

**PHASE I ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE
IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST REPORT FOR THE
PROPOSED TOWNSHIP ESTABLISHMENT ON THE REMAINING
EXTENT OF PORTION 46, PORTIONS 58 AND 59 OF THE FARM
ELANDSHEUWEL 436 IQ WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF JB
MARKS LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, NORTH WEST PROVINCE**



**PREPARED BY
RUINS ARCHAEO HERITAGE
CONSULTING (PTY) LTD**

Report Author: Alvord Nhundu
Cell: 078 344 2671
Email: nalvord@yahoo.com

**PREPARED FOR
VHULUVHI GROUP**

Contact Person: Olympus Luthada
Cell: 0105020622
Email: olympus@vhuluvhigroup.co.za

APRIL 2025

ABILITY TO CONDUCT THE PROJECT

Alvord Nhundu is a professional archaeologist. He completed his Bachelor of Science with honours degree in archaeology with the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) and Masters in Archaeology with the University of Pretoria (UP). His research interest lies in old and new world archaeology, palaeoenvironmental and climatology, archaeological theory, Later Stone Age, rock art, hunter-gatherers, hunter-gatherer interactions, several aspects of Southern African Iron Age and Indigenous archaeologies. Alvord is an accredited Cultural Resource Management (CRM) member of the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA No.338) with Field Director status in Iron Age and Stone Age, and Field Supervisor status in Grave Relocation and Rock Art. He is also affiliated to Society of South Africanist Archaeologists (SAfA) and the International Council of Archaeozoology (ICAZ). He has been practicing CRM for more than 10 years and has completed over 100 Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIA) for developmental projects in the Limpopo, Mpumalanga, North-West, Eastern Cape, Free State, Northern Cape and KwaZulu Natal provinces of South Africa. The projects include establishment and upgrade of power substations, road construction, development of malls, housing developments, establishment and expansion of mines. He has also conducted the relocation of graves. His detailed CV is available on request.

INDEPENDENCE

I, Alvord Nhundu, declare that:

- I act as an independent specialist;
- I am conducting work relating to the proposed township development in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the client;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have the required experience in conducting the specialist report and I will comply with legislation, regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I have not, and will not engage in conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority and the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- All the details and particulars furnished by me in this declaration are true and correct;
- I will perform all other obligations as expected from a heritage practitioner in terms of the Act and the constitutions of my affiliated professional bodies; and
- I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 71 of the regulations and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the NEMA.



Cell: 078 344 2671

E-mail: nalvord@yahoo.com

CLIENT CONTACT DETAILS:

Items	Details
Company Name	Vhuluvhi Group (Pty) Ltd
Contact Person	Olympus Luthada
Physical address	11 Silwer-Eike Ave, Heuweloord Ext 17, Centurion
Telephone/ Cell	0105020622
Email	olympus@vhuluvhigroup.co.za

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge Vhuluvhi Group (Pty) Ltd staff for their assistance in conducting the project. SAHRIS, Google Earth and Wikipedia are also acknowledged.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Ruins Archaeo- Heritage Consulting (Pty) Ltd was appointed by Vhuluvhi Group (Pty) Ltd to conduct an Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment study for the proposed Township establishment on the remaining extent of portion 46, portions 58 and 59 of the Farm Elandsheuwel 436 IQ within the jurisdiction of JB Marks Local Municipality of the North West Province. As prescribed by SAHRA and stipulated by the legislation, an HIA is a pre-requisite for such a development. The main purpose of the study was to identify and document the archaeological sites, cultural resources, sites associated with oral histories, graves, cultural landscapes, and any structure of historical significance that may be affected by the proposed industrial township establishment. To reach a defensible recommendation, both a desktop study and a field survey were conducted. The desktop study was undertaken through the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) for previous Archaeological Impact Assessments conducted in the region of the proposed development, and also for research that has been carried out in the wider area over recent years. The field survey was conducted to validate any assumptions made during the desktop study. The Heritage Impact Assessment was undertaken in terms of Section 38 (8) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999).

Methods

To understand the archaeology of the area, a background study was undertaken, and relevant institutions were consulted. These studies entail the view of archaeological and heritage impact assessment studies that have been conducted in and around the proposed area through SAHRIS. The author conducted the field survey on the **07th of April 2025**. The area of land for the proposed development was investigated on foot for any traces of material culture.

Restrictions and constraints

The site is disturbed by previous and current agricultural activities. As with any survey, archaeological materials may be under the surface and therefore unidentifiable to the surveyor until they are exposed once construction begins. Most of the sections of the site are overrun by dense vegetation and in addition, is heavily disturbed by crop farming as a result, should any archaeological/ or grave site be observed during the construction stage, a heritage specialist monitoring the development must immediately be notified.

Results

The Phase I Cultural-Heritage Impact Assessment study for the proposed township development did not reveal any significant archaeological material within the footprint of the proposed development. The study noted that no burial sites exist within the study area, the study therefore does not trigger Section 36 of the NHRA Act of 1999. The study also noted that the area proposed for the township establishment

development is littered with dilapidated structures that are older than sixty years (**HB01, HB02, and HB03**) on the GPS coordinates **26°33'57.11"S, 28°22'59.80"E**. The buildings and structures are remnants of the previous farming activities conducted on the remainder of portion 46 of the farm Elandsheuwel 436 IQ. The structures are overrun by vegetation and are of less heritage significance. The developer is however reminded that in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA Act of 1999, the demolition of such historic structures requires a permit from the North West Provincial Heritage Authority. It is important to note that the possibility of chance finds is ever present and during the construction phase the developer is urged to be careful and heedful of that.

Recommendations

Subject to the recommendations herein made and the implementation of the mitigation measures and adoption of this heritage report, there are no significant cultural heritage resources barriers to the proposed development project. SAHRA/NWPHRA may approve the project as planned with special commendations to implement the recommendations here in made:

1. It is recommended that SAHRA/NWPHRA endorse the report as having satisfied the requirements of Section 38 (8) of the NHRA requirements;
2. It is recommended that SAHRA/NWPHRA make a decision in terms of Section 38 (4) of the NHRA to approve the proposed township development;
3. The study noted that a cluster of derelict structures exist within the study area, the structures are remnants of the farmstead and associated farming infrastructure. In terms of Section 34 of the NHRA Act of 1999, *No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure, which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority;*
4. In the case of the discovery of any cultural material or historical artefacts or finds, the developer should stop the work and report the finds to the responsible Archaeologist or contact a museum in the region, preferably one with a professional Archaeologist; and
5. From a heritage perspective supported by the findings of this study, the project is supported. However, construction activities should be approved under the observation that the dimensions do not extend beyond the area considered in this report.

Conclusions

A thorough background study and survey of the proposed development was conducted in line with SAHRA guidelines. As per the recommendations above, the project may proceed subject to adherence of the above recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	v
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	xi
GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	xii
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 SITES LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	2
3 PURPOSE OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE STUDY	12
4 METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH.....	13
5 APPLICABLE HERITAGE LEGISLATION	15
6 ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE STUDY AREA	18
6.1 The Stone Age	18
6.2 The Iron Age.....	18
6.3 Historical Period	19
6.4 Brief History of Potchefstroom.....	19
7 PREVIOUS HERITAGE IMPACT STUDIES	21
8 DEGREE OF SIGNIFICANCE	23
9 SURVEY FINDINGS	24
9.1 Archaeological	24
9.2 Historical Buildings and Structures	24
9.3 Burial sites and Graves	26
9.4 Palaeosensitivity	26
9.5 Public Monuments and Memorials	26
10 Impact Assessment Statement	27
10.1 Pre & Construction/operational phase Impacts.....	27
10.2 Decommissioning /closure phase Impacts	28
11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	31
12 REFERENCES.....	33
APPENDIX 1: SITE SIGNIFICANCE	36
APPENDIX 2: CHANCE FIND PROCEDURE.....	37

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Locality map of the study area (HDA 2024).....	3
Figure 2: Google Earth view of the site proposed for the development (Author 2025).	4
Figure 3: Survey tracks within the site proposed for the development (Author 2025).....	5
Figure 4: Heritage sites identified within the area proposed for the development (Author 2025).	6
Figure 5: General view of the site proposed for the development.	7
Figure 6: View of access roads within the area proposed for the development.	7
Figure 7: Showing ongoing crop farming within the study area.	8
Figure 8: Showing thick grass cover within the study area.	8
Figure 9: View of cattle grazing within the proposed development site.	9
Figure 10: View of a section of the site disturbed by agriculture.	9
Figure 11: View of dense grass cover within the proposed development site.	10
Figure 12: View of a previously cleared section within the development site.	10
Figure 13: View of farm tracks within the study area.	11
Figure 14: View of thick grass cover within the study area.	11
Figure 15: The structure identified on the site HB01.	25
Figure 16: Showing derelict structures identified on site HB01.	25

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of project location details.	2
Table 2: A summary table of previous heritage studies conducted in the locality and vicinity of the project area:	22
Table 3: Grading systems for the identified heritage resources in terms of the NHRA (Act 25 of 1999).....	23
Table 4: Loss of heritage during construction phase.	27
Table 5: Loss of heritage during decommissioning/closure phase.	28
Table 6: Anticipated Impact Rating	29
Table 6: Key and guidance to impact rating	30

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AIA	Archaeological Impact Assessment
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
LIA	Late Iron Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age
EIA	Early Iron Age
HMP	Heritage Management Plan
LSA	Late Stone Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
ESA	Early Stone Age
NASA	National Archives of South Africa
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act
NWPHRA	North West Provincial Heritage Resources Authority
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

The following terms used in this Archaeology are defined in the National Heritage Resources Act [NHRA], Act Nr. 25 of 1999, South African Heritage Resources Agency [SAHRA] Policies as well as the Australia ICOMOS Charter (*Burra Charter*):

Archaeological Material: remains resulting from human activities, which are in a state of disuse and are in, or on, land and which are older than 100 years, including artifacts, human and hominid remains, and artificial features and structures.

Artefact: Any movable object that has been used, modified or manufactured by humans.

Conservation: All the processes of looking after a site/heritage place or landscape including maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction and adaptation.

Cultural Heritage Resources: refers to physical cultural properties such as archaeological sites, palaeontological sites, historic and prehistorical places, buildings, structures and material remains, cultural sites such as places of rituals, burial sites or graves and their associated materials, geological or natural features of cultural importance or scientific significance. This include intangible resources such religion practices, ritual ceremonies, oral histories, memories indigenous knowledge.

Cultural landscape: “the combined works of nature and man” and demonstrate “the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both internal and external”.

Cultural Resources Management (CRM): the conservation of cultural heritage resources, management, and sustainable utilization and present for present and for the future generations

Cultural Significance: is the aesthetic, historical, scientific and social value for past, present and future generations.

Chance Finds: means Archaeological artefacts, features, structures or historical cultural remains such as human burials that are found accidentally in context previously not identified

during cultural heritage scoping, screening and assessment studies. Such finds are usually found during earth moving activities such as water pipeline trench excavations.

Compatible use: means a use, which respects the cultural significance of a place. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.

Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.

Expansion: means the modification, extension, alteration or upgrading of a facility, structure or infrastructure at which an activity takes place in such a manner that the capacity of the facility or the footprint of the activity is increased.

Grave: A place of interment (variably referred to as burial), including the contents, headstone or other marker of such a place, and any other structure on or associated with such place.

Heritage impact assessment (HIA): Refers to the process of identifying, predicting and assessing the potential positive and negative cultural, social, economic and biophysical impacts of any proposed project, plan, programme or policy which requires authorisation of permission by law, and which may significantly affect the cultural and natural heritage resources. The HIA includes recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures for minimising or avoiding negative impacts, measures enhancing the positive aspects of the proposal and heritage management and monitoring measures.

Historic Material: remains resulting from human activities, which are younger than 100 years, but no longer in use, including artifacts, human remains and artificial features and structures.

Impact: the positive or negative effects on human well-being and / or on the environment.

In situ material: means material culture and surrounding deposits in their original location and context, for instance archaeological remains that have not been disturbed.

Interested and affected parties Individuals: communities or groups, other than the proponent or the authorities, whose interests may be positively or negatively affected by the proposal or activity and/ or who are concerned with a proposal or activity and its consequences.

Interpretation: means all the ways of presenting the cultural significance of a place.

Late Iron Age: this period is associated with the development of complex societies and state systems in southern Africa.

Material culture means buildings, structure, features, tools and other artefacts that constitute the remains from past societies.

Mitigate: The implementation of practical measures to reduce adverse impacts or enhance beneficial impacts of an action.

Palaeontology: Any fossilised remains or fossil trace of animals or plants which lived in the geological past, other than fossil fuels or fossiliferous rock intended for industrial use, and any site which contains such fossilised remains or trace.

Place: means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views.

Protected area: means those protected areas contemplated in section 9 of the NEMPAA and the core area of a biosphere reserve and shall include their buffers.

Public participation process: A process of involving the public in order to identify issues and concerns and obtain feedback on options and impacts associated with a proposed project, programme or development. Public Participation Process in terms of NEMA refers to: a process in which potential interested and affected parties are given an opportunity to comment on, or raise issues relevant to specific matters.

Setting: means the area around a place, which may include the visual catchment.

Significance: can be differentiated into impact magnitude and impact significance. Impact magnitude is the measurable change (i.e. intensity, duration and likelihood). Impact significance is the value placed on the change by different affected parties (i.e. level of significance and acceptability). It is an anthropocentric concept, which makes use of value judgments and science-based criteria (i.e. biophysical, physical cultural, social and economic).

Site: a spatial cluster of artifacts, structures, organic and environmental remains, as residues of past human activity.

1 INTRODUCTION

At the request of Vhuluvhi Group (Pty) Ltd, Ruins Archaeo- Heritage Consulting (Pty) Ltd conducted a Phase I Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Township establishment on the Remaining Extent of Portion 46, Portions 58 and 59 of the Farm Elandsheuwel 436 IQ within the jurisdiction of JB Marks Local Municipality of the North West Province. The survey was conducted in accordance with the SAHRA Minimum Standards for the Archaeology and Paleontology Study. The minimum standards clearly specify the required contents of the report of this nature. The study aims to identify and document archaeological sites, cultural resources, sites associated with oral histories, graves, cultural landscapes, and any structure of historical significance that may be affected by the proposed development, these will in turn assist the developer in ensuring proper conservation measures in line with the National Heritage Resource Act, 1999 (Act 25 of 1999).

2 SITES LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The Housing Development Agency intends to accommodate people living in and around the Grimbeek Park area, by establishing integrated and sustainable human settlement development; The development entails an establishment of an estimated ± 1500 housing opportunities for the creation of government fully subsidized housing programme (BNG), First Home Finance Subsidy (FHFS/ Bonded housing), and social amenities excluding roads within the Grimbeek Park area within the jurisdiction of JB Marks Local Municipality in the North West Province. The overall site is 85.2015 Ha, and can be accessed via the R501 and R53 roads.

Table 1: Summary of project location details.

Province	North West
District Municipality	Dr Kenneth Kaunda
Local Municipality	JB Marks
Affected farms	Elandsheuwel 436 IQ
Proposed development	Township Establishment



Figure 1: Locality map of the study area (HDA 2024).



Figure 2: Google Earth view of the site proposed for the development (Author 2025).



Figure 3: Survey tracks within the site proposed for the development (Author 2025).



Figure 4: Heritage sites identified within the area proposed for the development (Author 2025).

PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE STUDY AREA



Figure 5: General view of the site proposed for the development.



Figure 6: View of access roads within the area proposed for the development.



Figure 7: Showing ongoing crop farming within the study area.



Figure 8: Showing thick grass cover within the study area.



Figure 9: View of cattle grazing within the proposed development site.



Figure 10: View of a section of the site disturbed by agriculture.



Figure 11: View of dense grass cover within the proposed development site.



Figure 12: View of a previously cleared section within the development site.



Figure 13: View of farm tracks within the study area.



Figure 14: View of thick grass cover within the study area.

3 PURPOSE OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE STUDY

The purpose of this Archaeological and Cultural Heritage study was to entirely identify and document archaeological sites, cultural resources, sites associated with oral histories, graves, cultural landscapes, and any structure of historical significance that may be affected by the proposed development, these will in turn assist the developer in ensuring proper conservation measures in line with the National Heritage Resource Act, 1999 (Act 25 of 1999). Impact assessments highlight many issues facing sites in terms of their management, conservation, monitoring and maintenance, and the environment in and around the site. Therefore, this study involves the following:

- Identification and recording of heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed township establishment project; and
- Providing recommendations on how best to appropriately safeguard the identified heritage sites. Mitigation is an important aspect of any development in areas where heritage sites can be identified.

4 METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

The methods utilised in this study are informed by the 2012 SAHRA Policy Guidelines for impact assessment. To achieve the purpose and objectives different sources were used, and this includes;

I. Literature review

Relevant literature was consulted through the SAHRIS website, with an intention to review previous Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments conducted in and around the area of the proposed development. Various archaeological, historical sources and recently published and unpublished books were used to aid this study.

II. Field survey

The field survey was undertaken by the author on **07 April 2025**. The survey made use of a vehicle to get to the site, and the site was surveyed on foot. The survey covered the entire servitude of the proposed development.

III. Public Participation

A public participation will be undertaken by the project EAP to gather the issues and concerns of interested and affected parties (IAPs) and Authorities, including community leaders. The process consists of contacting the IAPs, having a public meeting with the stakeholders and informing and engaging with them on the project proposal. The issues raised will be incorporated in the EIA/EMP where relevant and outcome of heritage issues will be forwarded to the Author.

IV. Documentation

In line with the appropriate legislation, the site was documented by taking photographs using a camera 10.1 mega pixel Sony Cybershort Digital Camera and plotting of finds using a Garmin etrex Venture HC.

V. Restriction and assumption

A large portion of the site is overrun by vegetation, waterlogging conditions also reduced the visibility of Archaeological material. Underground heritage may not be represented on the surface making the identification difficult. This serves as considerable limitation. Should any

cultural material be identified when the development begins, a specialist must be consulted to examine the finds.

5 APPLICABLE HERITAGE LEGISLATION

Several legislations provide the legal basis for the protection and preservation of both cultural and natural resources. These include the National Environment Management Act (No. 107 of 1998); Tourism Act, 2014 (Act No.3 of 2014); Cultural Institution Act (No. 119 of 1998), and the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999). Section 38 (1) of the National Heritage Resources Act requires that where relevant, an Impact Assessment is undertaken in case where a listed activity is triggered. Such activities include:

- (a) the construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;*
- (b) the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50 m in length; and*
- (c) any development or other activity which will change the character of an area of land, or water -*
 - (i) exceeding 5 000 m² in extent;*
 - (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or*
 - (iii) involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or*
 - (iv) the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a Provincial Heritage Resources Authority;*
- (d) the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m² in extent; or*
- (e) any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a Provincial Heritage Resources Authority, must at the very earliest stages of initiating such a development, notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.*

Section 3 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) lists a wide range of national resources protected under the act as they are deemed to be national estate. When conducting Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) the following heritage resources have to be identified:

- (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 natural features of cultural significance*
- (e) Geological sites of scientific or cultural importance*
- (f) Archaeological and paleontological sites*
- (g) Graves and burial grounds including-*
 - (i) ancestral graves*
 - (ii) royal graves and graves of traditional leaders*
 - (iii) graves of victims of conflict*
 - (iv) graves of individuals designated by the Minister by notice in the Gazette*
 - (v) historical graves and cemeteries; and*

- (vi) other human remains which are not covered by in terms of the Human Tissue Act, 1983 (Act No. 65 of 1983)
- (h) Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa
- (i) moveable objects, including -
 - (i) objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and paleontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens
 - (ii) objects to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage
 - (iii) ethnographic art and objects
 - (iv) military objects
 - (v) objects of decorative or fine art
 - (vi) objects of scientific or technological interest; and
 - (vii) books, records, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic, film or video material or sound recordings, excluding those that are public records as defined in section 1 of the National Archives of South Africa Act, 1996 (Act No. 43 of 1996).

Section 3 of the National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999) also distinguishes nine criteria for places and objects to qualify as ‘part of the national estate if they have cultural significance or other special value ...’ These criteria are the following:

- (a) Its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa’s history
- (b) Its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage
- (c) Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage
- (d) Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa’s natural or cultural places or objects
- (e) Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group
- (f) Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at particular period
- (g) Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons
- (h) Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa; and
- (i) Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

Other sections of the Act with a direct relevance to the AIA are the following:

Section 34(1) No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure, which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.

Section 35(4) No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority:

- *destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or paleontological site or any meteorite*

Section 36 (3) *No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority:*

- *destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or*
- *bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in detection or recovery of metals.*

6 ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE AREA

The archaeology of southern Africa is broadly divided into Stone Age, Iron Age and the Historical Period, and South Africa fits well into this periodisation.

6.1 The Stone Age

The Stone Age is the period in history of human evolution when lithic material was mainly used to make tools (Robins et al. 1998). In South Africa, in line with the picture in southern Africa, the period is divided into three phases. It is important to note that these dates are relative and only provide a broad framework for interpretation. The division for the Stone Age according to Lombard et al (2012:125). is as follows

Earlier Stone Age (ESA) 2 million-150 000 years ago

Middle Stone Age (MSA) 150-30 000 years ago.

Later Stone Age (LSA) 40 000-1840 A.D

There are no known Stone Age sites in the study area. The closest recorded sites are at the Vredefort Dome area. Pelsner (2017) found a number of Stone tools scatters close to Potchefstroom town. The LSA is more visible in the greater region of study; Rock engravings have been recorded close to Carletonville (Bergh 1999). There is also the well-known rock art site of Bosworth (Mason 1962), at this rock art site there are nearly 600 engravings of animals as well as geometrical patterns (Van Schalkwyk 2015:9).

6.2 The Iron Age

The Iron Age is the period in human history when metal was mainly used to produce tools. The primary technology used by the Bantu people was the 'Iron hoe', hence the advent of the Iron Age to designate the period which these groups expanded throughout southern Africa (Huffman 2000, 2007). In South Africa, the period is divided into two separate phases namely Early Iron Age (EIA) 200-1000A.D and Late Iron Age (LIA) 1000-1850A.D. Huffman (2007:361), however, indicates that a Middle Iron Age must be included although some feel that Middle Iron Age should be restricted to the Limpopo. His dates which now seem to be widely accepted in South Africa 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

No EIA sites are known to exist in the study area. As with the same picture with the Gauteng region, the larger geographical area was occupied later, in the 16th Century due to hostile

unfavourable climatic conditions. By the 16th Century, things changed, the climate became warmer and wetter allowing LIA farmers to occupy areas which they could not previously including the treeless plains of the North West (Maggs 1976).

The region is characterised by LIA stone-walled sites in Potchefstroom, Parys, Klerksdorp (Bergh 1999). According to Huffman (2007), the LIA sites in the larger geographical area could belong to various facies, of the Urewe tradition that include Ntsuanatsatsi, Uitkomst, Olifantspoort, Thabeng and Buispoort. These facies date to between AD1450 and AD1840, and were found at sites like Buffelshoek in the Vredefort Dome area (Huffman 2007). The Sotho people have been credited with the stone-walled settlements in the wider region of study; they built stone-walled settlements that were mainly concentrated along the northern plateau of the mountain. These LIA farmers herded cattle and small stock, and also planted crops (Mitchell 2002).

6.3 Historical Period

The first group of Europeans to move through the study area was that of Cornwallis Harris in 1836, closely followed by the Voortrekkers and then white farmers (Bergh 1999). Potchefstroom was one of the earliest towns to be established in the Transvaal in 1839 (Bergh 1999:14). During the Anglo-Transvaal War (1880-1881), a British garrison in Potchefstroom was besieged by the Boers, while during the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902), there were a lot skirmishes and battles around the study area such as Frederikstad (Bergh 1999). There was also a Black concentration camp at Frederickstad and a white concentration camp west of Potchefstroom (Bergh 1999: 14).

6.4 Brief History of Potchefstroom

Potchefstroom was founded in November 1838 by a group of Voortrekkers led by Hendrik Potgieter (Raper 2004). The name was derived from POT (gieter), the Voortrekkers leader, CHEF (referring to the leader, being Potgieter and STROOM (the Mooi River) where it is located (Raper 2004). Until 1960, it was the capital of the old South African Republic of which the first President, Marthinus Wessel Pretorius was sworn there. The town is a renowned Historical Town as it was the first town north of the Vaal River. It was originally built on the position of the current 'Oude Dorp' after the flood in 1840, it was decided that Potchefstroom would be developed an hour horse-ride south from the 'Oude Dorp' next to Mooi River. The town has a rich history and it brags of 24 declared national monuments. The first shots of the war of independence were fired in Potchefstroom, and the town also played a critical role

during the guerilla phase of the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) (<http://www.potchefstroom.co.za>). Potchefstroom also housed a large concentration camp, and it was the first of the 16 in the Transvaal (former ZAR) (www.theheritageportal.co.za).

7 PREVIOUS HERITAGE IMPACT STUDIES

There are very few Cultural Resources Management (CRM) studies that have been carried out within the project area. It should be noted that these reports are generally from within 20 km of the study area, but some studies here from the wider project area have only been included here to provide a significant contribution to the assessment. These few studies show the nature of the heritage of the study area. Of great importance are the two reports and an exemption letter that were done on the farm. One study yielded historical structures, and the other two including the exemption letter did not record anything. In general project area, the few studies have yielded Stone Age surface scatters, Iron Age pottery, Historical farmsteads and structures. Below is a summary of the studies and findings:

Table 2: A summary table of previous heritage studies conducted in the locality and vicinity of the project area:

Author/Year	Local Municipality	Farm name (s)	Findings
Coetzee (2023)	JB Marks	Town and Townlands 435 IQ	No material of cultural significance
Van der Walt (2023)	JB Marks	Vyfhoek 428 IQ	Nothing of heritage significance
Van der Walt (2022)	JB Marks	Vyfhoek 428 IQ	Historical structure and farmstead
Van Schalkwyk (2021)	Potchefstroom	Town and Townlands 435 IQ	No heritage resources
Van Schalkwyk (2015)	Potchefstroom	Town and Townlands 435 IQ	Low density of Stone Age tools
Pelser (2020)	Potchefstroom	Vyfhoek 428 IQ	No sites
Pelser (2013)	Potchefstroom	Town and Townlands 435 IQ	Iron Age pottery
Kusel (2008)	Tlokwe	Portion 46 of Elandsheuwel 436 IQ	Historical farmstead
Kusel (2008)	Tlokwe	Portion 2 of Elandsheuwel 436 IQ	No sites

8 DEGREE OF SIGNIFICANCE

Assessment of significance is important in this study as it provides rating of the impact prompted by the proposed development on heritage resources. The assessment of significance gives mitigation measures to limit the effects of the impact that could result as the cause of the development on heritage resources.

Table 3: Grading systems for the identified heritage resources in terms of the NHRA (Act 25 of 1999).

Level	Significance	Possible action
National (Grade I)	Site of National Value	Nominated to be declared by SAHRA
Provincial (Grade II)	Site of Provincial Value	Nominated to be declared by PHRA
Local Grade (IIIA)	Site of High Value Locally	Retained as heritage
Local Grade (IIIB)	Site of High Value Locally	Mitigated and part retained as heritage
General Protected Area A	Site of High to Medium	Mitigation necessary before destruction
General Protected Area B	Medium Value	Recording before destruction
General Protected Area C	Low Value	No action required before destruction

9 SURVEY FINDINGS

9.1 Archaeological

The Phase I Cultural-Heritage Impact Assessment study for the proposed township establishment, did not reveal any significant Archaeological material.

9.2 Historical Buildings and Structures

The desktop study for the farm Elandsheuwel shows that the whole farm was originally granted to one R.P. du Toit on the 28th of September 1854 and officially surveyed in June 1896. Portion 1 was then surveyed again between August 1902 & June 1903 (Pelser 2022). The field study confirmed that the proposed development is within an area that is heavily disturbed by previous agricultural activities and this is evidenced by the remaining infrastructures. The study identified derelict structures **(HB01)** on the GPS coordinates **26°44'0.91"S, 27° 6'50.55"E**. The structure is comprised of two silos and a building with only one face of the wall not collapsed... The structures were noted to be over sixty years of age and linked to the old farmhouse identified previously by (Kusel 2001). The structures, however, have been noted to have no significant historical, social or regional value as the associated farmhouse was demolished. The developer is however reminded that in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA Act of 1999, No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure, which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority in this case the North West Provincial Heritage Authority.



Figure 15: The structure identified on the site **HB01**.



Figure 16: Showing derelict structures identified on site **HB01**.

9.3 Burial sites and Graves

Human remains and burial sites are commonly found close to archaeological sites; they may be found in abandoned and neglected burial sites, or occur sporadically anywhere as a result of prehistoric activity, victims of conflict or crime. It is often difficult to detect the presence of archaeological human remains on the landscape as these burials, in most cases, are not marked at the surface. Archaeological and historical burials are usually identified when they are exposed through erosion and earth moving activities for infrastructure developments such as powerlines and roads. In some instances, packed stones or heap of stones may indicate the presence of informal pre-colonial burials.

The study noted that no burial sites exist in the study area. It is important to note that the probability of identifying unidentified and unmarked graves within the study area is ever present and highly probable and the developer is urged to be diligent.

9.4 Palaeosensitivity

The Palaeontology Desktop Study by (Fourie 2025) noted that fossils in South Africa mainly occur in rocks of sedimentary nature and not in rocks from igneous or metamorphic nature. Therefore, if there is the presence of strata the palaeontological sensitivity can generally be **very low** to **very high**, and here locally **high** for the Daspoort Formation, **moderate** for the Hekpoort Formation, **low** for the Quaternary, and **very low** for the diabase several of the Transvaal Supergroup, A wide range of possible fossil remains occur in the Cenozoic, though these are often sparse, such as: mammalian bones and teeth, tortoise remains, ostrich eggshells, non-marine mollusc shells, ostracods, diatoms, and other micro fossil groups, trace fossils (e.g. calcretised termitaria, rhizoliths, burrows, vertebrate tracks), freshwater stromatolites, plant material such as peats, foliage, wood, pollens, within calc tufa. Stromatolite structures range from a centimetre to several tens of metres in size.

9.5 Public Monuments and Memorials

None exist within the study area

10 Impact Assessment Statement

An impact can be defined as any change in the physical-chemical, biological, cultural, and/or socio-economic environmental system that can be attributed to human activities related to the project site under study for meeting a project need a quantitative impact assessment will be conducted for the project. The method to be used makes use of the basic risk assessment approach of deriving an expression for risk from the product of likelihood (probability) and consequences.

10.1 Pre & Construction/operational phase Impacts

Table 4: Loss of heritage during construction phase.

	Loss of Heritage					
Phase		Construction/ Excavation				
Criteria		Details / Discussion				
Description of impact	• Destruction of archaeological remains during clearance. • Stumping of archaeological remains by movement of heavy construction vehicles. • Demolition of Historical Buildings					
Mitigation required	• Use existing tracks and roads within the development area • Application of Section 34 Destruction/Demolition permit • Induct construction workers on heritage resources and chance finds • Use chance find procedure to manage accidental finds					
Parameters	Magnitude	Spatial scale (Extent)	Reversibility	Duration	Probability	Significance
Without-Mitigation	Moderate (4)	Local (3)	Irreversible (5)	Long-term (4)	Highly probable (4)	Moderate to high (64)
With-Mitigation	Very Low (2)	Local (3)	Completely reversible (1)	Short-term (2)	Likely (4)	Moderate to low (32)

10.2 Decommissioning /closure phase Impacts

No direct loss of heritage resources is expected during this phase of the project. However, indirect impacts may occur during movement of vehicles.

Table 5: Loss of heritage during decommissioning/closure phase.

	Loss of heritage					
Phase		Decommissioning (Removal infrastructure and equipment)				
Criteria		Details / Discussion				
Description of impact	• Destruction of archaeological remains by moving vehicles. • Demolition of historical structures and buildings					
Mitigation required	• Using existing tracks and roads to remove infrastructure and equipment. • Use chance find procedure to manage any accidental exposure /damage of heritage resources.					
Parameters	Magnitude	Spatial scale (Extent)	Reversibility	Duration	Probability	Significance
Without-Mitigation	Moderate (4)	Local (3)	Irreversible (5)	Long-term (4)	Highly probable (4)	Moderate to high (64)
With Mitigation	Very Low (2)	Local (3)	Completely reversible (1)	Short-term (2)	Likely (4)	Moderate to low (32)

Table 6: Anticipated Impact Rating

The status of the impact		
Status		Description
Positive:		a benefit to the holistic environment
Negative:		a cost to the holistic environment
Neutral:		no cost or benefit
The duration of the impact		
Score	Duration	Description
1	Short term	Immediate/ short term (less than 3 months)
2	Medium term	Construction or decommissioning period
3	Long term	For the life of the operation
5	Permanent	Permanent
The extent of the impact		
Score	Extent	Description
1	Footprint	Within the site boundary
2	Site	Affects immediate surrounding areas
3	Local	Local area / district (neighbouring properties, transport routes and adjacent towns) is affected
4	Regional	Extends to almost entire province or larger region
5	National	Affects the country.
The reversibility of the impact		
Score	Reversibility	Description
1	Completely reversible	Reverses with minimal rehabilitation & negligible residual affects
3	Reversible	Requires mitigation and rehabilitation to ensure reversibility
5	Irreversible	Cannot be rehabilitated completely/rehabilitation not viable
The magnitude (severe or beneficial) of the impact		
Score	Severe/beneficial effect	Description
1	Zero	Natural and/or social functions and/or processes remain unaltered.
2	Very Low	Natural and/or social functions and/or processes are negligibly altered.
3	Low	Natural and/or social functions and/or processes are slightly altered and are reversible with time.
4	Moderate	Natural and/or social functions and/or processes are notably altered and are reversible with rehabilitation.
5	High	Natural and/or social functions and/or processes are permanently altered.
The probability of the impact		
Score	Rating	Description
1	Unlikely	The chance of this impact occurring is zero (0%).
2	Possible	May occur. The chances of this impact occurring is defined as 25%.
3	Probable	Likely to occur. The chances of this impact occurring is defined as 50%.
4	Highly Probable	The chances of this impact occurring is defined as 75%.
5	Definite	Will certainly occur. The chance of this impact occurring is defined as 100%.
The Consequence		= Magnitude (3) + Extent (3 + Duration (3) + Reversibility (4).
The Significance		= Consequence x Probability. 14×4=52

Table 7: Key and guidance to impact rating

Score	Significance
1 to 20	Low
21 to 40	Moderate to Low
41 to 60	Moderate
61 to 80	Moderate to high
81 to 100	High

11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

At the request of Vhuluvhi Group (Pty), Ruins Archaeo- Heritage Consulting (Pty) Ltd conducted a Phase I Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment Study for the proposed Township establishment on the remaining extent of portion 46, portions 58 and 59 of the Farm Elandsheuwel 436 IQ within the jurisdiction of JB Marks Local Municipality of the North West Province. Desktop research revealed that the project area would have been rich in Stone Age and Iron Age artefacts, however, the field study did not identify any sites within the proposed development site. In terms of the archaeology, there are no obvious ‘Fatal Flaws’ or ‘No-Go’ areas. However, the potential for chance finds, remains and the applicant and contractors are urged to lookout for chance finds during construction. The procedure for reporting chance finds has clearly been laid out and if this report is adopted by SAHRA, then there are no archaeological reasons why the proposed township establishment development cannot be approved. Subject to the recommendations herein made and the implementation of the mitigation measures and adoption of this heritage report, there are no significant cultural heritage resources barriers to the proposed development project. SAHRA/NWPHRA may approve the project as planned with special commendations to implement the recommendations here in made:

1. It is recommended that SAHRA/NWPHRA endorse the report as having satisfied the requirements of Section 38 (8) of the NHRA requirements;
2. It is recommended that SAHRA/NWPHRA make a decision in terms of Section 38 (4) of the NHRA to approve the proposed township development;
3. The study noted that a cluster of derelict structures exist within the study area, the structures are remnants of the farmstead and associated farming infrastructure. In terms of Section 34 of the NHRA Act of 1999, *No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure, which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority;*
4. In the case of the discovery of any cultural or historical artefacts or finds, the developer should stop the work and report the finds to the responsible Archaeologist or contact the nearest museum, preferably where there is an Archaeologist; and

5. From a heritage perspective supported by the findings of this study, the project is supported. However, construction activities should be approved under the observation that the dimensions do not extend beyond the area considered in this report.

12 REFERENCES

Bergh, J.S. 1999. Geskiedenis atlas van Suid Afrika. Die vier Noordelike Provinsies. J.L. van Schaik.

Cobbing, J. 1988. The Mfecane as alibi: thoughts on Dithakong and Mbolompo. Johannesburg; Wits University Press.

Coetzee, F.P. 2023. Phase 1 Investigation for the proposed construction of a new concrete bridge over the Mooi River, a functional Overflow for the Retention Dam, a Wastewater Treatment Plant, Route NWU Sewer Usage Volume to the Treatment Plant and Upgrade the existing Water Canal (concrete culvert) on portion 24 and portion 412 of the farm Potchefstroom Town and Townlands 435 IQ and portion 1 of Erf 1302, JB Marks Local Municipality, Dr Kenneth Kaunda District Municipality, North West Province. Unpublished report prepared for Milnex cc.

Deacon, H. J. and Deacon, J. 1999. Human beginnings in South Africa: Uncovering the secrets of the Stone Age. Cape Town: David Philip

Evers, T.M. 1975. Recent Iron Age research in the eastern Transvaal, South Africa. South African Archaeological Bulletin, 30: 71-83.

Hamilton, C. 1995. Mfecane Aftermath: Reconstruction Debates in southern African History. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Huffman, T.N. 2007 Handbook to the Iron Age: The archaeology of pre-colonial farming societies in southern Africa. Scottville: University of KwaZulu Natal Press.

Inskeep, R.R. 1977. The peopling of Southern Africa. David Philip: Cape Town.

Klein, R. G. 2000. Earlier Stone Age of southern Africa. South African Archaeological Bulletin 27 (172):107-122.

Kusel, U. 2008. Cultural Heritage resources Impact Assessment of portion 2 of the farm Elandsheuwel 436 IQ, Tlokwe Local Municipality, North West Province. Unpublished report prepared for Environmental & GIS Consultants.

Kusel, U. 2008. Cultural Heritage Resources Impact Assessment of portion 46 of the farm Elandsheuwel 436 IQ (portions adjacent and to the west of Loopspruit), Tlokwe Local Municipality, North West Province. Unpublished report prepared for Environmental & GIS Consultants.

Lombard, M, Wadley, L, Deacon, J, Wurz, S, Parsons, I, Mohapi, M, Swart, J & Mitchell, P 2012. South African and Lesotho Stone Age sequence updated. South African Archaeological Bulletin 67: 123-144.

Mitchell, P. J. 2002. The archaeology of southern Africa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pelser, A.J. 2013. A report on a Phase 1 heritage assessment for the proposed expansion of the Roodekraal Free Range Chicken Farm Operations, located near Potchefstroom, North West Province. Unpublished report prepared for AB Enviro Consult.

Pelser, A.J. 2020. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for a proposed Township Development on portion 51 of the farm Vyfhoek 428 IQ in the Potchefstroom, North West Province. Unpublished report prepared for AB Enviro Consult.

Raper, P.E. 2004. Dictionary of Southern African Place Names. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball Publishers.

Ross, R. 2002. A concise history of South Africa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van der Walt, J. 2022. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Baillile Park extension 64 and 65 Township development in Potchefstroom, North West Province. Unpublished report prepared for Texture Environmental Consultants.

Van der Walt, J. 2023. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Township development on portion 1108 of the farm Vyfhoek 428 IQ, JB Marks Local Municipality, Potchefstroom, North West Province. Unpublished report prepared for Texture Environmental Consultants.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2015. Cultural Heritage Assessment for the proposed Ikageng extension 13 on portion 2 of the remainder of Town and Townlands of Potchefstroom 435 IQ, North West Province. Unpublished report prepared for Environamics.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2021. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed installation of a Bulk Sewer pipeline in the Mohadin region, western Potchefstroom. Unpublished report prepared for Environsolution Consulting.

Villa, P., Sonano, S., Tsanova, T., Dengano, I., Higham, T. F. G., d'Erico, F., Blackwell, L., Lucejko, J. J., Colombini, M. P & Beaumont, P. B. 2012. National Academy of Sciences 109 (33): 13208-13213.

Wright, J. & Hamilton, C. 1989. Traditions and Transformations. The Phongolo-Mzimkhulu Region in the late Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Centuries. In: Duminy, A. & Guest, B (eds.) Natal and Zululand from earlier times to 1910. A New History. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press and Shutter and Shooter (Pvt), Ltd, pp 49-82.

Legislation, Policy and Official documents

SAHRA, 2005. Minimum Standards for the Archaeological and Paleontological components of Impact Assessment Reports, Draft Version 1.4.

The National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999. South Africa: Government Gazette.

Internet Sources

<http://www.potchefstroom.co.za>

www.theheritageportal.co.za

13 APPENDIX 1: SITE SIGNIFICANCE

The following guidelines for determining site *significance* were developed by SAHRA in 2003. It must be kept in mind that the various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and that the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these.

(a) Historic value

- Is it important in the community, or pattern of history?
- Does it have strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance in history?
- Does it have significance relating to the history of slavery?

(b) Aesthetic value

- Is it important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group?

(c) Scientific value

- Does it have potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of natural or cultural heritage?
- Is it important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period?

(d) Social value

- Does it have strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons?

(e) Rarity

- Does it possess uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage?

(f) Representivity

- Is it important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of natural or cultural places or objects?
- What is the importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a range of landscapes or environments, the attributes of which identify it as being characteristic of its class?
- Is it important in demonstrating the principal characteristics 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?

14 APPENDIX 2: CHANCE FIND PROCEDURE

The following procedure is to be executed in the event that archaeological material is discovered:

- All construction/clearance activities in the vicinity of the accidental find/feature/site must cease immediately to avoid further damage to the find site.
- Briefly note the type of archaeological materials you think you have encountered, and their location, including, if possible, the depth below surface of the find
- Report your discovery to your supervisor or if they are unavailable, report to the project ECO who will provide further instructions.
- If the supervisor is not available, notify the Environmental Control Officer immediately. The Environmental Control Officer will then report the find to the Site Manager who will promptly notify the project archaeologist and SAHRA.
- Delineate the discovered find/ feature/ site and provide 25m buffer zone from all sides of the find.
- Record the find GPS location, if able.
- All remains are to be stabilised in situ.
- Secure the area to prevent any damage or loss of removable objects.
- Photograph the exposed materials, preferably with a scale (a yellow plastic field binder will suffice).
- The project archaeologist will undertake the inspection process in accordance with all project health and safety protocols under direction of the Health and Safety Officer.
- Finds rescue strategy: All investigation of archaeological soils will be undertaken by hand, all finds, remains and samples will be kept and submitted to a Museum as required by the heritage legislation. In the event that any artefacts need to be conserved, the relevant permit will be sought from the SAHRA.
- An on-site office and finds storage area will be provided, allowing storage of any artefacts or other archaeological material recovered during the monitoring process.
- In the case of human remains, in addition to the above, the SAHRA Burial Ground Unit will be contacted and the guidelines for the treatment of human remains will be adhered to. If skeletal remains are identified, an archaeologist will be available to examine the remains.
- The project archaeologist will complete a report on the findings as part of the permit application process.
- Once authorisation has been given by SAHRA, the Applicant will be informed when construction activities can resume.