

**Archaeological Survey for Harding-Weza Water
Pipeline, Ugu District Municipality**

**For
Stewart Scott**

**By
Gavin Anderson
Institute for Cultural Resource Management, Natal Museum, Private Bag 9070,
Pietermaritzburg, 3200**



2 May 2002

INTRODUCTION

Steward Scott approached the ICRM to undertake an archaeological survey of the Harding-Weza water scheme for the Ugu District Municipality. The survey was undertaken in April 2002, during which parts of the project had already been completed. The archaeological survey included Phases 1A, 1B-xx and 1C of the project.

The Terms of Reference for the contract are to:

- Undertake an archaeological survey of the area to be affected by the pipelines, water treatment works and reservoirs
- Assess each archaeological site and suggest appropriate mitigation
- Submit the results in a report to KwaZulu-Natal Heritage

Two new archaeological sites were recorded during the course of the survey. One site dates to the Late Iron Age/Historical Period, while the other dates to the Middle Stone Age. Neither of the two sites requires further mitigation, however a permit for the partial damage to each site is required. This is in accordance with of the KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act of 1997. Parts of the Phase 1A of the project have already damaged the Stone Age site.

METHODOLOGY

Most of the pipeline occurs within 50 m of the road reserve and/or through current agricultural and domestic areas. Thus, any site existing within a large portion of the pipeline servitude has been affected already. The archaeological survey covered a maximum distance of 50 m on both sides of the servitude.

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, especially pottery. Sites of medium significance have diagnostic artefacts and these are sampled. Sites of high significance are excavated or extensively sampled. The sites that are extensively sampled have high research potential, yet poor preservation of features. I attempt to recover as many artefacts from these sites by means of systematic sampling, as opposed to sampling diagnostic artefacts only.

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 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.

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.

THE SITES

WEZA 1

This site is located on a gradual incline above one of the smaller valley streams. The site consists of a scatter of pottery sherds, upper grinding stones, and a piece of slag. The pottery varies in thickness and colour suggesting that several vessels occur on the site. One sherd has a dark brown burnish. An archaeological deposit may exist at the site, however the area has been extensively cultivated and the artefacts are not *in situ*.

Significance: The site is of low archaeological significance

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required

WEZA 2

This site is located near the river abstraction, pump station and waste treatment works just above the Weza River. ~~Construction of the reservoir and pipeline wear nearly completed by the time of the survey, and the artefacts were located in the spoil heap of the pipeline.~~ The site is a scatter of Middle Stone Age (MSA) stone tools. These tools included cores, flakes and blades, are heavily demineralised and in a secondary context. Open MSA sites tend to occur over large areas. In this case, the site extends across the entire flood plain.

Construction of the reservoir and pipeline was nearly completed by the time of the survey, and the artefacts were located in the spoil heap of the pipeline. In other words the pipeline, and probably the reservoir (or its secondary constructions) had already disturbed the site, before any archaeological mitigation.

Significance: The site is of low archaeological significance

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required

CONCLUSION

Formatted

The Harding-Weza water pipeline covers a vast area of the Ugu District Municipality. The ICRM was contracted to undertake an archaeological survey of these pipelines in April 2001. Two archaeological sites were recorded in the affected area, however both sites are of low archaeological significance and no mitigation is required. The developer, in this case Stewart Scott is required to apply for a permit to (partially) damage both sites. This is in accordance with the Amafa aKwaZulu-Natali Act of 1997.

No further archaeological mitigation is required for this project.

Table 1: Archaeological sites along the Harding-Weza pipeline.

	Weza1	Weza2
Significance	Low	Low
Mitigation	None	None
Lattitude	E 29 ⁰ 45' 12"	E 29 ⁰ 46' 17"
Longitude	S 30 ⁰ 39' 17"	S 30 ⁰ 37' 38"