

**THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY AND MONITORING OF
THE EKUBO ECOESTATE: FENCING PHASE AND GENERAL
MONITORING**

For Buk'Indalo Consultancy cc & Star Choice Trading cc

Date: 1 December 2005

By Gavin and Louise Anderson

Umlando: Archaeological Tourism and Resource Management

PO Box 102532, Meerensee, 3901



INTRODUCTION

Umlando undertook the monitoring of the fencing of the Ekubo Ecoestate. This forms part of the heritage management plan as submitted in previous reports for this development. The aim of the current monitoring exercise was to supervise the placement of fence holes along the sensitive areas. I also carried out a general site inspection of the development.

RESULTS FROM MONITORING OF THE FENCING

The entire section of PED3, PED2 and S1 was monitored over a two day period.

The holes used by the fencing are 40 cm x 40 cm wide and 60 cm deep. These are placed at 2 m intervals. Most of the archaeological material from the other sites was located within the upper 60 cm, and thus I considered the holes to be deep enough to locate any sites, artefacts or features if they existed.

No artefacts or features were observed from the fence holes along the PED2 and PED3 area. However, several marine shell fragments were observed in the S1 area, especially near the areas of the fencing. The shell fragments are signs of shell middens that would occur below the surface.

No shell middens were observed along the S1 fencing line. However, they may still occur in the S1 area.

RESULTS FROM GENERAL MONITORING

I conducted a general site inspection of the entire development to ensure that the management plan set out in the permit had been followed. The management plan, or permit requirements, had been disregarded on two occasions.

The first violation of the permit requirement occurred at EKU4. A shell midden had been exposed by the road cutting and had not been reported to

the environmental officer or the archaeologist. The permit clearly states that this would need to be reported. The construction company should be given some leeway, as they had not been shown shell middens before this midden had been uncovered.

The construction company and I reached the following agreement:

1. The RE would ensure that all staff are shown the shell midden
2. This implies that all staff would know when a shell midden is exposed
3. In future, a “lack” of knowledge could not be used as an excuse for not reporting.
4. Any future sites that have been exposed will be reported, otherwise the company will accept liability for failure to comply with the legislation and permit requirements.

The second transgression is more serious. A sewer pipeline was excavated to the north(east) of PED3. This is part of the sewer line for the Pump Station #1. The sewer line occurred in the area previously demarcated as a “no-go” area for any development. Furthermore, the southeastern section of the line had been demarcated for further archaeological excavations. These instructions had been written in the site environmental log book and in the excavation report.

I cannot determine the full impact of the disturbance as the excavations have been closed with soil. I did notice pottery and stone tools in the disturbed area. This implies that at least artefacts, if not features, did occur along this route.

The construction company admits that the sewer line is in the sensitive area and that it should not have been excavated without archaeological approval. This is the second main transgression on the site relating to archaeological sites. KwaZulu Natal Heritage would need to comment on this transgression.

CONCLUSION

The Ekubo Ecoestate has been a very sensitive development from the onset of the proposed development. There have been many environmental concerns as well as heritage concerns (both archaeological and historical). This report deals with the heritage issues.

The last report dealt with the results of the excavations and demarcated areas that would require further work. The last site survey located fragmentary shell middens at S1, and I will re-introduce S1 area as having sensitivity. It will also require archaeological input for any further construction activity. Since the middens appear to be fragmentary I would suggest that monitoring be used as a form of mitigation.

One of the more sensitive areas of concerns was initially that of the São João (the shipwreck campsite and mass grave), and later of the Late Stone Age deposit. These concerns have been continuously highlighted since the onset of the construction phase of the project, and the parties involved have had generally good working relationship. However, there have been two serious transgressions to the permit requirements, and a few minor transgressions. It has become clear that unsupervised construction activity will lead to transgressions of the permit requirements.

The aim of any management plan is to minimise potential impacts and transgressions and to maximise the salvaging of heritage material. If transgressions occur then these also need to be mitigated. I therefore suggest that the following:

- ◆ **ALL** future work in the entire development has approval by the heritage consultant
- ◆ The areas **originally** identified as EKU4, PED2, PED3, and S1 are retained as sensitive areas
- ◆ A qualified person is on site for the duration of the construction phase of the project, specifically during the construction of the houses. This person

would work under our supervision and would need to have archaeological training.

- ◆ This must take into account that the housing development will not take place in a continuous building stream. The individual homeowners will build as and when, within a five-year period from the date of registration of the property. The first registrations will possibly in February 2006, when the civil infrastructure is complete.
 - The home building process is as follows:
 - The home owner is to submit their building plans to committee comprising, a home owner, the project architect, an engineer, the developer, an environmentalist, who will scrutinise the plans and actually fix the footprint of the development.
 - The EMP describes development of the houses and the ECO in attendance
- ◆ In addition to the above, those areas previously demarcated as being sensitive and requiring further excavations (i.e. PED3, PED2, S1 and EKU4) would still require excavations and monitoring. We have not decided whether the excavations would occur in conjunction with, or prior to, the construction of the houses.