000 A.D
- Late Iron Age (LIA) 1000 – 1850 A.D.

Huffman (2007: xiii) however indicates that a Middle Iron Age should be included. His dates, which now seem to be 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.

There are no known Iron Age sites (EIA or LIA) in the immediate study area, although a large number of EIA to LIA sites are known to exist in the larger geographical landscape in which the study area falls. This includes the sites of Klein Afrika & Happy Rest (EIA) located north & west of Louis Trichardt respectively, and the sites of Verulam, Verdun & Machedema (LIA) north of the study area (Bergh 1999: 6-7).

Tom Huffman's research work shows that Iron Age sites, features or material could possibly be found in the area. This could include the so-called Silver Leaves facies of the Urewe Tradition dating to between AD280 and AD450 (Huffman 2007: 123); Mzonjani facies of the same tradition dating to between AD450 and AD750 (p.127); Icon facies of Urewe dating to between AD1300 and AD1500 (p.183); the Happy Rest facies of the Kalundu Tradition dating to between AD500 & AD750 (p.219); the Malapati facies of Kalundu dating to between AD750 & AD1030 (p.239); the Tavhatshena facies of Kalundu dating to between AD1450 & AD1600 (p.263); the Letaba facies of Kalundu dating to between AD1600 & AD1800 (p.267) and finally the Mutamba facies of the same tradition dating to between AD1250 and AD1450 (Huffman 2007: 271).

There are no known Iron Age sites, features or material in the study and development area. A few possible Late Iron Age features and material were however recorded in the area during the recent assessment and will be discussed further on in the report.

7.3 Historic age

The historical age started with the first recorded oral histories in the area. It includes the moving into the area of people that were able to read and write. The first European group to pass close by the area were that of Coenraad de Buys in 1821 and 1825, followed by groups of Voortrekkers after 1844 (Bergh 1999: 12-14). Schoemansdal (originally Zoutpansbergdorp) was established in 1848, and finally abandoned as a result of conflict with local groups in July 1867 (Bergh 1999: 131; 187). The town of Louis Trichardt was formally established in February 1899 (Bergh 1999: 147). During the Anglo-Boer war (1899-1902) there was a skirmish between British and Boer forces at Fort Edward near Louis Trichardt between 20 and 28 March 1902 (Bergh 1999: 54).

The town of Giyani is situated to the south of the study area. During the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) the closest battle or skirmish in this area was at Houtboschberg on 30 April 1901 (Bergh 1999: 54). The District of Giyani was formally established on the 1st of June 1972 (Bergh 1999: 151), while Giyani was also part of the former Homeland Gazankulu (p.43).

The wider area here is famous for the residence of the Rain Queen Modjadj (of the Balobedu people), whose ethnography was described in some detail from the 1930s onwards by social anthropologists Eileen Jensen Krige and Jacob Daniell Krige and whose culture around rain-making continues to be a focus of such studies. Other history of the wider area includes the 1895 war between Chief Makgoba and the ZAR, the 1889 establishment of the famous postal coach service from Pietersburg via Haenertsburg to Leydsdorp by Doel Zeederberg and the passage of the Anglo-Boer War including a clash between the Bushveldt Carbineers (BVC) and the Letaba Commando at W.H. Viljoen's farm Duiwelskloof (to the south west of the study area) in August 1901. Further away and to the south west the destruction of the last Long Tom guns took place near Haenertsburg in April 1901 (Fourie 2016).

There are no known recent historical sites and features in the study & development area. The possible presence of previously unknown sites, such as graves/informal cemeteries, should however be kept in consideration. One recent historical feature was recorded in the area during the assessment.

Results of the June 2023 field-based assessment

The 1st site recorded (Site 001) consists of a possible retaining wall of stone, cement and bricks. It is around 1m in length and is situated close to a dry stream bed. It dates to recent historical times and has no archaeological/historical context. It has no heritage significance and no mitigation is required.

GPS Coordinates: S23°17'15.55 E30°25'51.77.

Sites 002 to 005 could date to the Late Iron Age/Historical period, and consists of the remains of 4 possible huts, with some pieces of undecorated and decorated pottery found in proximity to some of these features.

The remains of the four possible huts are identified by groupings of stones, mounds of soil and clay and possible hut dagha. The only decorated piece of pottery is characteristic of so-called Letaba pottery. Based on Huffman's research the Letaba facies of the so-called Kalundu Iron Age tradition dates to between AD1600 & AD1800 (2007: 267). The estimated date of the remains in the study area is however more likely the late 19th century. The area is obscured by dense grass cover, with small open areas wherein which these possible huts are situated. More cultural material and possible refuse middens may be located in the area, though none were visible. Furthermore, no substantial stone-packed settlement or livestock kraal walls are located in the study and development area footprint, visible on the ground or via Google Earth. The huts, therefore, do not appear to be part of a larger Late Iron Age/Historical period resettlement.

A final walk-down of the area is recommended to be conducted once the vegetation has been cleared to establish the extent and significance of the sites. Together with a Chance Finds Protocol, this would help identify and safeguard any missed hut remains or middens. At this point, the recorded possible hut remains appear to be of low significance as it has no archaeological context.

GPS Coordinates: S23°17'9.47 E30°25'19.07 (002); S23°17'11.93 E30°25'19.89 (003); S23°17'12.39 E30°25'19.69 (004) & S23°17'12.78 E30°25'19.87 (005).



Figure 11: The Site 001 wall feature (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 12: One of the possible hut remnants recorded (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 13: Another possible hut mound (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 14: The 3rd possible hut. Note the packed stones in an arc (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 14: The 4th possible hut (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 15: The piece of decorated pottery from the area around the huts (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 16: A piece of undecorated pottery from the area (courtesy Ubique Heritage Consultants).



Figure 17: Map showing the distribution of the sites recorded in the area during the assessment (Google Earth 2023).

Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

The significance of impacts is determined using the following criteria:

Probability: describes the likelihood of the impact actually occurring

- **Improbable:** the possibility of the impact occurring is very low, due to the circumstances, design or experience.
- **Probable:** there is a probability that the impact will occur to the extent that provision must be made therefore.
- **Highly probable:** it is most likely that the impact will occur at some stage of the development.
- **Definite:** the impact will take place regardless of any prevention plans and there can only be relied on mitigation measures or contingency plans to contain the effect.

Duration: the lifetime of the impact

- **Short Term:** the impact will either disappear with mitigation or will be mitigated through natural processes in a time span shorter than any of the phases.
- **Medium Term:** the impact will last up to the end of the phases, where after it will be negated.
- **Long Term:** the impact will last for the entire operational phase of the project but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter.
- **Permanent:** the impact is non-transitory. Mitigation either by man or natural processes will not occur in such a way or in such a time span that the impact can be considered transient.

Scale: the physical and spatial size of the impact

- **Local:** the impacted area extends only as far as the activity, e.g. footprint
- **Site:** the impact could affect the whole or measurable portion of the abovementioned property.
- **Regional:** the impact could affect the area including the neighboring residential areas.

Magnitude/Severity: Does the impact destroy the environment, or alter its function

- **Low:** the impact alters the affected environment in such a way that natural processes are not affected.
- **Medium:** the affected environment is altered, but functions and processes continue in a modified way.
- **High:** function or process of the affected environment is disturbed to the extent where it temporarily or permanently ceases.

Significance: This is an indication of the importance of the impact in terms of both physical extent and time scale, and therefore indicates the level of mitigation required.

- **Negligible:** the impact is non-existent or unsubstantial and is of no or little importance to any stakeholder and can be ignored.
- **Low:** the impact is limited in extent, has low to medium intensity; whatever its probability of occurrence is, the impact will not have a material effect on the decision and is likely to require management intervention with increased costs.
- **Moderate:** the impact is of importance to one or more stakeholders, and its intensity will be medium or high; therefore, the impact may materially affect the decision, and management intervention will be required.
- **High:** The impact could render development options controversial or the project unacceptable if it cannot be reduced to acceptable levels; and/or the cost of management intervention will be a significant factor in mitigation.

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

Sum (Duration, Scale, Magnitude) x Probability

S = Significance weighting; Sc = Scale; D = Duration; M = Magnitude; P = Probability

With some sites, features and material of cultural heritage origin and significance recorded in the area, the current site layout/footprint will have an impact.

Aspect	Description	Weight
Probability	Improbable	1
	Probable	2
	Highly Probable	4
	Definite	5
Duration	Short Term	1
	Medium Term	3
	Long Term	4
	Permanent	5
Scale	Local	1
	Site	2
	Regional	3
Magnitude/Severity	Low	2
	Medium	6
	High	8
Significance	Sum (Duration, Scale, Magnitude)	x Probability
	Negligible	≤20

	Low	>20≤40
	Moderate	>40≤60
	High	>60

Results: 1+2+2×2 = 10 i.e., ≤20

The impact of the proposed development on the recorded and known cultural heritage sites in the area is therefore deemed as Negligible based on the Impact Assessment criteria used. However, there is always a possibility of sites, features and material being missed as a result of various factors such as vegetation cover hampering visibility on the ground, as well as the often-subterranean nature of cultural heritage resources (including low stone-packed or unmarked graves). These factors need to be taken into consideration and it is therefore recommended that a Chance Finds Protocol be drafted and implemented for the proposed Township Development.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

APelser Archaeological Consulting cc (APAC cc) was appointed by Mang Geoenviro Services, on behalf of the Giyani Local Municipality, to conduct a Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for proposed Township Development. The study and development area footprint are located to the east of Giyani in the Limpopo Province. As part of the Phase 1 HIA a Desktop-based study was initially undertaken and a report submitted prior to the physical assessment being completed. This Final Phase 1 HIA Report is the result of the June 2023 field-based assessment.

The literature review indicates that there are some cultural heritage (archaeological & historical) sites and features in the larger geographical area within which the study area falls. There is now known cultural heritage sites, features or material in the specific study & development area, but some were identified in the study area during the recent field survey. These include a small recent historical wall feature of no heritage significance, as well as 4 possible Late Iron Age huts with some decorated pottery associated that could date the features to between the 16th & late 19th centuries. However, because of their evidently lacking archaeological context (no associated other features such as stone-walling) they are deemed of Low Heritage significance. A number of recommendations are provided in the report, including a final walk-down after vegetation clearance to determine the extent and significance of the possible Iron Age site and features.

The impact of the proposed development on the recorded and known cultural heritage sites in the area is deemed as Negligible based on the Impact Assessment criteria used. However, as there is always the possibility of sites, features and material being missed as a result of various factors such as vegetation cover hampering visibility on the ground, as well as the often-subterranean nature of cultural heritage resources (including low stone-packed or unmarked graves), it is therefore recommended that a Chance Finds Protocol be drafted and implemented for the proposed Township Development.

Finally, from a Cultural Heritage point of view, based on both the Desktop Research and Field-based assessment, it is recommended that the proposed Township Development can continue taking into consideration the recommendations provided above.

8. REFERENCES

General and Closer views of study & proposed Township Development area and Sites Recorded: Google Earth 2023.

Field Assessment Information and Photographs: Provided by Ubique Heritage Consultants June 2023.

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

Fourie, W. 2016. **Proposed Upgrade of the Giyani Waste Water Treatment Works, Giyani, Limpopo Province: Phase 1 – Heritage Impact Assessment**. Unpublished Report 121HIA PGS Heritage. For: EIMS (Pty) Ltd. 21 January 2016.

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.

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

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.

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, paleontological, 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, paleontology 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.