

The Archaeological Survey of Shelly beach Lot 911

For K2M Technologies (Pty) Ltd

Date: 10 August 2007

By Gavin Anderson Anderson

Umlando: Archaeological Tourism and Resource
Management

PO Box 102532, Mecklenburg, 3901



INTRODUCTION

Umlando was contacted by K2M Technologies (Pty) Ltd to undertake an archaeological survey of an area that may be affected by the construction of residential complexes. on Lot 911, Shelly Beach. The property is located on the northern bank of the uMhlanga between the N2 and the Marine Drive, Shelly beach. This survey is in accordance with the KZN Heritage Act of 1999. Amafa KZN regarded the area as being sensitive and thus requiring some for of heritage impact assessment.

No archaeological sites were observed, although a small patch of marine shell was noted.

METHOD

The archaeological survey consisted of a foot survey of the entire affected area. The foot survey involves the physical surveying of the entire affected area.

All sites are grouped according to low, medium, and high significance for the purpose of this report. Sites of low significance have few, or no, diagnostic artefacts, especially pottery. Sites of medium significance have diagnostic artefacts and these are 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. 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. A permit from Amafa KZN is required for any excavations and sampling.

Significance is generally determined by several factors. However, in this survey, a wider definition of significance is adopted since the aim of the survey is

to gather as much information as possible from every site. This strategy allows for an analysis of every site in some detail, without resorting to excavation.

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.

STUDY AREA

Previous buildings, roads, and/or afforestation have disturbed most of the area. Much of the upper area is also part of modern (illegal) refuse dumping that includes building remains. Furthermore, the vegetation in the afforested area is dense. It appears that several areas have also been used as sand borrow pits. I thus based the survey on the various footpaths and drainage trenches.

RESULTS

No archaeological sites were recorded during the course of the survey. One small patch of shell containing whelk and other marine shell fragments were noted (Fig. 1). These remains are not associated with any artefacts and may be more recent. Possible upper grindingstones could occur in the area, however these appear are more likely to be naturally smoothed river pebbles.

CONCLUSION

Umlando surveyed the land to be affected by proposed residential complexes. No archaeological sites were observed. No further mitigation should be required.

Figure 1: Location of the shell patch at Shelly Beach Lot 911

