

**PHASE 1 HERITAGE IMPACT
ASSESSMENT:
PORTION 62 OF THE FARM *THE REST* 454JT,
NELSPRUIT**

MPUMALANGA PROVINCE

PREPARED FOR

EMROSS CONSULTING

M. ROSSAAK, P.O. BOX 507, WHITE RIVER, 1240

Tel: 013 – 7502782

Fax: 0866754320

30 JUNE 2009

**ADANSONIA HERITAGE CONSULTANTS
ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICAN PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS**

C. VAN WYK ROWE

e-mail: christinevwr@gmail.com

P.O. BOX 75, PILGRIM'S REST, 1290

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study was done in the area known as *The Rest*, situated approximately 8 km south of Nelspruit, Mpumalanga, on portion 62 of the farm *The Rest* 454JT, topographical map 1:50 000, 2530 DB.

A phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment was conducted and surveyed to identify all archaeological and historical cultural resources on the entire farm. Comments and recommendations are made to manage the identified relevant features which might be impacted upon as the area is earmarked for residential development.

Several fragmented remains of Late Iron Age stone walls, terrace walls, undecorated clay potsherds and a lower grinding stone had been identified, as well as more recent features in the form of a concrete floor, clay potsherds, modern bottles and metal fragments. The latter is associated with modern settlement.

Archaeologist, Dr. Udo Küsel was consulted to review the report and delivered constructive comment.

It is recommended that the owner may continue with the development on condition that a second phase investigation for research purposes at sites NTR3,4,5,6,7,9,11,12 &13 be executed. This includes the documentation, recording and mapping of the stone walls. The developer should then apply for a destruction permit before construction activities commences. Procedures as specified by SAHRA should be followed at the site of the grave or possible grave and this area should not be impacted upon. Alternatively, application to SAHRA for a permit to relocate the remains, should be made and professional grave relocaters should be used.

Should development not be planned on the specific sites of the stone walls, and the owner chooses to leave them **undisturbed** and preserved, then **it is recommended** that the stone walled ruins be fully documented, recorded and mapped, in order to contribute to scientific information on the region, and management guidelines be developed to ensure that other activities such as gardening or recreation do not impact on them or extend beyond its limits.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT	4
B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE REGION	5
• Literature review; Museum databases & previous relevant impact assessments	5
• Late Iron Age (LIA)	6
C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT	7
• Locality	8
• Description of methodology	8
D. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES	9
• Late Iron Age features	9
• Other cultural heritage features	10
• Graves	11
• Discussion on footprint of the proposed residential development: Sites, location, impact by proposed development & mitigation	11
E. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA	13
• Evaluation methods	13
• National Heritage Resources Act	14
• Field rating	16
F. RECOMMENDATIONS	16
G. CONCLUSION	17
H. SOURCES	18
Archival sources, Government publications, Literature, Literary sources, Personal information	
I. APPENDIX 1: TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF PORTION 62, THE REST 454JT	19
J. APPENDIX 2: LAYOUT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT: (Provided by Emross Environmental Consultants) (June 2009)	21
K. APPENDIX 3: LOCATION OF HERITAGE SITES: (Google Earth image).	23
L. APPENDIX 4: PHOTOGRAPHS OF HERITAGE FEATURES	25

**PHASE 1 HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT, PORTION 62 OF THE FARM
THE REST 454JT, NELSPRUIT**

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT

Adansonia Heritage Consultants were appointed by Emross Environmental Consultants in conjunction with the owner, Mr. Piet Kruger, to conduct a phase 1 heritage impact assessment on archaeological and other heritage resources on *portion 62 of the farm The Rest 454JT*, south of Nelspruit. This report has also been sent to archaeologist Dr. U. Küssel for review. The area is earmarked for residential development.

The aims of this report are to source all relevant information as well as archaeological resources on *portion 62 of the farm The Rest 454JT*, Nelspruit. The owner will be advised as to where sensitive heritage areas are, and where development may not take place in terms of the specifications as set out in the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999). Recommendations for maximum conservation measures of any heritage resources will also be made. All other relevant cultural heritage information or archaeological resources on the farm, will be taken into consideration. The study area is indicated in *Appendix 1* (Topographical map of *portion 62 of The Rest, 454 JT*).

- This study forms part of an EIA, Consultant: Emross Consulting Pty Ltd, P.O. Box 507, White River, 1240, Tel: 013-7502782, Fax 086 6754320.
- Type of development: Mixed, residential, tourism and commercial (offices). Rezoning is applied for Mpumalanga Province, Mbombela LM, pt 62 of The Rest 454JT, Nelspruit.
- Contact details: Owner: Mr. P. Kruger, P.O. Box 13133, Northmead, 1511. Cell: 0836540804, Fax: 011 8495084.
- Terms of reference: As specified by section 38 (3) of the NHRA, the following information is provided in this report.
 - a) The identification and mapping of heritage resources;
 - b) Assessment of significance of the resources;
 - c) Assessment of the impact of the development;
 - d) Evaluation of the impact of the development;
 - e) Consultation of communities to be affected by the development (if any is affected directly);
 - f) Alternatives given to affected heritage resources by development;

g) Plans for mitigation.

- Legislative requirements

The National Heritage Resources Act, no 25 (1999)(NHRA), protects all heritage resources, which are classified as national estate. The NHRA stipulates that any person who intends to undertake a development, is subjected to the provisions of the Act, (section 38 (1)(a), subsections (7)(8) and (9). It specifies that no person may destroy, damage, deface, excavate, alter, remove from its original position, subdivide or change the planning status of any heritage site without a permit issued by the heritage resources authority responsible for the protection of such sites, (section 27(18)), and that special consent of the local authority must be required for any alteration or development affecting a heritage area (section 31(7)).¹

B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY & HISTORY OF THE REGION

- **Literature review; Museum databases & previous relevant impact assessments**

In order to place the sites which were located on the farm *The Rest* in archaeological context, primary and secondary sources were consulted. Ethnographical and linguistic studies by early researchers such as Ziervogel and Van Warmelo shed light on the cultural groups living in the area since ca 1600. Historic and academic sources by Bergh, De Jongh, Evers, Myburgh, Thackeray and Van der Ryst were consulted, as well as historic sources by Makhura, Webb and Bornman.

Primary sources were consulted from the Pilgrim's Rest Museum Archives for a brief background on the pre-history and history of the area. The author is not aware of any previous impact assessments in the direct area of *The Rest*.

Discussions were held with Dr. U. Küsel, Mr. A. Erasmus and Emross Consultant, Ms. M. Rossaak.

The area is generally known as the *Lowveld*, of which the farm *The Rest* forms a part. The study area was originally inhabited by the San or Bushman people. Remains of stone tools and occasionally rock art sites have been found throughout the *Lowveld* area.² However, none of the above, were found on *portion 62 of The Rest 454JT*.

¹ National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999.

² PRMA: Information file 9/2.

- **Iron Age:**

The earliest appearance of Iron Age people in the foothills of the Drakenberg, is probably around 800 – 1100AD,³ although the earliest date for black settlement in the *Lowveld* is dated to around 200 AD from the Silver Leaves site near Tzaneen.⁴ During the 15th to 18th centuries, the *Lowveld* was a hive of activity before European settlement.

Very little contemporary research has been done on prehistoric African settlements in the study area. An Early Iron Age site in the immediate area at Plaston, was excavated and dated to ca 900 AD.⁵

The Late Iron Age in Mpumalanga (previous eastern Transvaal) and Free State, are typified by hundreds of stone-walled settlements. They were occupied by the ancestors of the present-day Sotho- and Tswana-speaking people of southern Africa. Most of these villages date from around 1500AD. These stone-built settlements are often found in grassland areas where timber was scarce. The way that the settlements were planned and built, reflects the important role that cattle played in their economy. Typical stone walled settlements had an outer ring of stone walls, and huts enclosed a central area in which the cattle were kept at night.⁶

In archaeological terms, hills or higher ground were vantage points for hunting, for protection of livestock (from predators or tsetse-fly), as well as symbolic physical elevation for groups overlooking inferior people. Hill-tops also have association with rain-making rituals, and hill slopes were occasionally terraced for agricultural purposes. Therefore one often finds stone-walled structures on top and on the sides of hills,⁷ but not exclusively. Stone walled settlements are in abundance throughout the current Nelspruit, Badplaas, Machadodorp, Belfast and Lydenburg districts.⁸ Several circular stone-walled complexes and terraces as well as graves were recorded in the vicinities of Hazyview⁹, Bushbuckridge, Graskop, Sabie and Nelspruit, clay potsherds and upper as well as lower grinding stones, are scattered at most of these sites.¹⁰

³ M. De Jongh, (ed), *Swatini*, p. 9.

⁴ T.M. Evers, *Three Iron Age Industrial sites in the Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*, Fig. 87.

⁵ M.M. Van Der Ryst., *Die Ystertydperk*, in J.S. Bergh (red)., *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*. p. 97.

⁶ A. Thackeray *et al.* (eds), *The Early History of Southern Africa to AD 1500*, p. 29.

⁷ T. Makhura, *Early Inhabitants*, in Delius, P. (ed)., *Mpumalanga: History and heritage*. p. 122-124.

⁸ J.S. Bergh, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*. p. 7.

⁹ PRMA: Information file 9/2.

¹⁰ D. Ziervogel, *The Eastern Sotho, A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey*, p. 3.

Several ethnographical and linguistic studies by early researchers such as D. Ziervogel and N.J. Van Warmelo, revealed that the study area was inhabited by Eastern Sotho groups (Pulana, Kutswe and Pai), the Tsonga (Nhlanganu and Tšhangana), from before the 18th century.^{11 12} However, when concentrating on ethnographical history, it is important to include a slightly wider geographical area in order for it to make sense.

When the Swazi began to expand northwards they forced the local inhabitants out of Swaziland, or absorbed them.¹³ There is evidence of resistance, but the Eastern Sotho groups who lived in the northern parts of Swaziland, moved mainly northwards.¹⁴ This appeared to have taken place towards the end of the 18th century,¹⁵ when these groups fled from Swaziland to areas such as Nelspruit, Bushbuckridge, Klaserie, Blyde River and Komatipoort.¹⁶ Some Swazi chiefs claimed wide areas under their jurisdiction, such as MHOLA who claimed control over a piece of territory within Nelspruit, Pilgrim's Rest, and Lydenburg¹⁷, indicating widespread Swazi influence.

Mswati II (from Swaziland), nearly destroyed the smaller Sotho groups as far as Zimbabwe and Mozambique. He established observation points to protect his territory. Matsafeni Mdluli was put in charge of the Malelane drift area (near the current Malelane rest camp in the Kruger National Park). Matsafeni (also later referred to as Mataffin) moved to the Nelspruit region in 1888 (in the area of the current Mataffin Hill, and in the direct vicinity of *The Rest 454JT*). He had close contact with the first Europeans in the area, such as H.L. Hall who started farming in Nelspruit in 1890. The Government later named the Mataffin siding after him. Matsafeni was murdered by Nhliziyo Mdlovu, in 1891 near Pretoriuskop.¹⁸

C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT

A residential development is planned on *portion 62 of The Rest 454JT*. The proposed footprint for the development is set out in *Appendix 2* (Layout of proposed development on

¹¹ N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. pp. 90-92 & 111.

¹² H. S. Webb, *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld*, in *Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*. p. 16.

¹³ A.C. Myburgh, *The Tribes of Barberton District*, p. 10.

¹⁴ N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. p. 111.

¹⁵ H. S. Webb, *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld*, in *Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*. p. 14

¹⁶ H. S. Webb, *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld*, in *Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*, p. 16.

¹⁷ A.C. Myburgh, *The Tribes of Barberton District*, p. 32.

¹⁸ H. Bornman, *Pioneers of the Lowveld*, pp. 4-5.

portion 62 of The Rest), as supplied by Emross Consultants (June 2009). One hundred and forty one (141) stands of variable sizes are planned to be developed in 9 phases. No additional roads are planned except for entrance roads to each stand.¹⁹

- **Locality**

The study area includes all features which fall within *portion 62 of The Rest 454JT*, on topographical map 1:50 000, 2530 DB (*Appendix 1*). The farm is situated approximately 8 kilometers south of Nelspruit, in the Mpumalanga Province. The proposed development of residential sections, are set out in *Appendix 2*.

The surface of the study area ranged from granite-quartzite outcrops, with mainly natural vegetation, a young poplar plantation, wooded gullies, and thorn thickets. An area of approximately four (4) hectares to the south east of the current homestead, is planted with macadamia trees, which is disturbed land. GPS co-ordinates were used to locate all archaeological and other heritage resources on the property.

- **Description of methodology**

A map of the layout of the development was used as a guideline for the investigation of the residential development. 2004 Google Earth images were also studied to assess current and historicly disturbed areas or infrastructure.

In order to reach a comprehensive conclusion regarding the archaeological and cultural heritage resources in the vicinity of the proposed residential development, the following methods were used:

- The fieldwork and survey were conducted on foot with two people over two days of the entire *portion 62, of The Rest 454JT*, which is in the extent of 60 hectares.
- Visibility of the area was excellent in some areas (which was burnt) but not so good in the areas which have not been burnt. In general, the visibility was fair.
- The area is mostly uneven terrain with rocky granite-quartzite outcrops.
- All relevant data was located with a GPS instrument (Garmin Etrex), datum WGS 84, and plotted on an aerial photograph. Co-ordinates are within 4-6 meters, of all heritage resources (see *DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES*).
- Evaluation of the resources which might be impacted upon by the footprint, was done

¹⁹ M. Rossaak, mette@emross.co.za 2008-07-21.

within the framework provided by the NHRA, no. 25 (1999).

- Personal communication with relevant stakeholders was held, and a peer review by Dr. U. Küsel.
- All features were allocated with a code and number (eg. NTR20), which indicates the town and farm name (Nelspruit, The Rest) and number of sequence in the survey.

D. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES

The proposed residential development is earmarked on *portion 62 of The Rest 454JT*. All comments should be studied in conjunction with *Appendix 1, 2, 3 & 4*, which indicates the area and which corresponds with the discussion below.

A total of 14 cultural heritage features (NTR1 - 14) associated with the Late Iron Age were identified during the survey. A few LIA stone walls, terrace walls, a possible grave, undecorated clay potsherds and a lower grinding stone, were identified on *portion 62 of The Rest 454JT*, but it is not a typical extensive LIA complex, but rather fragmented.

• Late Iron Age features:

Site Location indicated in Appendix 3	Archaeological features on portion 62, The Rest 454JT	GPS Co-ordinate
No. NTR1	Undecorated clay potsherds of various thickness and texture	Elevation: 892m S 25°31'44.3" E 30°57'56.0"
No. NTR2	Undecorated clay potsherds of various thickness and texture	Elevation: 890m S 25°31'44.0" E 30°57'55.0"
No. NTR3 see Appendix 3	LIA stone terrace wall (straight), not clearly defined. Surface material consisted of undecorated clay potsherds – associated with agricultural practices See Fig. 1	Elevation: 892m S 25°31'44.3" E 30°57'55.6"
No. NTR4 see Appendix 3	LIA stone walls – associated with settlement, not clearly defined but fragmented. No surface collection. See Fig. 2	Elevation: 897m S 25°31'41.7" E 30°57'55.7"
No. NTR5 see Appendix 3	LIA stone walls, few meters north of same settlement as no. 4 above. No surface collection. See Fig. 3	Elevation: 901m S 25°31'41.2" E 30°57'57.1"
No. NTR6 see Appendix 3	Fragment of LIA stone wall– associated with settlement; approximately 600mm high. This unit extends towards the east of the feature, above. No surface collection See Fig. 4	Elevation: 928m S 25°31'38.3" E 30°58'08.5"

Site Location indicated in Appendix 3	Archaeological features on portion 62, The Rest 454JT	GPS Co-ordinate
Site Location indicated in Appendix 3	Archaeological features on portion 62, The Rest 454JT	GPS Co-ordinate
No. NTR7 see Appendix 3	Fragments of LIA stone walls on rocky outcrop – not clearly defined – Surface collection consisted of undecorated clay potsherds. See Fig. 6	Elevation: 1005m S 25°31'28.8" E 30°58'23.9"
No. NTR8	Undecorated clay potsherds- below outcrop, possibly associated with feature no. NTR7, above	Elevation: 989m S 25°31'32.0" E 30°58'23.9"
No. NTR9 see Appendix 3	LIA Stone walls – not clearly defined. No surface collection visible See Fig. 7	Elevation: 1013m S 25°31'31.2" E 30°58'30.7"
No. NTR10	Lower grinding stone associated with the LIA settlement	Elevation: 1011m S 25°31'31.0" E 30°58'28.5"
No. NTR11 see Appendix 3	LIA Stone walls – associated with settlement. Situated south-west of feature no. NTR9). See Fig. 8	Elevation: 1005m S 25°31'33.4" E 30°58'28.0"
No. NTR12 see Appendix 3	LIA stone walls - associated with settlement and extension of feature no. NTR11, above. Not clearly defined See Fig. 9	Elevation: 999m S 25°31'35.0" E 30°58'27.8"
No. NTR13 see Appendix 3	Remains of LIA stone walls – associated with settlement - (two fragmented sections very close to each other) disturbed by current macadamia orchard. Poorly defined	Elevation: 986m S 25°31'41.6" E 30°58'22.6"
No. NTR14 see Appendix 3	Remains of LIA stone wall situated in garden below current homestead, severely disturbed and therefore poorly defined.	Elevation: 966m S 25°31'36.3" E 30°58'17.1"

• **Other cultural heritage features:**

The presence of European associated features in the form of a fairly modern concrete floor, bottles with screw tops, metal and enamel fragments were also identified (feature no. NTR15).

Site Location indicated in Appendix 3	Archaeological features on portion 62, The Rest 454JT	GPS Co-ordinate
No. NTR15 see Appendix 3	Concrete floor, modern bottles, metal and enamel fragments and undecorated clay potsherds See Fig. 5	Elevation: 928m S 25°31'42.2" E 30°58'05.0"

- **Graves**

SAHRA's Burial Sites Unit outlines the guidelines and principles in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act. Graves and other public objects and places of commemoration form an important part of South Africa's heritage and must be conserved for future generations. SAHRA is commissioned to take care of and preserve the burial sites and would also like to make sure that these burial grounds are respected. Communities should be encouraged to respect, honour, remember and commemorate the lost lives of those who perished.

Graves and monuments are tangible and symbolic reminders of individual, family and community histories of bereavement. This history is as much concerned with the record of individual loss, as with collective representation of suffering, or ideas of patriotic sacrifice or national aspirations.

The preservation and care of such important places of commemoration is an expression of respect, honour and responsibility to the memory of every individual who perished on South African soil.²⁰

Site Location indicated in Appendix 3	Archaeological features on portion 62, The Rest 454JT	GPS Co-ordinate
No. NTR6 see Appendix 3	Stone heap with poorly defined grave dressing stones – possibly a grave	Elevation: 928m S 25°31'38.3" E 30°58'08.5"

Discussion on the footprint of the proposed development

A total of 14 cultural heritage features (NTR1 - 14) associated with the Late Iron Age were identified during the survey. A few LIA stone walls, terrace walls, a possible grave, undecorated clay potsherds and a lower grinding stone, were identified on *portion 62 of The Rest 454JT*, but the walls are not clearly defined and fragmented. Feature NTR 15 is associated with modern recent settlement.

Sites NTR1-14

Location: See Appendix 3. The stone walls, NTR3,4,5,6,7,9,11,12,13 & 14 are indicated on the *Location of Heritage Sites* map.

²⁰ SAHRA, Burial sites, <http://www.sahra.org.za/burial.htm>, Access, 2008-10-16.

The Section on the *BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY & HISTORY OF THE REGION* suggests that the Late Iron Age stone walls at *The Rest 454JT*, may culturally be associated with the history of the Swazi people. The Swazi began to expand northwards from the current Swaziland and absorbed many of the smaller cultural groups which crossed their way. This appeared to have taken place towards the end of the 18th century,²¹ when these groups fled from Swaziland to areas such as Nelspruit, Bushbuckridge, Klaserie, Blyde River and Komatipoort.²² Some Swazi chiefs claimed wide areas under their jurisdiction, such as Nelspruit, Pilgrim's Rest, and Lydenburg. Mswati II established observation points to protect his territory. It is indicated that chief Matsafeni Mdluli was at first put in charge of the Malelane area near the current Malelane Rest Camp in the Kruger National Park. He later moved to the Nelspruit region in 1888 (in the area of the current Mataffin Hill, which is in the direct vicinity of *The Rest 454JT*). It is believed that the LIA stone walled ruins on *The Rest 454JT* may be associated with this group as part of their wider settlement. This part of Mpumalanga is known for hundreds of such fragmented stone walled features, and better examples of such settlements have previously been researched by Evers and Collett.²³

The stone walls as *The Rest* are very fragmented and not well defined. More representative examples have been observed in the Barberton, Badplaas and Escarpment areas.

Impact by proposed development:

Some of the sections will be impacted upon by the proposed development (See *Appendix 3: Location of Heritage sites*).

Mitigation:

Based on the observations above, and from extensive discussions with Dr. Küsel, a second phase investigation is recommended at sites NTR3,4,5,6,7,9,11,12,13 & 14, to document the ruins for research purposes; The developer should then apply for a destruction permit before construction activities commences;

or, that the stone walled ruins be documented and mapped, and management guidelines be developed to ensure that other activities such as gardening or recreation do not extend beyond its limits.

²¹ H. S. Webb, *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld, in Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*, p. 14

²² H. S. Webb, *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld, in Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*, p. 16.

²³ J.P. Celliers, Lydenburg Museum, 2009-06-18.

Sites NTR1-14

Location: See Appendix 3. Possible grave: NTR6. This is indicated on the *Location of Heritage sites*, map.

Impact by proposed development:

The possible grave is adjacent stone walls and will directly be impacted on by the proposed development (See *Appendix 3: Location of Heritage sites*).

Mitigation:

The developer should apply for a permit from SAHRA and the grave should be relocated by a professional grave relocater;

or, if the developer chooses not to develop this section, then this area should be included in management guidelines and visitors or family members of the deceased should be allowed to visit the grave.

SITE NTR15

Location: See Appendix 3: *Location of Heritage sites*

This area consists of the foundations of a recent or modern structure. A concrete floor, with surface material such as modern bottles, metal-, and enamel fragments and undecorated clay potsherds were observed. This area is of no cultural value.

Impact by proposed development: None.

Mitigation: None.

E. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA

Section 38 of the National Heritage resources act (25 of 1999), rates all heritage resources into National, Provincial or Local significance, and proposals in terms of the above is made for all identified heritage features.

- **Evaluation methods**

Site significance is important to establish the measure of mitigation and/or management of the resources. Sites are evaluated as *HIGH (National importance)*, *MEDIUM (Provincial importance)* or *LOW (local importance)*, as is specified in the NHRA. It is explained as follows:

- **National Heritage Resources Act**

The National Heritage Resources Act no. 25, 1999 (NHRA) aims to promote good management of the national estate, and to enable and encourage communities to conserve their legacy so that it may be bequeathed to future generations. Heritage is unique and it cannot be renewed, and contributes to redressing past inequities.²⁴ It promotes previously neglected research areas of which the study area is in crucial need of.

Previous research which was conducted in this section of the *Lowveld* revealed that the groups of black people lived in the area since 1000 AD, and some stone-walled settlements date from about 1500 AD. During the 17th and 18th centuries, Sotho groups fled from Swaziland and settled throughout the *Lowveld* district, encountering other groups such as the Shangaan and Tsonga towards the current day Hazyview and Bushbuckridge areas. The area around Nelspruit was mainly occupied by Eastern Sotho groups with extensive Swazi influence or Swazi groups, and it is generally believed that the stone walls encountered on *The Rest*, may be associated with the late 18th century (See section on *BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY & HISTORY OF THE REGION*).

The Late Iron Age remains which were identified on *portion 62 of The Rest 454JT*, have relevant cultural value of local significance, and is specified in the formal protection of the NHRA. Section 27(18) states that “no person may destroy, damage, deface, excavate, alter, remove from its original position, subdivide or change the planning status of any heritage site without a permit issued by the heritage resources authority responsible for the protection of such site;”²⁵ The general protection of the NHRA, states in section 5(7) that “the identification, assessment and management of the heritage resources of South Africa must - (a) take account of all relevant cultural values...” and forms part of the national estate.²⁶

The significance of the cultural heritage features can be summarised as follows:

²⁴ National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. p. 2.

²⁵ National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. p. 42.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<i>Site</i>	<i>Cultural Heritage features</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Measures of mitigation</i>
NTR3, NTR4, NTR5, NTR7, NTR9, NTR11, NTR12, NTR13 & NTR14	Late Iron Age stone and terrace walls	Low	Documentation, mapping Destruction permit or management guidelines
NTR6	NTR6 is an unnatural heap of stones, possibly indicating a grave	Low	Permit and relocation or management guidelines
NTR1, NTR2, NTR8	Undecorated clay potsherds	Low	NONE
NTR10	Lower grinding stone		
NTR15 & NTR16	Recent / modern features	Low	NONE

- The significance of the Late Iron Age heritage resources are “Low”, but mitigation measures should be applied for scientific purposes and to conserve and manage it properly.
- The grave or possible grave is regarded as of “Low” significance, as it is not an extensive or known burial site. However, care should be taken not to impact on this section as the possibility still exist that it may well be a grave. It should then be included in management guidelines for protection together with the associated LIA stone walls. Alternatively, application to SAHRA for a permit to relocate the remains, should be made and professional grave relocators should be used.
- The surface material associated with Late Iron Age such as the undecorated clay potsherds and lower grinding stone, are out of direct archaeological context, and the significance is “Low”.
- The significance of the recent heritage resources (concrete floor and modern bottles) are “Low”.

All archaeological and other cultural heritage resources are evaluated according to the NHRA, section 3(3). The features identified in the study area are considered to be part of the national estate, and has cultural significance or other special value in terms of the following criteria:

- (a) its importance in the pattern of South Africa's history;

- (c) its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's cultural heritage;
- (g) its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons.²⁷

• **Field rating:**

The cultural heritage features, as it is discussed in the section above, is rated as Low and therefore of local significance. The stone walls as *The Rest* are very fragmented and not well defined. More representative examples have been observed in the Barberton, Badplaas and Escarpment areas, as is also described in Delius's book, Mpumalanga: History & Heritage. These sites should be documented and recorded before application for a destruction permit.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the above information as well as the specifications as stipulated in the Act, it is recommended:

- That a phase two heritage impact assessment be conducted to document and map the stone walls (No. NTR 3,4,5,6,7,9,11,12,13), for research purposes;
- The developer may then apply for a destruction permit from SAHRA;
- The grave or possible grave, should not be impacted upon. Alternatively, application to SAHRA for a permit to relocate the remains, should be made and professional grave relocators should be used.

ALTERNATIVELY:

Should development not take place on the stone walled areas, and the developer chooses to leave them intact:

- the stone walled ruins should be fully documented and mapped, and management guidelines be developed to ensure that other activities such as gardening or recreation do not extend beyond its limits.
- Site no. NTR6 is possibly a grave. Should this area not be developed, then it is recommended that this section be included in the management guidelines such as described above;
- Should the developer decide to develop in section NTR6, a permit is required from SAHRA to relocate the skeletal remains by professional grave relocators.

²⁷ National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. pp. 12-14

G. CONCLUSION

All heritage features identified in the area as a whole, are protected under the National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999, and changes are subject to professional research and impact assessment.

Archaeological material or graves are not always visible during a field survey and therefore some significant material may only be revealed during construction activities. It is therefore recommended that the developer be made aware of this possibility and when human remains, clay or ceramic pottery etc. are observed, a qualified archaeologist must be notified and an assessment be done. Further research might be necessary in this regard for which the developer is responsible.

Adansonia Heritage Consultants can not be held responsible for any archaeological material or graves which were not located during the survey.

H. SOURCES:

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

UNPUBLISHED:

- Pilgrim's Rest Museum Archives: (PRMA) Information file 9/2.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

- National Legislation

Republic of South Africa, National Heritage Resources Act, (Act No. 25 of 1999).

LITERARY SOURCES

- BERGH, J.S. (red.), *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid-Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*, J.L. Van Schaik, 1999.
- BORNMAN, H. *Pioneers of the Lowveld*, 1992.
- DE JONGH, M. (ed.), *Swatini*, Unisa, 1987.
- EVERS, T.M., *Three Iron Age Industrial sites in the Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*. M.A. Dissertation, University of Witwatersrand, 1974.
- MAKHURA, T., *Early Inhabitants*, in *Delius, P. (ed.)*, *Mpumalanga: History and heritage*. Kwazulu Natal University press, 2007.
- MYBURGH, A.C., *The Tribes of Barberton District*, Government Printer Pretoria, 1949.
- THACKERAY, A.I. *et al.* (eds), *The Early History of Southern Africa to AD 1500*, Cape Town, 1990.
- VAN DER RYST, M.M., *Die Ystertydperk*, in *J.S. Bergh (red.)*, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*, J.L. Van Schaik, 1999.
- VAN WARMELO, N.J., *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, in *Ethnological Publications, Vol. V, Department of Native Affairs*, Pretoria, 1935.
- WEBB, H.S., *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld*, in *Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*.
- ZIERVOGEL, D., *The Eastern Sotho, A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey*, Pretoria, 1954.

ELECTRONIC INFORMATION SOURCES

- SAHRA, Burial sites, [Http://www.sahra.org.za/burial.htm](http://www.sahra.org.za/burial.htm), Access, 2008-10-16.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

- ERASMUS, A., Resident on *The Rest*, portion 62, 454JT, Mpumalanga province, 2008-07-17-18.
- KUSEL, U., Archaeologist, Pretoria, 2009-06-02.
- ROSSAAK, M., Emross Consulting, mette@emross.co.za, 2008-07-22.

APPENDIX 1:

TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF PORTION 62,
THE REST 454JT, 1:50 000, 2530DB

APPENDIX 2:

LAYOUT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:
(Provided by Emross Environmental Consultants)
(June 2009)

APPENDIX 3:

LOCATION OF HERITAGE SITES: (GOOGLE EARTH
IMAGE)

APPENDIX 4:

PHOTOGRAPHS OF HERITAGE FEATURES



FIG. 1:
NTR 3: LIA stone terrace wall associated with agricultural practices.



FIG. 2:
NTR 4: LIA stone wall



FIG. 3:
NTR5: LIA stone wall, a few meters north of NTR4.



FIG. 4:
NTR6: LIA stone wall, well preserved and clearly defined – associated with settlement; approximately 600mm high. This unit extends towards the east. No surface collection



FIG. 5:

NTR6: Stone heap with undefined stone dressing – possibly a grave. This feature is situated close to the stone wall above.



FIG. 6:

NTR7: LIA stone walls on rocky outcrop – poorly defined.



FIG. 7:
NTR 9: LIA stone walls, poorly defined.



FIG. 8:
NTR11: LIA stone walls.



FIG. 9:
NTR12: LIA stone walls, associated with feature NTR11.