

Archaeological Survey for Three  
Developments along the Kwazulu-  
Natal South Coast

For Bhuk? Indalo Consultancy

By

By Gavin Anderson

Institute for Cultural Resource Management, Natal Museum, Private Bag 9070,  
Pietermaritzburg, 3200

5 February 2003



## **Archaeological survey of three housing developments along the Kwazulu-Natal south coast**

The Institute for Cultural Resource Management was approached by Bhuk' Indalo Consultancy cc to undertake an archaeological survey of three areas along the Kwazulu-Natal south coast: Louisiana Slum Clearance, Freeland Park, and Bay Hill Extension. These developments are for luxury and low cost housing. Several sites were recorded of which most are of low significance and do not require further mitigation. One site is of medium significance and requires test-pit excavations. All archaeological sites are protected by the Kwazulu-Natal Heritage Act of 1996. The developers will need to obtain permits for the destruction, or damage, of each site.

### **Defining significance**

Archaeological 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 varies 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.

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. These test-pit excavations may require further excavations if the site is of significance. 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.

### **Louisiana Slum Clearance**

Louisiana Slum Clearance, near Umentweni, is marked for low cost housing. The area is approximately 10 km from the sea and has several high hills. Seven archaeological sites were located in this area and are of low significance.

#### **LSC1**

The site is a multicomponent site with Middle Stone Age (MSA), Late Stone Age (LSA), and Late Iron Age (LIA), or Historical Period artefacts. All artefacts are on the surface and in a secondary context, over an  $\pm 40$  m radius.

The Iron Age artefacts consist of pottery sherds. The sherds are thin-walled in red or brown colouring. This suggests that they date to the LIA or Historical Period.

The MSA and LSA artefacts include a variety of stone tools. The tools are typical of both periods and consist of flakes and cores. No formal tools were observed.

Significance:

The site is of low archaeological significance.

Mitigation:

No mitigation is required.

#### **LSC2**

The site is a scatter of MSA and LSA stone tools on the top of a hill. The MSA tools includes flakes and a MRP on dolerite. The LSA tools include a bipolar core on quartzite, and utilised flakes on crypto-crystalline silicate (CCS).

Significance:

The site is of low archaeological significance.

Mitigation:

No mitigation is required.

**LSC3**

The site is located on the top of a hill. The artefacts date to the MSA, LSA and LIA. The MSA stone tools include flakes and cores. The LSA tools consist of a large scraper, flakes and cores.

The LIA artefacts consist if several sherds in an orange or black colour.

Significance:

The site is of low archaeological significance.

Mitigation:

No mitigation is required.

**LSC4**

The site is located on the top of a hill, and extends down the slopes. The artefacts date to the MSA and LIA. The MSA artefacts consist of flakes on quartzite. The LIA artefacts consist of several sherds in an orange colour.

Significance:

The site is of low archaeological significance.

Mitigation:

No mitigation is required.

**LSC5**

The site is located on the top of a hill southeast of LSC1. The site consists of MSA and LIA artefacts.

The MSA artefacts consist of stone tools on dolerite. The LIA artefacts consist of several thin-walled sherds. One sherd is decorated with comb stamping and a horizontal groove below it.

Significance:

The site is of low archaeological significance.

Mitigation:

No mitigation is required.

#### **LSC6**

The site is situated on a small hill at the base of the development area. The general area is relatively flat and situated in a confluence of several annual streams. The artefacts date to the MSA, LSA and LIA. The site has a potential deposit, however the artefacts appear to be in a secondary context.

The MSA component consists of several flakes and cores. The LIA artefacts consist of several sherds

Significance:

The site is of low archaeological significance.

Mitigation:

No mitigation is required.

#### **LSC7**

The site consists of a scatter of MSA flakes, LIA pottery and possible EIA pottery as well. The MSA material is on dolerite. The LIA material consists of several sherds of which one is decorated. The decoration is in the form of cross-hatching. One possible EIA sherd was also observed.

Significance:

The site is of low archaeological significance.

Mitigation:

No mitigation is required.

## Freeland Park Extension

### FPE1

FPE1 is located along the northern part of the development area. The site occurs along the upper parts of the hill, and artefacts are scattered along its slopes. The site has been partly damaged by previous housing and developments, such as the MTN and Vodacom towers, as well as the water reservoir. The site appears to date to the early Late Iron Age.

The site has an archaeological deposit and it appears that *in situ* artefacts and features. Several shell middens, sherds, daga fragments, slag and grinding stones were observed at the site. There appears to be a spatial component at the site as well.

#### Significance:

The site is of medium significance, due to its deposit, spatial component and artefacts.

#### Mitigation:

Test-pit excavations should be undertaken to determine the full significance of the site. Further excavations may be required if the site yields more significant information.

## Bay Hill Extension

No archaeological sites were recorded in this development area. However scatters of MSA tools were observed along the northern borders. Fragments of shell from shell middens were also observed. These remains appear to be more recent in age and do not form part of an archaeological site.

The 1:50 000 map had a ruin recorded in the development area. This ruin could not be located either due to the dense vegetation, or it has been removed. I cannot comment on the historical nature of this building.

### **Conclusion**

Three areas were surveyed for archaeological sites along the south coast region. Most of the sites had archaeological sites, however these were of low significance and no further mitigation is required. Only the Freeland park area had one site of medium significance, which requires at least test-pit excavations.

Each development area and/or archaeological site will require a permit from KwaZulu-Natal Heritage. These permits would be for the damage or destruction of each site.



### Co-ordinate for the archaeological sites<sup>1</sup>

Development	Site	Longitude (south)	Latitude (east)
Freeland Park	FPE1	30° 16' 03"	30° 45' 24 "
Louisiana Slum Clearance	LSC1	30° 40' 52"	30° 26' 52"
Louisiana Slum Clearance	LSC2	30° 40' 42"	30° 26' 50"
Louisiana Slum Clearance	LSC3	30° 30' 48"	30° 26' 58"
Louisiana Slum Clearance	LSC4	30° 40' 36"	30° 27' 08"
Louisiana Slum Clearance	LSC5	30° 40' 56"	30° 26' 46"
Louisiana Slum Clearance	LSC6	30° 50' 00"	30° 27' 00"
Louisiana Slum Clearance	LSC7	30° 41' 02"	30° 27' 32"
Louisiana Slum Clearance	grave <sup>2</sup>	30° 41' 13"	30° 26' 46"

<sup>1</sup> These co-ordinates are not for any public documentation, but for the permit applications.

<sup>2</sup> Approximate location