



25 Rood Street  
P.O.Box 1856  
Nelspruit, 1200  
info@vhhc.co.za

Tel: 013 752 5551  
Mobile: 083 357 3669  
Fax: 086 263 5671  
richard@vhhc.co.za

---

**PHASE 1 HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT  
FOR THE PROPOSED TOWNSHIP ESTABLISHMENT OF 300 SITES ON  
REMAINDER OF PORTION 1 OF THE FARM NATURALLE LOKSASIEW 272 LS  
WITHIN MAKHADO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY OF VHEMBE DISTRICT, LIMPOPO  
PROVINCE.**

*Compiled for:*

**Ngoti Development Consultants**

Hazeldean Office Park  
King Fisher Building Unit 11  
687 Silverlakes Road  
Tyger Valley Pretoria, 0054  
Tel: +27 12 770 4022  
Cell: +27 72 537 2390  
Email: info@ngoti.co.za  
Fax: 086 641 0575

*Compiled by:*

**Vhufa Hashu Heritage Consultants**

25 Roodt Street  
Nelspruit, 1200  
P.O. Box 1856  
Nelspruit, 1200  
Mobile: 083 357 3669  
Fax: 086 263 5671  
E-mail: info@vhhc.co.za

**May 2021**

## **Executive Summary**

**Local Authority:** Makhado Local Municipality

**Magisterial Authority:** Vhembe District Municipality

**Type of Development:** Township Establishment

**Status of the Report:** Final Report

**Date of field work:** May 2021

**Date of report:** May 2021

### **Purpose of the Study**

Vhufa Hashu Heritage Consultants was appointed by Ngoti Development Consultants to undertake a phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment of a proposed Township Establishment of 300 sites on remainder of portion 1 of the farm Naturalle Loksasiew 272 LS near Tshikota area under Makhado Local Municipality of Vhembe District, Limpopo Province, in compliance with Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999.

The purpose of this study is to identify heritage resources within a proposed development area, assess their significance, the impact of the development on the heritage resources and to provide relevant mitigation measures to alleviate impacts to the heritage resources. An assessment of impacts on heritage resources defined in section 3 of the NHRA, heritage assessment is required in terms of section 38 of the NHRA.

South Africa's historical, archaeological and paleontological heritage resources are unique and non-renewable as defined in section 3 of the NHRA. Heritage Resources as defined in section 3 of the NHRA are given "formal" protection in terms of section 27-29 and 31-32 of the NHRA and "general" protection in terms of sections 33,34,35,36 and 37 of the NHRA. Therefore, no damage, destruction or alteration may occur to heritage resources without a permit issued by a relevant heritage authority.

An assessment of impacts on heritage resources of a development is required in terms of section 38(1 and 8) of the NHRA. Where possible, heritage resources should be preserved *in situ* and conserved for future generations. This can be achieved through a monitoring and management plan that may be stipulated in the conditions issued on a development by an authority as per section 38(4)c of the NHRA. Where it is not possible to retain the

heritage resources *in situ*, and the heritage resources are not deemed significant, the loss of information can be reduced by recording and mitigation of the heritage resources through a process of excavation (or sampling) as a condition on the development in terms of section 38(4)d and e, after obtaining a permit from the relevant Heritage Resources Authority (HRA), at the cost of the developer. This allows us to record a part of the history of the place as part of the national inventory. Assessment and mitigation in the early phase of the development may save the developer considerable delays and related costs.

### **Heritage Resources Descriptions and Significance**

No heritage/archaeological resources was identified within the proposed Township Establishment site

### **Conclusion**

No further studies / Mitigations are recommended given the fact that within the proposed Township Establishment site and its surrounding there are no archaeological or place of historical significance to be impacted by the Township Establishment Development. From a Heritage perspective, the development should be allowed to continue.

**Acknowledgements:**

**CLIENT NAME:** Ngoti Development Consultants

**CLIENT CONTACT PERSON:** Khuthadzo Mudau

**TEL:** (012) 770 4022

**HERITAGE CONSULTANT:** Vhufashu Heritage Consultants

**CLIENT CONTACT PERSON:** Richard R Munyai

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. R. Munyai'.

.....  
Archaeologist and Heritage Consultant

## **EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT**

<b>AIA</b>	Archaeological Impact Assessment
<b>ASAPA</b>	South African Archaeological Professional Association
<b>CMP</b>	Conservation Management Plan
<b>EIA</b>	Early Iron Age
<b>EMP</b>	Environmental Management Plan
<b>ESA</b>	Early Stone Age
<b>GPS</b>	Geographical Positioning System
<b>HIA</b>	Heritage Impact Assessment
<b>HMP</b>	Heritage Management Plan
<b>ICOMOS</b>	International Council of Monuments and sites
<b>LIA</b>	Late Iron Age
<b>LSA</b>	Late Stone Age
<b>MIA</b>	Middle Iron Age
<b>MSA</b>	Middle Stone Age
<b>NASA</b>	National Archives of South Africa
<b>NHRA</b>	National Heritage Resources Agency
<b>PRHA</b>	Provincial Heritage Resources Authority
<b>SAHRA</b>	South African Heritage Resources Agency
<b>SAHRIS</b>	South African Heritage Resources Information System
<b>VHHC</b>	Vhufa Hashu Heritage Consultants

## DEFINITIONS

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

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

**“Conservation”** in relation to heritage resources, includes protection maintenance, preservation and sustainable use of places or objects so as to safeguard their cultural significance

**“Conservation Management Plan”** A policy aimed at the management of a heritage resource and that is approved by the Heritage Resources Authority setting out the manner in which the conservation of a site, place or object will be achieved

**“Cultural Significance”** As defined in the NHRA means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance

**“Development”** means any physical intervention, excavation, or action, other than those caused by natural forces, which may in the opinion of a heritage authority in any way result in a change to the nature, appearance or physical nature of a place, or influence its stability and future wellbeing, including-

- (a) construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change of use of a place or a structure at a place;
- (b) carrying out any works on or over or under a place;
- (c) subdivision or consolidation of land comprising a place, including the structures or airspace of a place;
- (d) construction or putting up for display signs or hoardings;
- (e) any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land; and
- (f) any removal or destruction of trees, or removal of vegetation or topsoil.

**“Heritage agreement”** means an agreement referred to in section 42,

**“Heritage Impact Assessment”** A report compiled in response to a proposed development that must meet the minimum requirements set out in the NHRA and should be submitted to a heritage resources authority for consideration.

**“Heritage site”** means a place declared to be a national heritage site by SAHRA or site declared to be a provincial Heritage site by a PHRA

**“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.

**“Improvement”** in relation to heritage resources includes repair, restoration and rehabilitation of a place protected in terms of this Act.

**“Interested and Affected Parties”** Individuals, organisations or communities that will either be affected and/or have an interest in a development or the resulting impacts of a development.

**“Management”** in relation to heritage resources includes the conservation, presentation and improvement of a place protected in terms of this Act.

**“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.

## Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>DEFINITIONS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2. TERMS OF REFERENCE .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED AREA.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1. THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT .....	15
4.2. THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCE ACT (25 OF 1999).....	17
4.3. THE HUMAN TISSUES ACT (65 OF 1983) .....	17
<b>5. METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>18</b>
5.1. SOURCE OF INFORMATION.....	18
5.1.1. SURVEY OF LITERATURE .....	18
5.1.2. FIELD SURVEY .....	18
5.1.3. DOCUMENTATION.....	19
<b>6. RESULTS OF THE FIELDWORK.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>7. ARCHIVAL AND DESKTOP RESEARCH FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>8. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND AND HERITAGE. ....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>9. CHRONOLOGICAL SEQUENCE OF THE STONE AND IRON AGE .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>10. ASSESMENT CRITERIA .....</b>	<b>30</b>
10.1. ARCHAEOLOGICAL .....	31
10.2. HISTORICAL.....	31
10.3. BURIAL GROUNDS AND GRAVES .....	31
10.4. SIGNIFICANCE VALUATION BURIAL GROUND, HISTORIC CEMETERIES AND GRAVES .....	33
10.5. PREVIOUSLY UNIDENTIFIED BURIAL SITES/GRAVES – .....	33
<b>11. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GRAVES AND BURIAL SITES .....</b>	<b>33</b>
11.1. SITE SIGNIFICANCE .....	34
11.2. IMPACT RATING .....	35
11.3. CERTAINTY .....	37
11.4. DURATION .....	37
11.5. MITIGATION .....	37
<b>12. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>13. REFERENCE .....</b>	<b>39</b>



## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Vhufa Hashu Heritage Consultants was appointed by Ngoti Development Consultants to undertake a phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment of a proposed Township Establishment of 300 sites in Tshikota township under Makhado Local Municipality of Vhembe District, Limpopo Province.

The National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA - Act No. 25 of 1999) protects all structures and features older than 60 years (section 34), archaeological sites and material (section 35) graves and burial sites (section 36). In order to comply with the legislations, the Applicant requires information on the heritage resources, and their significance that occur in the demarcated area. This will enable the Applicant to take pro-active measures to limit the adverse effects that the development could have on such heritage resources.

## **2. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The terms of reference for the study were to conduct heritage impact assessment for the proposed Township Establishment in Tshikota.

- ❖ the identification and mapping of all heritage resources in the area affected;
- ❖ an assessment of the significance of such resources in terms of heritage assessment criteria set out in regulations;
- ❖ an assessment of the impact of the development on heritage resources;
- ❖ an evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources;
- ❖ if heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the consideration of alternatives; and
- ❖ plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after completion of the proposed development.

### 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED AREA

The proposed Township Establishment is situated on the Southern side of Tshikota Township and North of Tshikota Grave Yard, west of the street to the grave yard. The area to be developed is generally situated south of Tshikota Township, road R522 from Makhado (formerly known as Louis Trichardt) to Vivo and north of the N1 (GPS S23°03'22.82" E29°52'23.04") within Makhado Local Municipality of Vhembe District, Limpopo Province.

The vegetation of the area and landscape features varies from low mountains, slightly to extremely irregular plains to hills. The geology and Soils is Soutpansberg Group of sandstones with lesser amounts of conglomerate, shale and basalt is mostly exposed in this area. Some Karoo Supergroup rocks are also present. Most of the area has deep sands to shallow sandy lithosols. A few limited areas with heavier soil, particularly in the B-horizon, occur near the western boundary of the Kruger National Park.




**Figure 1:** Aerial View of the proposed site.



**Figure 2:** Old aerial photo map



**Figure 3:** View of the field work track record.



**Figure 4:** Locality map



**Figure 5:** General view of the proposed site.



**Figure 6:** View of Tshikota Township where the new development will start.



**Figure 7:** Road to the grave yard taken from the grave yard gate and the Proposed site to the left.



**Figure 8:** Access road to the Masowe Church (note the white cloth).



**Figure 9:** Road within the proposed site which end at the Masowe Church.



**Figure 10:** View of Tshikota grave yard gate.

#### **4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

Two sets of legislation are relevant for the study with regards to the protection of heritage resources and graves. These are the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998).

##### **4.1. The National Heritage Resources Act**

According to the above-mentioned act the following is protected as cultural heritage resources:

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

The National Estate includes the following:

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

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:

- The construction of a linear development (road, wall, power line, canal etc.) exceeding 300m in length
- A construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length
- Any development or other activity that will change the character of a site and exceed 5 000m<sup>2</sup> or involve three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof
- Re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m<sup>2</sup>
- Any other category provided for in the regulations of SAHRA or a provincial heritage authority.



#### **4.2. The National Heritage Resource Act (25 of 1999)**

This act established the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA) and makes provision for the establishment of Provincial Heritage Resources Authorities (PHRA). The Act makes provision for the undertaking of heritage resources impact assessments for various categories of development as determined by Section 38. It also provides for the grading of heritage resources and the implementation of a three tier level of responsibilities and functions for heritage resources to be undertaken by the State, Provincial authorities and Local authorities, depending on the grade of the Heritage resources. The Act defines cultural significance, archaeological and palaeontological sites and material (Section 35), historical sites and structures (Section 34), graves and burial sites (Section 36) which falls under its jurisdiction. Archaeological sites and material are generally those resources older than a hundred years, while structures and cultural landscapes older than 60 years, including gravestones, are also protected by Section 34. Procedures for managing grave and burial grounds are clearly set out in Section 36 of the NHRA. Graves older than 100 years are legislated as archaeological sites and must be dealt with accordingly.

Section 38 of the NHRA makes provision for developers to apply for a permit before any heritage resource may be damaged or destroyed.

#### **4.3. The human tissues act (65 OF 1983)**

This Act protects graves younger than 60 years. These fall under the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the Provincial Health Departments. Approval for the exhumation and re-burial must be obtained from the relevant Provincial MEC as well as the relevant Heritage Authorities.

Graves 60 years or older fall under the jurisdiction of the National Heritage Resources Act as well as the Human Tissues Act, 1983.

## **5. METHODOLOGY**

### **5.1. Source of information**

#### 5.1.1. Survey of Literature

The methodological approach used for the study is aimed at meeting the requirements of the relevant heritage legislation. As such a desktop study was undertaken followed by a survey of the impact areas. Most of the information was obtained through the site visit made on the 13 February 2020. In practice, most archaeological and historical sites are found through systematic survey of the target landscapes. The survey therefore, sought to identify cultural heritage sites including graves, burial grounds and contemporary religious or sacred ceremonial sites associated with the proposed Township Establishment. VHHC heritage specialists conducted the reconnaissance survey and impact assessment by transecting the affected landscape on foot looking for indicators of archaeological and any other cultural materials in the affected areas. In part the field officer also inspected soil profiles for potential archaeological materials that may still be trapped *in situ* in an area disturbed by human activities as well the burrowing animals.

#### 5.1.2. Field Survey

Standard archaeological observation practices were followed; Visual inspection was supplemented by relevant written sources, and oral communications with local communities from the surrounding area. In addition, the site was recorded by hand held GPS Garmin Oregon 65 and plotted on 1:50 000 topographical map. Archaeological/historical material and the general condition of the terrain were photographed with a Garmin Oregon 65 Camera.

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 archaeological significance in the area of the proposed development.

### 5.1.3. Documentation

All sites, objects and features identified were documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. 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.

## **6. RESULTS OF THE FIELDWORK**

No cultural heritage (archaeological or historical) sites, features or objects were found. There is no structures/buildings on site which are older than 60 years.

## **7. ARCHIVAL AND DESKTOP RESEARCH FINDINGS**

The historical data and cartographic resources represents a critical additional tool for locating and identifying heritage resources and in determining the historical and cultural context of the study area. The internet literature search was conducted and relevant archaeological and historical texts were also consulted. Relevant topographic maps old and new satellite imagery were studied.

Researching the SAHRIS online database (<http://www.sahra.org.za/sahris>), it was determined that very few archaeological studies had been performed in the vicinity of study area. Previous studies listed for the area in the Report Mapping Project included a number of surveys within the wider vicinity which are listed below:

Roodt, H. 1999. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment Vodacom Mast McKenzie, Giyani Northern Province. An unpublished report by R & R Cultural Resource Consultants on file at SAHRA as 1999-SAHRA-0069.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2001a. Archaeological Investigation of Iron Smelting Site Mut 41, in the Nandoni Dam, Thohoyandou District, Northern Province. An unpublished

report by the National Cultural History Museum on file at SAHRA as 2001-SAHRA-0006.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2001b. A Survey of Cultural Resources in Three Areas of Nandoni Dam, Thohoyandou, Northern Province. An unpublished report by the National Cultural History Museum on file at SAHRA as 2001-SAHRA-0040.

Murimbika, M. 2006. Archaeological Impact Assessment Study for the Proposed Construction of Electricity Distribution Powerlines Within, Limpopo Province. An unpublished report by Nzumbululo Heritage Solutions on file at SAHRA as 2006-SAHRA-0443.

Gaigher, S. & Hutten, M. 2007. Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Malamulele Shopping Complex and High School, Malamulele Area, Limpopo Province. An unpublished report by Archaeo-Info on file at SAHRA as 2007-SAHRA-0351.

Munyai, R. & Roodt, F. 2008. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment and Archaeological Investigation of a Proposed Magona Filling Station Within Vhembe District Municipality, Limpopo Province. An unpublished report by Vhufa Hashu Heritage Consultants on file at SAHRA as 2008-SAHRA-0490.

Murimbika, M. 2008. Phase 1 Cultural and Archaeological Heritage Impact Assessment Specialist Study for the Proposed Township Establishment at Malamulele in the Thulamela Local Municipality of Vhembe District, Limpopo Province. An unpublished report by Nzumbululo Heritage Solutions on file at SAHRA as 2008-SAHRA-0501.

Researching the SAHRIS online database (<http://www.sahra.org.za/sahris>) further studies were identified in the wider vicinity of the study area:

SAHRIS case number 605. Draft Basic Assessment Report for the Construction of a 35km 132 KV Powerline from Mbahe Substation to Mhinga Substation in Thohoyandou, within the Thulamela Local Municipality of the Limpopo Province, South Africa.

## **8. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND AND HERITAGE.**

The northernmost of South Africa is a well-known region; it appears on early historical documents as wildlife hunting grounds (Carruthers, 2003; Boeyens, 1985) trade network routes intersections (De Vaal, 1984) and lastly occurrence of early and late farming communities' archaeological sites (De Vaal, 1943; 1943; Prinsloo, 1974; Loubser, 1988). The presence of these sites has attracted attention of archaeologists since the early 1930s (Fouche, 1937; Hanisch, 1980; Mason, 1986). Archaeological investigations and assigning cultural identity to southern African farming communities goes back to the early 1931 following the work by Gertrude Caton Thompson at Great Zimbabwe (Carton Thompson, 1931). Within the South African context similar work was conducted on top of Mapungubwe hill and K2 sites by Leo Fouche in 1933. Generally the farming communities in southern Africa is represented by remnants of settled villages with distinctive ceramics, grinding stones, stonewalls, livestock enclosures, agricultural terraces and these attributes show long term settlement in the region (Maggs, 1980; Loubser, 1988).

Various theories have been put forward to explain the development of farming communities, the most plausible being that farming communities occurred as a results of early population movement from further north (Phillipson, 1977; 1985; 2005; Huffman, 1970; 2007; Pwiti, 1991; Soper, 1971; 1982; Maggs, 1984; Collet, 1982). Despite this, however archaeologists are still grappling with the nature of farming communities spread and expansion to central and southern Africa (Ehret, 2002; Huffman, 1989; Sutton, 1994/5; Pikirayi, 2007). There is still disagreement and uncertainty on the nature of the movement or their area of origin. Bantu Migrations was certainly no longer seen as a realistic way of interpreting farming communities' movement (Collet, 1982).

Topography, drainage system and good climatic conditions could have influenced these societies to settle in this region. The influence of the natural environment is undisputable, although it is not deterministic (Katsamudanga, 2007). The

proposed studies are quite often stimulated by the development of new research methods, new theories or mere need to understand cultural development in previously unexpected areas. It is the aim of this study to interrogate the archaeological character of the study area in order to trace the origin and development of these Farming Communities within the Soutpansberg Mountains. The decision to investigate within the proposed study area was influenced by a number of factors, First and foremost was the location of archaeological sites in close proximity to water sources. The location of settlement in close proximity to or association with some elements of environment should be related to what the environment offers as opportunities for survival. Secondly farming communities sites are not well understood because of limited research conducted within the region to date. Existence of these archaeological sites within the region is acknowledged, however these sites never received serious archaeological attention. Research coverage has been skewed towards the middle Limpopo valley which may be associated with very early state systems in southern Africa (Huffman, 2007).

Greatest credits should be directed to archaeologists for their recent dramatic advances in our understanding of the early societies of South Africa. They have long since laid to rest the well-worn myth that African communities arrived south of the Limpopo at much of the same times as whites first settled in the Western Cape. Archaeological research has recorded the existence of cultural material remains in which human occupation is made up of pre-colonial elements (Stone Age and Iron Age) as well as Missionaries and the colonial farmer's component.

Cultural material finger prints such as pottery fragments, iron smelting material components (slag, tuyere and furnaces) remains of grain bins, hut floors, stone enclosures and walls are the true evidence which reflected that early humans lived here, discontinuously, for thousands of years, from the Early Stone Age, through what is known as the Middle Stone Age, and well into the Late Stone Age. Evidence that confirm the existence and the presence of Stone Age people within study area is confirmed by the occurrence of stone tools

(scraper, blades, core and flakes) dating to the Middle and Late Stone Age. The majorities of finds are classified as isolated surface occurrences, and such finds are judged to have a low significance and they require no mitigation measures.

Iron Age people moved into southern Africa by c. AD 200, entering the area either by moving down the coastal plains, or by using a more central route. It seems more likely that the first option was what brought people into the study area. From the coast they followed various rivers inland. They moved south of the Limpopo River into areas previously habituated only by Stone Age people (hunter gatherers) they started to clear vegetation, the inland; valley sites seem to have been located on fertile soil and suggest they were cultivated previously. There is a wide array of evidence that support this notion, numerous grain bin foundations, grinding stones were noted in many archaeological sites in the Soutpansberg region, most of these sites were located adjacent to water source. More than 1500 sites are currently known within the Soutpansberg region, those that have been investigated by archaeologist have yielded a number of radio carbon dates covering a broad time span. According to Maggs (1986) the Lowveld was occupied on an increasingly extensive scale from the fifteen century onwards, it is at this time that the Late iron age brought significant changes in the patterns of land occupation, architectural style and building techniques marked by extensive use of stones for building.

Iron Age sequence owes much to the work undertaken by Menno Klapwijk (1974), in the Tzaneen area, and Helgaard Prinsloo (1974) in Happy rest and Klein Africa Soutpansberg region, these Iron age sites were specifically referred to as the earliest known site component of the Iron Age period. The site Silver Leaves was occupied in the third century, being dated by radiocarbon to circa 280 AD. Similar dates also came from Eiland sites discovered few kilometres south east of Tzaneen in the then Northern Transvaal. On both sites, direct evidence of cultivation was extremely limited, but impressions of *Pennisetum* millet seeds were discovered. This was the principal evidence of the earliest Iron Age penetration with the then dominant crop being brought in and introduced to the area (Klapwijk 1974).

More recently Iron Age site which date to 750AD has been found further south of the Soutpansberg Mountain, the site was excavated as part of archaeological site rescue excavation for the development of Nandoni dam. Iron Age occupation of the Soutpansberg region seems to have taken place on a significant scale were they introduce metallurgy and worked with copper and iron. Sites dating to the Early Iron Age are known to occur to the west of the Nzhelele valley at Klein Africa and Happy Rest these sites were first identified by De Vaal (1941) and were later excavated by Helgaard Prinsloo (1974) . During his excavations process Prinsloo uncovered human skeletal remains which was later described as a male individual with Negroid characteristics buried on a sitting position. Early and Late Iron Age occupation occurs throughout the Soutpansberg region, especially to the north. Most Late Iron Age sites have been dominated by typical stone walls; these sites can be linked with Venda- speaker and date to the period 1500-1600AD. Linguistic and archaeological evidence indicate that these Iron Age inhabitants were most likely the ancestors of the pre- Venda (Vhangona). Vhavenda of today are generally viewed as fully outside of great Nguni communities and are decedents of many heterogeneous groups, with multiple versions on their origin. According to Loubser(1988;1991) there are two school of thought that dominate the interpretation of the VhaVenda origin with the early school emphasizing migration from central Republic of Congo and the current school emphasizing autochthonous development. According to Stayt and Van Warmelo the pre-Venda unification (before 1500AD) has placed Vhangona as the earliest communities who occupied the Soutpansberg before the Singo arrived.

The oldest settlements in the Soutpansberg area ever recorded have one or several livestock dung concentration (Loubser, 1988). This type of settlement schema fit well with what have been developed by Kuper (1982b) and Huffman (2007) as Central Cattle Pattern. The settlement is characterised by cattle kraal at the centre of the settlement, used as burial places for high status individual. The huts are arranged around the kraal, presence of sunken grain storage and grain pits (Huffman 2007:25). The model has been derived from the eastern Bantu ethnographic model that shares a Patrilineal ideology, where



Men are associated with pastoralist and women with agriculture (Kuper, 1982b). These types of settlement are similar in the arrangement of livestock enclosures; however separation of adult livestock and calves enclosures have been identified (Huffman, 2007).

These types of settlement reflect socio-economic reality where cattle have a high Symbolic and religious significance as reflected in the position of their enclosures (Maggs, 1976). Evidence for the CCP has been reported from Early Iron Age sites in South Africa, including Ndondondwane (Greenfield et al. 2000; Greenfield & van Schalkwyk 2003, Greenfield and Miller, 2004), Nanda (Whitelaw, 1993) and Kwagandaganda (Whitelaw, 1994) in Kwazulu Natal as well as Broederstroom (Huffman, 1990; 1993) in the North West Province.

Zhizho sites are found in southwest Zimbabwe, adjacent parts of Botswana as well as the Limpopo Valley (Robinson, 1960; Huffman, 1973; 1984; Hanisch, 1980; Denbow, 1982). It is projected that most of the Zhizho sites conform to the Central Cattle Pattern.

Hanisch (1980) encountered two settlement patterns during his excavations of the Early Iron Age sites in the vicinity of Schroda and Pont drift within the Limpopo Valley. The lower level was dominated by the presence of hut floors, and absence of livestock kraal in the central part. The second pattern was characterised by small kraals amongst the huts. There is absence of large kraals, but rather a series of smaller ones occur in the central part of the site. Huts were erected around the central area thereby protecting livestock. Section of the site was utilised as midden. The second village differ with the first village in that huts do not surround the kraal and midden. Kraal and midden were placed up right against the rocky outcrop. At Pont drift, Hanisch found very few living huts remains on top of the ridge. The huts occurred in association with grain bins remains. The settlement observed as a large village compartmentalised into smaller units (Hanisch, 1980).

Also worth noting in this context is the work by Murimbika (2006) at K2 site in the Limpopo Valley. Murimbika (2006) drew conclusion that K2 site started as a Central Cattle Pattern, but at some point cattle were shifted from the centre. This change was interpreted as a major shift in spatial organization, which corresponds to change in socio political and economic relationship. Cattle were separated from the central space. According to Murimbika (2006) these shifts reflect the rise of a new form of wealth associated with the East Coast Trade Network.

Until recently, it was widely accepted that Central Cattle Pattern dominates the Early and Middle Iron Age sequences. However there is reaction levelled against the CCP pattern (Hall, 1987; Badenhorst, 2010). Some of the issues raised are what informs settlement patterns on those Iron Age communities without domestic livestock? Indirect evidence suggesting the likelihood of the absence of CCP in the Early Iron Age occupation may be seen in the absence of livestock kraals (Badenhorst, 2010).

The CCP Pattern which was advocated by Kuper (1982) and Huffman (2007) as settlement model for Early Iron Age settlement did not seem to be applicable on Mut2/2 Early Farming Community site, largely due to the fact that no cattle byres were found. The central section of the site had high concentration of structures and features and was most probably the area with the highest population and with most activities. Some of the examined grain storage pits had large dung mixture linings and they were filled up with ash and potsherds, suggesting that the pits were used as rubbish disposal. No dung deposit could be found in the village horizon (Archaeo- info, 2000).

The first Millennium AD Central Cattle Pattern lacks stone construction, with the economy characterised by livestock's and agriculture (Maggs, 1976; 1980; 1984). There is very limited evidence that shows that trade with the coast did take place (Mason, 1962: 431). During the Middle Iron Age (AD 900-1300) significance changes occur, settlements were located in uplands (Maggs and Wards, 1984), hilltops and promontory raised area (Loubser, 1988). This settlement pattern could have been altered by the socio-political development in the Limpopo Valley.

There was an over whelming farming production, co-ordination and control over economic, social and religious activities.

Stone building became regular feature of farming communities especially south of the Zambezi (Mason, 1969). Arrival of Nguni and Sotho Tswana speakers in southern Africa brought with new building style, different settlement locations, ceramic and other form of material culture (Badenhorst, 2010). They interacted with other absorbed farmers that already lived in the region before (Hammond-Tooke, 2004,; Huffman, 2007; Hall, 1986; Mitchell, 2002; Philipson, 2005). This intensified farming activities and the dominance of cattle in the region (Badenhorst, 2010). Various states appeared during the second millennium AD following the development within the Limpopo Valley, this includes Great Zimbabwe, Khami and Venda all associated with Shona and Venda (Huffman, 2007; Mitchell, 2002).

The late Iron Age (AD 1300-1820s) is mostly characterised by socio political complexity, higher population, environmental degradation, intensive hunting, overgrazing and extensive use of stones as construction materials (Maggs, 1976; Badenhorst, 2009). Before the arrival of the Late Iron Age farmers, there is little evidence suggesting the dominance of stone constructions. In fact, available evidence rather suggests absence of stone constructions on precursor Early Iron Age sites.

Presences of stone terraces have been recorded in agricultural ploughing zones. Terraces are part of important principles and agricultural practice. They occur when the scattered stones are cleared from the main field and placed in row of lines for easy cultivation . According to Rodriguez (2006) Smith and Price (1994) Badenhorst (2010) terraces control soil erosion and increase crop production. Variety of crops grows very well in terraces land, because burnt vegetation leaves ash as fertilizer which promotes growth of certain plants.

Terraces date to the second millennium AD and are commonly associated with sites using stone construction dating mostly to the Late Iron Age (cf. Evers, 1980; Mason, 1969). Stone terraces have been recorded throughout southern Africa for example highland of eastern (Soper, 2002) other parts of Zimbabwe (Robinson, 1966), Limpopo and Mpumalanga (Collet, 1982; Evers, 1973; 1975; 1981; Mason, 1968; Marker and Evers, 1976; Plug and Pistorius, 1999; Trevor, 1930; Van der Merwe and Scully, 1971). These terraces were used for agricultural and settlement purposes. Some of the investigated terraces walls had evidence of remains of small houses built in the middle (Pistorius et al. 2001; Van der Merwe and Scully, 1971). Middle and Late Iron Age periods settlements have been recorded north and south of Soutpansberg Mountains. According to Loubser (1988: 35) they are located in variable areas for example, on top of the mountain, hilltop and raised areas. Syntheses of ethnographic data by Loubser (1988) shows that most of these settlements categorized by the presence of stonewall and these ruins were ethnographically associated with the royal families ascribed to early Vha-Venda, Sotho and Shangaans.

Historical documents suggest that the Shangaans originated from the Zulu. This movement came in light during the fierce war of extermination- The Mfecane/Difacane that broke out at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Shaka defeated the Kingdom of amaNdwandwe which was led by King Zwide along the Mhlatuze River and incorporated into the mighty Amazulu Kingdom. It was during this time period when Soshangana broke away immediately after the defeat of Zwide in 1819 and entered Mozambique at around 1820. The overpowered the indigenous groups (The Tsonga, Ndawu (Vandau) Vahlengwe, Vanyai, Varhonga, Vachopi, Vatswa, Mashona, Vahlave, Vadzonga and other groups) and eventually incorporated them. Soshangana led a kingdom of about 500000 to 2000000 subjects stretching from close to Nkomati River in the south, to the Zambezi and Pungwe River in the south and the Indian Ocean in the East to the Drakensberg and Soutpansberg and the eastern Zimbabwe. The direct authority extended over the whole of what is known as southern Mozambique, large part of western Zimbabwe, Limpopo and Mpumalanga Provinces (Liesegang 1975, Myburgh, 1949, Omer-Cooper, 1988:59)

Soshangana aka Manukuze (1760-1858) was the son of Zikode and was the grandson of Gaza, after whom the kingdom was named. He established the capital at Chaimite, that later became a sacred village and the area where they lived was known as ka Shangana and they were referred to as Mashangana, after Soshangana. Between 1825 and 1827 Soshangana lived on the tributary of Nkomati River. From 1827 to 1834 his residence was in the lower Limpopo valley. In 1835 he moved with his troops to Musapa in the present day Melssetter District (between Mussurize-Manica and chipinge) in Zimbabwe. In 1839 as a result of the small pox epidemic in which he lost many of his warriors, he returned to their earlier home in the Limpopo valley, Bileni, leaving his son, Mzila to place the north of Zambezi under his tribute.

King Mzila, son of soshangana was Ngungunyani's father; he was born around 1845-50 at Bileni in the Gaza Province. In 1859 to 1861 he stayed at the Soutpansberg within the Transvaal. In 1862 to 1889 he stayed at Masapa melster District with his capital called Mandlakazi in Chipinge in Zimbabwe. As a young man he spend most of this time preparing for military training and for governance. Documents suggest that Ngunguyani had twenty children. When king soshangana passed away in 1858 and his grandson Ngungunyani was only 13 years old. King Soshangana was succeeded by his son, Mawewe, and after a protracted civil war, Mawewe was dethrone by his half-brother Mzila, who ruled the kingdom for 23 years (1861-1884). He died in 1884 and he was succeeded by his son, Ngunguyani in 1884, king Ngungunyain was not the only son of king Mzila. There were other brothers like Mafemane and Komokomo. They were eligible successors to Mzila as a king. On Mzila's death Ngungunyani's supporters amongst them one of the kings brother and few military officers acted quickly. Mafemane, the main competitor was killed before a major confrontation, like that after Soshangana's death in 1858, could develop. The other brother was not attacked however he was executed at the court between 1893 and 1895 (Liesegang, 1975).

## 9. CHRONOLOGICAL SEQUENCE OF THE STONE AND IRON AGE

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

Early Stone Age (ESA): complex	Predominantly the Acheulean hand axe industry dating to + 1Myr yrs-250 000 yrs. Before present.
Middle Stone Age (MSA):	Various lithic industries in SA dating from $\pm$ 250 000 yr.- 30 000 yrs. before present.
Late Stone Age (LSA):	The period from $\pm$ 30 000-yr.to contact period with either Iron Age farmers or European colonists.

There are no known Stone Age sites in the area including rock art. No Stone Age sites or objects were recorded during the assessment of the area.

The Iron Age is the name given to the period of human history when metal was mainly used to produce artifacts:

Early Iron Age (EIA):	Most of the first millennium AD
Middle Iron Age:	10 <sup>th</sup> to 13 <sup>th</sup> centuries AD
Late Iron Age (LIA):	14 <sup>th</sup> century to colonial period. The entire Iron Age represents the spread of Bantu speaking peoples.

## 10. ASSESMENT CRITERIA

This section describes the evaluation criteria used for determining the significance of archaeological and heritage sites. The significance of archaeological and heritage sites were based on the following criteria:

- The unique nature of a site

- The amount/depth of the archaeological deposit and the range of features (stone walls, activity areas etc.)
- The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site.
- The preservation condition and integrity of the site
- The potential to answer present research questions.

### **10.1. Archaeological**

No archaeological materials were found in the study area.

### **10.2. Historical**

No historical sites/materials found on site.

### **10.3. Burial grounds and graves**

No graves were identified on site

The legislation also protects the interests of communities that have an interest in the graves: they should be consulted before any disturbance takes place. The graves of victims of conflict and those associated with the liberation struggle are to be identified, cared for, protected and memorials erected in their honor.

Graves older than 60 years, but younger than 100 years, fall under Section 36 of Act 25 of 1999 (National Heritage Resources Act) as well as the Human Tissue Act (Act 65 of 1983) and are under the jurisdiction of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA). The procedure for Consultation regarding Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36(5) of Act 25 of 1999) is applicable to graves older than 60 years that are situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority. Graves in the category located inside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority will also require the same authorization as set out for graves younger than 60 years, over and above SAHRA authorization.

In terms of the Section 36 (3) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) no person may, without a permit issued by the relevant heritage resources authority:

(a) 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;

(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 equipment, or any equipment, which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.

Therefore, in addition to the formal protection of culturally significance graves, all graves which are older than 60 years and which are not already located in a cemetery (such as ancestral graves in rural areas), are protected. Communities, which have an interest in the graves, must be consulted before any disturbance can take place. The graves of victims of conflict and those associated with the liberation struggle will have to be included, cared for, protected and memorials erected in their honor where practical. Regarding graves and burial grounds, the NHRA distinguishes between the following:

- Ancestral graves
- Royal graves and graves of traditional leaders
- Graves of victims of conflict
- Graves of individuals designated by the Minister by notice in the Gazette
- Historical graves and cemeteries
- Other human remains, which are not covered in terms of the Human Tissue Act, 1983 (Act No.65 of 1983).



#### **10.4. Significance valuation Burial Ground, Historic Cemeteries and Graves**

The significance of burial grounds and gravesites is closely tied to their age and historical, cultural and social context. Nonetheless, every burial should be considered as of high significance. Should any grave previously unknown be identified during construction, every effort should be made not disturb them. The streets designs should be shifted to ensure the grave or burial ground is not disturbed.

#### **10.5. Previously unidentified burial sites/graves –**

Although the possibilities of this occurring are very limited, should burial sites outside the NHRA be accidentally found during the proposed development, they must be reported to the nearest police station to ascertain whether or not a crime has been committed. If there is no evidence for a crime having been committed, and if the person cannot be identified so that their relatives can be contacted, the remains may be kept in an institution where certain conditions are fulfilled. These conditions are laid down in the Human Tissue Act (Act No. 65 of 1983). In contexts where the local traditional authorities give their consent to the unknown remains to be re-buried in their area, such re-interment may be conducted under the same regulations as would apply for known human remains.

### **11. HE SIGNIFICANCE OF GRAVES AND BURIAL SITES**

The significance of burial grounds or graves has been indicated by means of stipulations derived from the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999)

Heritage Significance	:	GP.A; High/Medium Significance
Impact	:	Negative
Impact Significance	:	High
Certainty	:	Probable
Duration	:	Permanent
Mitigation	:	C

- *Informal graves and Formal grave yards (Cemeteries)*

Informal and formal grave yards (Cemeteries) can be considered to be sensitive remains of high significance and are protected by various laws. Legislation with regard to graves includes the National Heritage Resources Act (no 25 of 1999) this act applies whenever graves are older than sixty years. The act also distinguishes various categories of graves and burial grounds. Other legislation with regards to graves includes those which apply when graves are exhumed and relocated, namely the Ordinance on exhumation (Ordinance no 12 of 1980) and the Human Tissue Act (Act no 65 of 1983 as amended).

### **11.1. Site significance**

The site significance classification standards as prescribed and endorsed 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 as guidelines in determining the site significance for the purpose of this report.

<b>FIELD RATING</b>	<b>GRADE</b>	<b>SIGNIFICANCE</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED MITIGATION</b>
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1	-	Conservation; National Site nomination
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2	-	Conservation; Provincial Site nomination
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3A	High Significance	Conservation; Mitigation not advised
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3B	High Significance	Mitigation (Part of site should be retained)
Generally Protected A (GP.A)	Grade 4A	High / Medium Significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GP.B)	Grade 4B	Medium Significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GP.C)	Grade 4C	Low Significance	Destruction

Grading and rating systems of heritage resources

## **11.2. Impact rating**

### **VERY HIGH**

These impacts would be considered by society as constituting a major and usually permanent change to the (natural and/or cultural) 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 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 (e.g. farmers) 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 the public or the specialist as constituting a fairly unimportant and usually short 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 society as constituting a fairly important and usually medium 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 changes 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 living 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 certain formation may be regarded as severe from a geological perspective, but is of NO SIGNIFICANCE in the overall context.

### **11.3. 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 an 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 of the likelihood of an impact occurring.

### **11.4. Duration**

*SHORT TERM* : 0 – 5 years

*MEDIUM* : 6 – 20 years

*LONG TERM* : more than 20 years

*DEMOLISHED* : site will be demolished or is already demolished

### **11.5. Mitigation**

Management actions and recommended mitigation, which will result in a reduction in the impact on the sites, will be classified 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 required; and
- **D** – Preserve site

## **12. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

No further studies / Mitigations are recommended given the fact that within the proposed Township Establishment area and its surrounding there are no archaeological or place of historical significance to be impacted by the proposed project development. However, should any chance archaeological or any other physical cultural resources be discovered subsurface, heritage authorities should be informed. From an archaeological and cultural heritage resources perspective, there are no objections to the proposed Township Establishment. We recommend to the Provincial Heritage Resource Agency, South African Heritage Resource Agency to approve the project as planned.

### 13. REFERENCE

Deacon, J. 1997. Report: Workshop on Standards for the Assessment of Significance and Research Priorities for Contract Archaeology. *South African Association of Archaeology*. No. 49,

Huffman, T.N. (2007). *Handbook to the Iron Age: The archaeology of pre-colonial farming societies in southern Africa*, Scottsville, South Africa, University of Kwazulu Natal Press.

Holm, S.E. 1966. *Bibliography of South African Pre- and Protohistoric archaeology*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik

Klapwijk, M. 1973. An Early Iron Age site near Tzaneen North eastern Transvaal. *South African Journal of Science*, vol.69, pp.324.

Inskeep, R .R & Maggs, T.M. O'C. 1975. Unique objects in the Iron Age of the Transvaal, South Africa. *Archaeological Bulletin* vol. 30, pp. 114-134.

Mason, R.J. 1962. *Prehistory of the Transvaal*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Mönnig, H.O. 1967. *The Pedi*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Van Warmelo, N J. 1935. *Preliminary survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. Ethnological Publications No. 5. Pretoria: Government Printer.