

**SURVEY OF THE FARM KOPLEEGTE, COLENZO,
KWAZULU-NATAL**

FOR NATURE STAMP

DATE:

By Gavin Anderson

**Umlando: Archaeological Surveys and Heritage
Management**

PO Box 102532, Meerensee, 3901

Phone/fax: 035-7531785 Fax: 0865445631

Cell: 0836585362



TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	3
KWAZULU-NATAL HERITAGE ACT NO. 4 OF 2008	8
METHOD	10
Defining significance.....	11
RESULTS	13
DESKTOP STUDY	13
FIELD SURVEY.....	19
G05.....	22
G25, G26 and G65	22
G40 & G40A	23
G50	24
G80	24
G81.....	26
G82.....	26
G83.....	26
G84.....	28
G85.....	28
G86.....	29
G89.....	29
GLK078d	30
GLK078e	30
LIA1, LIA3 and LIA4	31
MANAGEMENT PLAN	32
CONCLUSION.....	35
REFERENCES	36

TABLE OF FIGURES

FIG. 1 GENERAL LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA.....	4
FIG. 2: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AREA	5
FIG. 3: TOPOGRAPHICAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AREA.....	6
FIG. 4: THE ORIGINAL STUDY AREA VS NEW STUDY AREA.....	7
FIG. 5: LOCATION OF KNOWN HERITAGE SITES NEAR THE STUDY AREA	15
FIG. 6: STUDY AREA IN 1937 - 1938.....	16
FIG. 7: STUDY AREA IN 1944	17
FIG. 8: SITES RECORDED IN THE INITIAL SURVEY AND DESKTOP STUDY	18
TABLE 1: LOCATION OF RECORDED SITES AND FEATURES.....	19
FIG. 9: LOCATION OF RECORDED SITES	20
FIG. 10: GENERAL VIEW OF THE STUDY AREA.....	21
FIG. 11: STONE WALLING AT G25, G26, &G65	22
FIG. 12: FEATURE AT G40	23
FIG. 13: LARGE STONE WALLED KRAAL AT G50.....	25
FIG. 14: POSSIBLE GRAVE AT G82.....	27
FIG. 15: GRAVE AT G83.....	27
FIG. 16: STONE WALLING AT G85.....	28
FIG. 17: POSSIBLE GRAVE AT G89.....	29
FIG. 18: GRAVES AT GLK078E	31
FIG. 19: VIEW OF LIA1	32
TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT PLAN & MITIGATION.....	34

INTRODUCTION

Nature Stamp requested Umlando to complete a survey of the farm Kopleegte. The study area occurs on the farm Kopleegte, ~14km west-southwest of Colenso. Figures 1 – 3 indicate the location of the study area. The study area occurs between an Eskom Transmission line and farm road on the west and hills on the east.

The project entails changing grazing land into crop fields where several circular pivots will be constructed. Subsequent to the environmental studies, the size of the cultivation land has been reduced (fig. 4). The new area the placement of pivots will take full cognisance of the biodiversity and heritage resources.

The aim of the second survey was to note the occurrence of heritage sites in the new study area and suggest immediate mitigation so that the project is no longer delayed. Features/sites were noted and will be mitigated in a Phase 2 with more detailed recording. The survey walked the area noting the various features, in addition to previously recorded features. Each site or feature was photographed if possible. In some areas, the grass covered the low walling and photography was not possible.

The area is an heritage sensitive area for two reasons. Firstly, there are many known Late Iron Age to Historical Period stone walled settlements dating from ACE1250 onwards. Some of the hills contain engravings while the settlements often have human remains. Secondly, the area is related to the 2nd Anglo-Boer War as it occurs between Colenso and Spionkop and would have had British Forces passing through here.

FIG. 1 GENERAL LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA




FIG. 2: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AREA




FIG. 3: TOPOGRAPHICAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AREA




FIG. 4: THE ORIGINAL STUDY AREA VS NEW STUDY AREA¹



¹ Blue = original, yellow = new study area

KWAZULU-NATAL HERITAGE ACT NO. 4 OF 2008

“General protection: Structures.—

- No structure which is, or which may reasonably be expected to be older than 60 years, may be demolished, altered or added to without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- Where the Council does not grant approval, the Council must consider special protection in terms of sections 38, 39, 40, 41 and 43 of Chapter 9.
- The Council may, by notice in the *Gazette*, exempt—
- A defined geographical area; or
- defined categories of sites within a defined geographical area, from the provisions of subsection where the Council is satisfied that heritage resources falling in the defined geographical area or category have been identified and are adequately protected in terms of sections 38, 39, 40, 41 and 43 of Chapter 9.
- A notice referred to in subsection (2) may, by notice in the *Gazette*, be amended or withdrawn by the Council.

General protection: Graves of victims of conflict.—No person may damage, alter, exhume, or remove from its original position—

- the grave of a victim of conflict;
- a cemetery made up of such graves; or
- any part of a cemetery containing such graves, without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- General protection: Traditional burial places.—
- No grave—
- not otherwise protected by this Act; and
- not located in a formal cemetery managed or administered by a local authority, may be damaged, altered, exhumed, removed from its original position, or otherwise disturbed without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.

The Council may only issue written approval once the Council is satisfied that—

- the applicant has made a concerted effort to consult with communities and individuals who by tradition may have an interest in the grave; and
- the applicant and the relevant communities or individuals have reached agreement regarding the grave.

General protection: Battlefield sites, archaeological sites, rock art sites, palaeontological sites, historic fortifications, meteorite or meteorite impact sites.—

- No person may destroy, damage, excavate, alter, write or draw upon, or otherwise disturb any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, meteorite or meteorite impact site without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- Upon discovery of archaeological or palaeontological material or a meteorite by any person, all activity or operations in the general vicinity of such material or meteorite must cease forthwith and a person who made the discovery must submit a written report to the Council without delay.
- The Council may, after consultation with an owner or controlling authority, by way of written notice served on the owner or controlling authority, prohibit any activity considered by the Council to be inappropriate within 50 metres of a rock art site.
- No person may exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb, damage, destroy, own or collect any object or material associated with any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, meteorite or meteorite impact site without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- No person may bring any equipment which assists in the detection of metals and archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, or excavation equipment onto any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, or meteorite impact site, or

- use similar detection or excavation equipment for the recovery of meteorites, without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- The ownership of any object or material associated with any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, meteorite or meteorite impact site, on discovery, vest in the Provincial Government and the Council is regarded as the custodian on behalf of the Provincial Government.” (KZN Heritage Act of 2008)

METHOD

The method for Heritage assessment consists of several steps.

The first step forms part of the desktop assessment. Here we would consult the database that has been collated by Umlando. These databases contains archaeological site locations and basic information from several provinces (information from Umlando surveys and some colleagues), most of the national and provincial monuments and battlefields in Southern Africa (<http://www.vuvuzela.com/googleearth/monuments.html>) and cemeteries in southern Africa (information supplied by the Genealogical Society of Southern Africa). We use 1st and 2nd edition 1:50 000 topographical and 1937 aerial photographs where available, to assist in general location and dating of buildings and/or graves. The database is in Google Earth format and thus used as a quick reference when undertaking desktop studies. Where required we would consult with a local data recording centre, however these tend to be fragmented between different institutions and areas and thus difficult to access at times. We also consult with an historical architect, palaeontologist, and an historian where necessary.

The survey results will define the significance of each recorded site, as well as a management plan.

All sites are grouped according to low, medium, and high significance for the purpose of this report. Sites of low significance have no diagnostic artefacts or features. Sites of medium significance have diagnostic artefacts or features and these sites tend to be sampled. Sampling includes the collection of artefacts for future analysis. All diagnostic pottery, such as rims, lips, and decorated sherds are sampled, while bone, stone, and shell are mostly noted. Sampling usually occurs on most sites. Sites of high significance are excavated and/or extensively sampled. Those sites that are extensively sampled have high research potential, yet poor preservation of features.

Defining significance

Heritage sites vary according to significance and several different criteria relate to each type of site. However, there are several criteria that allow for a general significance rating of archaeological sites.

These criteria are:

1. State of preservation of:

- 1.1. Organic remains:
 - 1.1.1. Faunal
 - 1.1.2. Botanical
- 1.2. Rock art
- 1.3. Walling
- 1.4. Presence of a cultural deposit
- 1.5. Features:
 - 1.5.1. Ash Features
 - 1.5.2. Graves
 - 1.5.3. Middens
 - 1.5.4. Cattle byres
 - 1.5.5. Bedding and ash complexes

2. Spatial arrangements:

- 2.1. Internal housing arrangements
- 2.2. Intra-site settlement patterns
- 2.3. Inter-site settlement patterns

3. Features of the site:

- 3.1. Are there any unusual, unique or rare artefacts or images at the site?
- 3.2. Is it a type site?
- 3.3. Does the site have a very good example of a specific time period, feature, or artefact?

4. Research:

- 4.1. Providing information on current research projects
- 4.2. Salvaging information for potential future research projects

5. Inter- and intra-site variability

- 5.1. Can this particular site yield information regarding intra-site variability, i.e. spatial relationships between various features and artefacts?
- 5.2. Can this particular site yield information about a community's social relationships within itself, or between other communities?

6. Archaeological Experience:

6.1. The personal experience and expertise of the CRM practitioner should not be ignored. Experience can indicate sites that have potentially significant aspects, but need to be tested prior to any conclusions.

7. Educational:

- 7.1. Does the site have the potential to be used as an educational instrument?
- 7.2. Does the site have the potential to become a tourist attraction?
- 7.3. The educational value of a site can only be fully determined after initial test-pit excavations and/or full excavations.

8. Other Heritage Significance:

- 8.1. Palaeontological sites
- 8.2. Historical buildings

- 8.3. Battlefields and general Anglo-Zulu and Anglo-Boer sites
- 8.4. Graves and/or community cemeteries
- 8.5. Living Heritage Sites
- 8.6. Cultural Landscapes, that includes old trees, hills, mountains, rivers, etc related to cultural or historical experiences.

The more a site can fulfill the above criteria, the more significant it becomes. Test-pit excavations are used to test the full potential of an archaeological deposit. This occurs in Phase 2. These test-pit excavations may require further excavations if the site is of significance (Phase 3). Sites may also be mapped and/or have artefacts sampled as a form of mitigation. Sampling normally occurs when the artefacts may be good examples of their type, but are not in a primary archaeological context. Mapping records the spatial relationship between features and artefacts.

RESULTS

DESKTOP STUDY

The desktop study consisted of analysing various maps for evidence of prior habitation in the study area, as well as for previous archaeological surveys. The archaeological database indicates that there are archaeological sites in the general area (fig. 5). These sites include all types of Stone Age and Iron Age sites. No sites occur in the study area. Anderson (2015) has surveyed and excavated areas adjacent to the study area. These were Late Iron Age (LIA) and Historical Period settlements and engravings. Dr. T. Maggs had recorded an engraving site to the northeast of the study area several years ago (Natal Museum site records). Two sites occur within the first study area.

No national monuments, battlefields, or historical cemeteries are known to occur in the study area.

The 1937 aerial photographs show several circular LIA stone walled features (fig. 6). These photographs also clearly show the eastern hill being ploughed and used for crops. The fields and ploughing activity has also missed the main stone walls. This means that only the stone wall features are in a primary context and any artefacts are in a secondary context. The middle and eastern hills have remained grasslands.

The first edition 1:50 000 map (1944) shows that the eastern hill has reverted to grasslands (fig. 7). There is a settlement in the southwestern corner and this was recorded as GLK078e by Anderson (2008). The map also indicates that the farm was referred to as Koplage.

I used four Google Earth images to note the location of stone walling prior to the survey: 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2015. Each of these images was taken at different times of the year and thus has different heights of vegetation. This allows for more sites to be noted from aerial imagery. All of these sites were copied into the GPS and visited during the survey. Figure 8 shows the assumed features. The important aspect of the Google Earth imagery was that kraals would be noted, and thus highlight areas where graves could occur. Prins's data was used where his recorded clusters.

FIG. 5: LOCATION OF KNOWN HERITAGE SITES NEAR THE STUDY AREA




FIG. 6: STUDY AREA IN 1937 - 1938



FIG. 7: STUDY AREA IN 1944





FIG. 8: SITES RECORDED IN THE INITIAL SURVEY AND DESKTOP STUDY



FIELD SURVEY

The field survey recorded several individual stone walled features in addition to the ones noted from the desktop study. Figure 9 shows the revised and confirmed location of heritage features within the study area. Note that only the refined study area was surveyed. All areas where features were noted have an automatic 20m buffer and would require some form of management plan. Sites recorded by Prins (2015) are not described in detail below.

Figure 10 shows the general views of the study area.

TABLE 1: LOCATION OF RECORDED SITES AND FEATURES

Name	Latitude	Longitude	Description
1	-28.764683333	29.685013889	Cluster of Stone walling - FP
3	-28.768438889	29.690697222	Cluster of Stone walling - FP
4	-28.771500000	29.687863889	Cluster of Stone walling - FP
7	-28.768650000	29.683352778	Cluster of Stone walling - FP
8	-28.771455556	29.687847222	Cluster of Stone walling - FP
E1	-28.774322222	29.681988889	Engraving - not found -FP
E2	-28.770655556	29.679900000	Engraving - not found - FP
G05	-28.770879786	29.679724853	Grave
G5A	-28.770666970	29.679660983	Grave
g25	-28.763793726	29.684392316	Kraal
g26	-28.763797330	29.684848879	Kraal
g40	-28.767597014	29.682724988	Grave
G40A	-28.767697010	29.682863960	Grave
G050	-28.769098716	29.683058839	Kraal and Graves
g65	-28.763803449	29.685073849	Kraal
G80	-28.769730041	29.679411035	Kraal
G81	-28.770888001	29.680690030	Kraal
G82	-28.771185977	29.680367997	Grave
G83	-28.768761009	29.684405979	Grave
G84	-28.769378	29.684964	House floor
G85	-28.770703012	29.685460003	Kraal
G86	-28.769138027	29.690195024	Kraal
GG1	-28.770180987	29.679818982	Grave
GG2	-28.769173985	29.683094965	Grave
GG21	-28.769137021	29.683137964	Grave
GLK078d	-28.770231949	29.679471636	Stone walling, 2x graves?
GLK078e	-28.774462966	29.682266414	kraal, houses, 9+graves
Gr	-28.776030556	29.682569444	Grave
LIA1 a	-28.764635352	29.684978966	Cluster of Stone walling - FP

FIG. 9: LOCATION OF RECORDED SITES




FIG. 10: GENERAL VIEW OF THE STUDY AREA



G05

G05 is a low circular stone wall ~10m in diameter. There is a grave (G05a) ~20m from this kraal. The site was hidden in the grass thus no photograph was taken.

Significance: The kraal is of low significance while the grave is of high significance.

Mitigation: The kraal area should be mapped and photographed after the area has been burnt. The grave should have a 5m buffer with a clear demarcation.

SAHRA Rating: 3C for the kraal, 3A for the grave.

G25, G26 and G65

These three features occur outside of study area but appear to be related to LIA1. These are three rectangular kraals at the near base of the hill. They are ~2m x 3m in size (fig. 11).

Significance: The features are of low significance

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

SAHRA Rating: 3C

FIG. 11: STONE WALLING AT G25, G26, &G65



G40 & G40A

The general area around these two features requires re-assessment after the grass has been burnt. There are several low stone features including square walling (fig. 12). These are two probable graves.

Significance: The graves are of high significance.

Mitigation: Each grave should have a 20m buffer around each grave. The area needs reassessment after it has been burnt.

SAHRA Rating: 3A (for the graves)

FIG. 12: FEATURE AT G40



G50

G50 is the same as Prin's cluster 7. The site consists of a large stone walled byre with secondary walling (fig. 13). There is a possible house floor associated with the kraal. The entrance to the kraal is facing north, or downhill, and there are stone features ~10m from the entrance. These features could be graves. There are two more stone cairns ~25m east of the byre – GG1 and GG2. These are probably graves.

Significance: The graves are of high significance.

Mitigation: The site should be buffered from the proposed pivots. The site should be re-assessed after the area has been burnt to determine if the features are graves. If these were graves, the entire site would be protected from farming activities as the graves occur on each side of the main kraal and fall within their buffers.

SAHRA Rating: 3A

G80

The site consists of a low circular wall 11m in diameter. No associated features were noted. The site was hidden in the grass thus no photograph was taken.

Significance: The kraal is of low significance.

Mitigation: The kraal area should be mapped and photographed after the area has been burnt.

SAHRA Rating: 3C for the kraal.

FIG. 13: LARGE STONE WALLED KRAAL AT G50



G81

G81 is a low circular stone wall 19m in diameter. There is secondary walling to the primary wall. A maize lower grinding stone associated with this feature. The site was hidden in the grass thus no photograph was taken.

Significance: The kraal is of low significance.

Mitigation: The kraal area should mapped and photographed after the area has been burnt.

SAHRA Rating: 3C for the kraal.

G82

The site consists of two possible graves (fig. 14).

Significance: If these are graves then the site is of high significance.

Mitigation: The area will be re-assessed after burning. If they are graves, they will be demarcated and buffered.

SAHRA Rating: Could be 3A

G83

The site appears to be a 20th century grave (fig. 15). The grave is in a north-south orientation.

Significance: The grave is of high significance.

Mitigation: The grave should be buffered.

SAHRA Rating: 3A

FIG. 14: POSSIBLE GRAVE AT G82



FIG. 15: GRAVE AT G83



G84

The feature is a house floor, with the entrance facing northeast. The floor is 5m diameter. The site was hidden in the grass thus no photograph was taken.

Significance: The site is of low significance.

Mitigation: The feature needs to be mapped and photographed before destruction.

SAHRA Rating: 3C

G85

The feature is a low stone wall that is ~10m diameter (fig. 16).

Significance: The site is of low significance.

Mitigation: The feature needs to be mapped and photographed before destruction.

SAHRA Rating: 3C

FIG. 16: STONE WALLING AT G85



G86

The feature is a low stone wall that has a 5m diameter. The site was hidden in the grass thus no photograph was taken.

Significance: The site is of low significance.

Mitigation: The feature needs to be mapped and photographed before destruction.

SAHRA Rating: 3C

G89

The feature is a low stone cairn that could be a grave (fig. 17).

Significance: The site is of high significance.

Mitigation: The feature needs to be buffered.

SAHRA Rating: 3C

FIG. 17: POSSIBLE GRAVE AT G89



GLK078d

GLK078d is located to the east of the farm road. The site consists of at least one stone wall and two graves. This site probably dates to the LIA. The grave GG1 might be associated with kraal. The site was hidden in the grass thus no photograph was taken.

Significance: The kraal is of low significance while the grave is of high significance.

Mitigation: The kraal area should be mapped and photographed after the area has been burnt. The graves should have a 5m buffer with a clear demarcation.

SAHRA Rating: 3A

GLK078e

GLK078e consists of a recent settlement dating to the 20th century. There are several houses, kraals, and approx. ten graves (fig. 18). The most recent grave dates to 1984. This site dates to the historical and more recent past.

Significance: The graves are of high significance.

Mitigation: The graves need to be buffered.

SAHRA Rating: 3A

FIG. 18: GRAVES AT GLK078E²



LIA1, LIA3 and LIA4

These clusters were recorded by Prins. These sites are each clusters of stone walling and related features, including graves. The sites each have a diameter of ~200m. Fig. 19 shows the main kraal at LIA1.

Significance: The sites vary in significance and need to be assessed after burning.

Mitigation: The stone walling needs to be mapped and photographed, while the graves require buffering. Each cluster needs to be mapped after field burning and graves need to be marked. The larger sites will probably need to be buffered.

SAHRA Rating: 3A

² Anderson and Anderson 2008

FIG. 19: VIEW OF LIA1



MANAGEMENT PLAN

The low stone walled features are mostly of low significance unless they have a grave inside them. These sites tend to yield very few artefacts and occur in abundance in this part of KZN (see Anderson 2011). If they are to be affected by the crop pivots, then they should be mapped and photographed after the field has been burnt for easier recording and to make sure shallow and small features are not omitted. Thereafter, they can be destroyed. The alternative is to place a 20m buffer around these features and not disturb them. All demolished or partially damaged features would require a permit form Amafa KZN.

All graves need to be adequately demarcated. The archaeological graves could be excavated; however, the graves dating to the last 100 years would require further investigation and social consultation. It would be a better option

place a buffer around the graves. All graves are required to have a 5m buffer between the grave and the edge of the form of demarcation. I would recommend metal fence poles that are high enough to be seen over the crop. There also needs to be a 20m buffer between the grave(s) and the development. An alternative to buffering would be excavating the graves. However, given the space constraints on this project I would support a decreased 20m buffer provided that the sites are clearly demarcated. The excavations undertaken by Anderson and Anderson (2011) clearly show that none of the excavated graves had any human remains. I would support only a 5m buffer around all the graves and other features.

TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT PLAN & MITIGATION

NAME	Description	SIGNIFICANCE	MITIGATION REQUIRED	BUFFER REQUIRED
E1	Engraving - not found –FP			
E2	Engraving - not found - FP			
G05/5a	Walling and graves	Low- high	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
G25	Kraal	Low	Not affected	
G26	Kraal	Low	Not affected	
G40	Grave	High	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
G40A	Grave	High	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
G50	Kraals and graves	Low – high	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
G65	Kraal	Low	Not affected	
G80	Kraal	Low	Mapping	
G81	Kraal	Low	Mapping	
G82	Graves	High	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
G83	Graves	High	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
G84	House floor	Low	Mapping	
G85	Kraal	Low	Mapping	
G86	Kraal	Low	Mapping	
G89	Grave	High	Demarcate graves	5m for graves
GG1	Grave	High	Demarcate graves	5m for graves
GG2	Grave	High	Demarcate graves	5m for graves
GG21	Grave	High	Demarcate graves	5m for graves
GLK078d	Stone walling, 2x graves?	High	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
GLK078e	kraal, houses, 9+graves	High	No disturbance	5m for cemetery
1	Cluster of Stone walling - FP	Low - high	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
3	Cluster of Stone walling – FP	Low – high	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
4	Cluster of Stone walling – FP	Low – high	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
7	Cluster of Stone walling – FP	Low – high	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves
8	Cluster of Stone walling – FP	Low – high	Mapping, demarcate graves	5m for graves

CONCLUSION

Umlando was requested to assess an area that had been previously partially surveyed. The area will be converted into agricultural fields with a central pivot. Several sites were recorded that included stone walled settlements and graves dating from the Late Iron Age. Most of these settlements are of low significance and can be removed for agricultural purposes provided mitigation is undertaken. This will be undertaken after the area has been burnt. The graves will be buffered and not affected by the agricultural activities. Alternatively the archaeological graves may be excavated.

Most of the eastern hill has been farmed in the early 20th century and this would have destroyed any intact archaeological deposit. The middle and western hills appear to be grasslands. The cultural landscape has been severely affected by previous agricultural activities and transmission lines. Those areas that have the highest density of sites, and features, are not affected by the revised study area. The western hill, above the road, is still mostly well preserved and was excavated in 2009 – 2010. The excavations extended for 1km in a 10m wide strip. Furthermore, the NMPP line affected a 30m wide area and this was monitored during construction. Very few artefacts were noted during the NMPP mitigation, and by inference, the area to the east of the line would have even fewer artefacts and features, as noted during the brief surveys.

I would support the proposed agricultural project provided the required mitigation is undertaken.

REFERENCES

Anderson, G. and Anderson L. 2008. Proposed New Multi-Products Pipeline (NMPP) Project, Transnet Pipelines Durban, Kwazulu-Natal To Jameson Park Near Heidelberg, Gauteng. Specialist report for Transnet.

Anderson, G. and Anderson L. 2011. The Mitigation Of All Heritage Sites Affected By The NMPP. For NMPP.

Prins, F. 2015. Phase One Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Of Proposed Breaking Of Less Than 100 Hectares Of Virgin Land, On Portion 10 Of The Farm Kopleegte No. 1154, Near Colenso, In The Okhahlamba Local Municipality Within The Uthukela District, Kwazulu-Natal