

## **APPENDIX C2**

### **SPECIALIST STUDY : HERITAGE**

Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment on portions 5, 7, and  
the remainder of the farm De Rust 12 JU, near Hazyview, in the  
Ehlanzeni District Municipal area, Mpumalanga Province.

Compiled by

# Kudzala Antiquity



For Eco 8 Environmental Consultants

Surveyor: Mr JP Celliers

2 October, 2009

## Contents

1. Introduction	p. 4.
2. Description of surveyed area	p. 6.
3. Methodology	p. 6.
4. History and archaeology	p. 11.
5. Located sites, their description and suggested mitigation	p. 15.
6. Findings and recommendations	p. 22.
7. Bibliography	p. 25.
8. Appendix A – Terminology	p. 26.
9. Appendix B – List of located sites	p. 31.
10. Appendix C – Maps	p. 35.
1:50 000 location map	
Aerial photo location	
11. Appendix D – Photos of located sites	p. 39.

## **Executive summary**

An Archaeological Impact assessment was undertaken by Kudzala Antiquity CC for Eco 8 Environmental Consultants on portions 5, 7 and the remainder of the farm De Rust 12 JU near Hazyview. The survey was conducted on foot and with the use of a motor vehicle in an effort to locate archaeological remains and historical features. Nine sites were documented, three of which are graves of unknown individuals. One site has archaeological value and a second phase investigation is recommended under specific circumstances. The remaining sites are not regarded as having archaeological or historical value.

## 1. Introduction

Kudzala Antiquity was commissioned to conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) on portions 5,7 and the remainder of the farm De Rust 12 JU. The affected area is located near Hazyview which is located within the boundaries of the Ehlanzeni District Municipality. The survey was conducted for Eco 8 Environmental Consultants.

The study forms part of an Environmental Impact Assessment as required by legislation, the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25, 1999). This act requires of individuals (engineers, farmers, mines and industry) or institutions to have impact assessment studies undertaken whenever any development activities are planned. This is to ensure that heritage features or sites that qualify as part of the National Estate are not damaged or destroyed.

Heritage resources considered to be part of the national estate include those that are of cultural significance or have other special value to the present community or future generations.

The national estate may include:

- places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance;
- places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
- historical settlements and townscapes;
- landscapes and natural features of cultural significance;
- geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;
- archaeological and palaeontological sites;
- graves and burial grounds including:
  - (i) ancestral graves;
  - (ii) royal graves and graves of traditional leaders;
  - (iii) graves of victims of conflict;
  - (iv) graves of individuals designated by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette*;
  - (v) historical graves and cemeteries; and

other human remains which are not covered in terms of the Human Tissue Act, 1983 (Act No. 65 of 1983);

- sites of significance relating to slavery in South Africa;
- movable objects including:
  - (i) objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens;
  - (ii) objects to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
  - (iii) ethnographic art and objects;
  - (iv) military objects
  - (v) objects of decorative or fine art;
  - (vi) objects of scientific or technological interest; and

books, records, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic, film or video material or sound recordings, excluding those that are public records as defined in section 1 of the National Archives of South Africa Act, 1996 (Act No. 43 of 1996).

Cultural resources are unique and non-renewable physical phenomena (of natural occurrence or made by humans) that can be associated with human (cultural) activities (Van Vollenhoven, 1995:3).

These would be any man-made structure, tool, object of art or waste that was left behind on or beneath the soil surface by historic or pre-historic communities. These remains, when studied in their original context by archaeologists, are interpreted in an attempt to understand, identify and reconstruct the activities and lifestyles of past communities. When these items are disturbed from their original context, any meaningful information they possess is lost, therefore it is important to locate and identify such remains before construction or development activities commence.

An AIA consists of three phases, this document deals with the first phase. This (phase 1) investigation is aimed at getting an overview of cultural resources in a given area, thereby assessing the possible impact a proposed development may have on these resources.

When the archaeologist encounters a situation where the planned project will lead to the

destruction or alteration of an archaeological site, a second phase in the survey is normally recommended. During a phase two investigation, the impact assessment of development activities on identified cultural resources is intensified and detailed investigation into the nature and origin of the cultural material is undertaken. Normally at this stage, archaeological excavation is carried out in order to document and preserve the cultural heritage.

Phase three consists of the compiling of a management plan for the safeguarding, conservation, interpretation and utilization of cultural resources (Van Vollenhoven, 2002).

Continuous communication between the developer and surveyor after the initial report has been compiled may result in the modification of a planned route or development to incorporate or protect existing archaeological sites.

## **2. Description of surveyed area**

The study area falls within the Ehlanzeni District Municipality, and within Mpumalanga Province. The survey was carried out on approximately 100 ha of farm land located near Hazyview. The proposed development area is currently used for farming with mango's and citrus. The survey was conducted on foot in an effort to locate cultural remains.

## **3. Methodology**

The methodological approach for this study should meet the requirements of relevant heritage legislation. A desktop archival study followed by a physical survey of the impacted areas was conducted. This was done to assess whether graves or features of historical or archaeological value exist on the property.

During this survey, residents on the property were consulted to establish whether any graves are located in the area. Two informants were consulted.

SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency) and the relevant legislation (Act 25 of 1999, National Heritage Resources Act) require that the following components be

included in an Archaeological impact assessment:

- Archaeology
- Shipwrecks
- Battlefields
- Graves
- Structures older than 60 years
- Living heritage
- Historical settlements
- Landscapes
- Geological sites
- Palaeontological sites and objects

All the above-mentioned heritage components are addressed in this report, except shipwrecks, geological sites and palaeontological sites and objects.

The purpose of the archaeological study is to establish the whereabouts and nature of cultural heritage sites should they occur on the surveyed area. This includes settlements, structures and artifacts which have value for an individual or group of people in terms of historical, archaeological, architectural and human (cultural) development.

It is the aim of this study to locate and identify such objects or places in order to assess whether they are of significance and warrant further investigation or protection. This is



done by means of foot surveys, a desktop archival study as well as a study of the results of previous archaeological work in the area.

### **3.1. Desktop study**

The purpose of the desktop study is to compile as much information as possible on the heritage resources of the area. This helps to provide an historical context for located sites. Sources used for this study included published and unpublished documents, archival material and maps. Material obtained from the following institutions or individuals were consulted:

- Lydenburg Museum, Lydenburg
- Published and unpublished archaeological reports and articles
- Published and unpublished historical reports and articles

### **3.2. Significance of sites**

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) formulated guidelines for the conservation of all cultural resources and therefore also divided such sites into three main categories. These categories might be seen as guidelines that suggest the extent of protection a given site might receive. They include sites or features of local (Grade 3) provincial (Grade 2) and national (Grade 1) significance.

For practical purposes the surveyor uses his own classification for sites or features and divides them into three groups, those of low or no significance, those of medium significance, those of high significance.

Within the establishment of the significance of a site or feature there are certain values or dimensions connected to significance which may be allocated to a site. These include:

- **Types of significance**

The site's scientific, aesthetic and historic significance or a combination of these is established.

- **Degrees of significance**

The archaeological or historic site's rarity and representative value is considered. The

condition of the site is also an important consideration.

- **Spheres of significance**

Sites are categorized as being significant in the international, national, provincial, regional or local context. Significance of a site for a specific community is also taken into consideration.

It should be noted that to arrive at the specific allocation of significance of a site or feature, the specialist considers the following:

- Historic context
- Archaeological context or scientific value
- Social value
- Aesthetic value

More specific criteria used by the specialist in order to allocate value or significance to a site include:

- The unique nature of a site
- The integrity of the archaeological deposit
- The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site
- The location of the site in relation to other similar sites or features
- The depth of the archaeological deposit (when it can be determined or is known)
- The preservation condition of the site
- Quality of the archaeological or historic material of the site
- Quantity of sites and site features

In short, archaeological and historic sites that contain data which may significantly enhance the knowledge that archaeologists currently have about our cultural heritage should be considered highly valuable. In all instances these sites should be preserved and not damaged during construction activities. When development activities do however jeopardize the future of such a site, a second and third phase in the Cultural Resource Management (CRM) process is normally advised which entails the excavation or rescue excavation of cultural material along with a management plan to be drafted for the

preservation of the site or sites.

Graves are considered very sensitive sites and should never under any circumstances be jeopardized by development activities. Graves are incorporated in the National Heritage Resources Act under section 36 and in all instances where graves are found by the surveyor, the recommendation would be to steer clear of these areas. If this is not possible or if construction activities have for some reason damaged graves, specialized consultants are normally contacted to aid in the process of exhumation and reinterment of the human remains. This implies that construction activities at the particular grave site will be brought to a halt temporarily.

## **4. History and archaeology**

### **4.1. Historic background**

The first inhabitants of the eastern Lowveld were probably the San or Bushmen. They were a nomadic people who lived together in small family groups and relied on hunting and gathering of food for survival. Evidence of their existence is to be found in numerous rock shelters throughout the Lowveld where some of their rock paintings are still visible. A number of these shelters have been documented in the Nelspruit area (Bornman, 1995; Schoonraad in Barnard, 1975).

It has been argued that the red ochre source for these paintings is to be found at Dumaneni, near Malelane (Bornman, 1995).

Two Late-Holocene (Later Stone Age) sites near Hazyview in the Kruger National Park date to the last 2500 years and is associated with pottery and microlith stone tools (Bergh, 1998: 95). This is contemporary to typical hunter-gatherer lifestyle and may also have been sites frequented by San.

It was only later that Bantu-speaking tribes moved into this area from the northern parts of Southern Africa and settled here. This period is referred to as the Early Iron Age (AD 200-1500 approx.). These were presumably Sotho-Tswana herder groups.

Various historians and ethnographers describe that the Lowveld was frequented by Swazi and Sotho-Tswana groups during historic times i.e. Late Iron Age times during the period AD 1500-1800. (Barnard, 1975; Bergh, 1998; Bornman, 2002; Herbst, 1985; Myburgh, 1949).

Old trade routes was well established before the period of Colonial expansion and these routes mainly existed as a direct consequence of metallurgy and mining for iron, tin, copper and some gold to make weapons, agricultural equipment and ornaments (Bergh, 1998:103). The earliest signs of iron mining and working in the old Transvaal dates to approximately 300 AD and copper mining and working in Southern Africa may have been practiced as early as 620 AD (Bergh, 1998:103).

These people were responsible for the establishment of large centres like Monomtpa

the Zimbabwe Complex and also the famed Mapungubwe in the Limpopo valley. At around 900 AD Arab merchants established a trade post at Sofala (Beira). Since the start of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, these Arabs had trade relations with the people of Zimbabwe. Textiles, porcelain and glass beads were traded for gold, ivory and other minerals. An ancient trade route passed close-by the current Nelspruit and started from Delagoabay in a westward direction through the Lowveld towards the gold fields of Lydenburg, by passing through Malalapoort, the Nkhomati and Crocodile Rivers to Skipberg in the current Kruger National Park close-by the place where Pretoriuskop Rest Camp is located. From here onwards there were two possible routes up the mountains to reach the goldfields. The first one passed by Spitskop (Sabie) and from there on to Lydenburg. The second passed south of the “Devils Knuckles” to Lydenburg. The Voortrekkers used this route in 1845 when making the wagon route between Ohrigstad and Delagoabay (Berg, 1998: 104). There were also several linking routes to existing main routes, one of which started from Sabie or Lydenburg to the route which linked Delagoabay to the Soutpansberg via Pilgrim’s Rest. It is also believed that a footpath existed at the foothills of the (Transvaal) Drakensberg which led around the mountain to link again with a major route alongside the Olifants River (Bergh, 1998:104).

In 1721 Dutch sailors reached Delagoabay and settled there for nine years, during this time they launched a number of expeditions inland. During August 1723 lieutenant Jan Steffler and 17 men launched the first of these expeditions but they were ambushed by natives shortly after crossing the Lebombo Mountains. Exactly where they crossed the mountains is uncertain but it is possible that they were actually in northern Swaziland when they were attacked. Steffler succumbed as a result of this ambush and his followers returned to Delagoabay (Bergh, 1998:116).

A second attempt to create an inland route took place two years later in June 1725 when Francois de Cuiper and 34 men departed from Delagoabay and travelled in a north-western direction. They reached Gomondwano in the current Kruger National Park where they were also attacked by a local tribe. This resulted in them also having to return to Delagoabay. Although this attempt was also not successful, it is seen as the first European intrusion into this northern area (Bergh, 1998:116).

In the Lowveld a sub-group of the Northern Sotho, known as the eastern Sotho, were present nearby the eastern escarpment. They are known as the Pulana, Pai and Kutswe, these people moved from northern Swaziland further northwards when Swazi expanded into this area during the *mfecane* (Bergh, 1998:107-108). One of the recorded events relates to the attack of the Ndwandwe under Zwede on the Pedi in 1825 (Bergh, 1998:114-115). This seems to have started from the Lowveld in the region of the Pretoriuskop area towards Steelpoort.

Before the *mfecane* period (1820's) small farmer groups including the Pai and Pulana resided in the mountainous area surrounding Barberton and Nelspruit. The conflict during the *mfecane*, when the Swazi under Mswati II raided these smaller groups, resulted in scattered settlement of those who managed to escape the Swazi onslaught. Evidence of these scattered settlements are sometimes found in the form of small stone walled enclosures in and around Barberton, Nelspruit and onwards to the Schoemanskloof.

The Groot Trek of the Voortrekkers started with the Tregardt- van Rensburg trek in 1835. The two men met where Tregardt and his followers crossed the Orange River at Buffelsvlei (Aliwal North). Here van Rensburg joined the trek northwards. On August 23, 1837 the Tregardt trek left for Delagoabay from the Soutpansberg. They travelled eastwards alongside the Olifants River to the eastern foothills of the Drakensberg. From here they travelled through the Lowveld and the current Kruger National Park where they eventually crossed the Lebombo mountains in March 1838. They reached the Fortification at Lourenço Marques on 13 April 1838 (Bergh, 1998:124-125).

#### **4.2. Archaeological history of the area**

Some archaeological research was done during the 1970's at sites belonging to the EIA (Early Iron Age), location Plaston, a settlement close to White River (Evers, 1977). This site is located on a spur between the White River and a small tributary. It is situated on holding 119 at Plaston. The site was discovered during house building operations when a collection of pottery shards was excavated. The finds consisted of pottery shards both on the surface and excavated. Some of the pottery vessels were decorated with a red ochre wash. Two major decoration motifs occurred on the pots:

- Punctuation, using a single stylus and
- Broadline incision, the more common motif

A number of Early Iron Age pottery collections from Mpumalanga and Limpopo may be compared to the Plaston sample. They include Silver Leaves, Eiland, Matola, Klingbiel and the Lydenburg Heads site. The Plaston sample is distinguished from samples of these sites in terms of rim morphology, the majority of rims from Plaston are rounded and very few beveled. Rims from the other sites show more beveled rims (Evers, 1977:176).

Early Iron Age pottery was also excavated by archaeologist, Prof. Tom Huffman during 1997 on location where the Riverside Government complex is currently situated (Huffman, 1998). This site known as the Riverside site is situated a few kilometers north of Nelspruit next to the confluence of the Nelspruit and Crocodile River. It was discovered during the course of an environmental impact assessment for the new Mpumalanga Government complex/ offices. A bulldozer cutting exposed storage pits, cattle byres, a burial and midden on the crest of a gentle slope. Salvage excavations conducted during December 1997 and March 1998 recovered the burial and contents of several pits.

One of the pits contained among other items, pottery dating to the eleventh century (AD 1070 ± 40 BP) this relates the pottery to the Mzonjani and Broederstroom phases. The early assemblage belongs to the Kwale branch of the Urewe tradition.

## **5. Located sites, their description and suggested mitigation**

A total of nine sites were documented. Some of them are regarded as having some archaeological or historical significance and others such as the grave sites have social as well as historic significance. The sites were numbered HD 1 to HD 9. The initials “HD” represent Hazyview and the farm De Rust and each number thereafter the number of the site. In general the project area has been and still is extensively used for agriculture. This is evident from existing mango and citrus orchards.

### **5.1. Social consultation**

Farm workers, the farm owner and the farm manager who reside on the farm were consulted during the surveying of the Project area.

They are:

- Mr Kobus Koekemoer, farm owner
- Mr Nico Coetzee, farm manager
- Mr Joseph Ndlovu
- Mr Emson Nyalunga

The representatives were consulted regarding information relating to graves and burial grounds which may be located nearby. They pointed out three grave locations and also the ruins of an old farm labourers residential area. Mr Ndlovu was a valuable informant as he has been living and working on this farm since August 1981.

#### **5.1.1. Site HD 1.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and C.

**Description:**

A single grave of an unknown individual. Discovered by farm workers while clearing land and pointed out by informant Emson Nyalunga. The grave dressing is not discernible as it is hidden under impenetrable lantana cuttings.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The development will probably impact on the site.



**Mitigation:**

It is recommended that the site not be disturbed by any future development activities. It is also recommended that the grave be fenced off and relatives be allowed access to the grave. If this is not possible, a process of social consultation should be followed with the families or relatives of the deceased to discuss further options. This is in accordance to section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998).

**5.1.2. Site HD 2.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and C.

**Description:**

The remains of one of a few square structures associated with farm worker's quarters. Farm owner Mr Kobus Koekemoer and other farmers in the area also stated that an old store used to be here. All that remain now are some wall foundations and remains of the structure, pointed out by informant Mr Joseph Ndlovu.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

It is not known in which way the proposed development will impact on the site

**Mitigation:**

No mitigation recommended.

**5.1.3. Site HD 3.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and C.

**Description:**

The remains of one of a few square structures associated with farm worker's quarters. Farm owner Mr Kobus Koekemoer and other farmers in the area also stated that an old store used to be here. All that remain now are some wall foundations and remains of the structure. Informant Mr Joseph Ndlovu.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

It is not known in which way the proposed development will impact on the site.

**Mitigation:**

No mitigation recommended

#### **5.1.4. Site HD 4.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and C.

**Description:**

The remains of one of a few square structures associated with farm worker's quarters. Farm owner Mr Kobus Koekemoer and other farmers in the area also stated that an old store used to be here. All that remain now are some wall foundations and remains of the structure. Informant Mr Joseph Ndlovu.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

It is not known in which way the proposed development will impact on the site.

**Mitigation:**

None recommended.

#### **5.1.5. Site HD 5.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and C.

**Description:**

A small scatter of pottery sherds. This was probably exposed during the installation of a water pipeline and the construction of an electrical fence (see fig. 6-8).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

It is not known in which way the proposed development will impact on the site.

**Mitigation:**

The possibility exists that these may be the remains of an Early Iron Age settlement and a second phase archaeological investigation is recommended if the proposed development activities will jeopardize the integrity of this site. If development activities are planned within a radius of 20 metres from this site, a second phase investigation is recommended. This will be done by digging test trenches in order to determine the nature and depth of the deposit.

#### **5.1.6. Site HD 6.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and C.

**Description:**

A grave pointed out by informant Mr Joseph Ndlovu. An unknown individual lies buried here.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

It is not known in which way the proposed development will impact on the site.

**Mitigation:**

It is recommended that the site not be disturbed by any future development activities. It is also recommended that the grave be fenced off and relatives be allowed access to the grave. If this is not possible, a process of social consultation should be followed with the families or relatives of the deceased to discuss further options. This is in accordance with section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998).

#### **5.1.7. Site HD 7.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and C.

**Description:**

A grave pointed out by informant Mr Joseph Ndlovu. An unknown individual lies buried here.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

It is not known in which way the proposed development will impact on the resort.

**Mitigation:**

It is recommended that the site not be disturbed by any future development activities. It is also recommended that the grave be fenced off and relatives be allowed access to the grave. If this is not possible, a process of social consultation should be followed with the families or relatives of the deceased to discuss further options. This is in accordance to section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998).

#### **5.1.8. Site HD 8.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and C.

**Description:**

Existing house. The farm manager currently stays here. The main house was built in 1955 and this house probably thereafter.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

It is not known in which way the proposed development will impact on the resort.

**Mitigation:**

No mitigation recommended

#### **5.1.9. Site HD 9.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and C.

**Description:**

Existing house. The farm owner, Mr Kobus Koekemoer confirmed that this house was built in 1955.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

It is not known in which way the proposed development will impact on the resort.

**Mitigation:**

No mitigation recommended.

**TABLE 5.1. General Significance of located sites.**

<b>Site No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Type of significance</b>	<b>Degree of significance</b>	<b>Sphere of significance</b>
HD 1	Grave	Social significance	High	Local Community
HD 2	Historic Ruins	Historic	Low	Local
HD 3	Historic Ruins	Historic	Low	Local
HD 4	Historic Ruins	Historic	Low	Local
HD 5	Pottery and daga	Archaeological	High	Local
HD 6	Grave	Social significance	High	Local Community
HD 7	Grave	Social significance	High	Local Community
HD 8	House	Social and historic significance	Low; built in 1955	Local
HD 9	House	Social and historic significance	Low; built in 1955	Local

**TABLE 5.2. Significance allocation of located sites**

Site no.	Unique nature	Integrity of archaeological deposit	Wider context	Relative location	Depth of deposit	Quality of archaeological/ historic material	Quantity of site features	Preservation condition of site
HD1	Grave	Not known	Grave	Residence of farm labourers	Not known	Archaeological: Medium Historic: High	N/A	Fair
HD2	Not unique	Not known	Farm workers residence	Residence of farm labourers	Not known	Archaeological: Low Historic: Low	N/A	Poor
HD3	Not unique	Not known	Farm workers residence	Residence of farm labourers	Not known	Archaeological: Low Historic: Low	N/A	Poor
HD4	Not unique	Not known	Farm workers residence	Residence of farm labourers	Not known	Archaeological: Low Historic: Low	N/A	Poor
HD5	Possible EIA	Disturbed	EIA history	Near perennial river	Not known	Archaeological: Medium Historic: Medium	Small scatter exposed through excavation	Fair
HD6	Grave	Not known	Grave	Residence of farm labourers	Not known	Archaeological: Medium Historical: High	N/A	Fair
HD7	Grave	Not known	Grave	Residence of farm labourers	Not known	Archaeological: Medium Historical: High	N/A	Fair
HD8	House	N/A	Potential heritage value when older than 60 years	Farm house	N/A	Archaeological: Low Historical: Medium	N/A	Good
HD9			Potential heritage value when older than 60 years	Farm house	N/A	Archaeological: Low Historical: Medium	N/A	Good

It must be noted that the bulk of archaeological remains are normally located beneath the soil surface. It is therefore possible that some significant cultural material or remains were not located during this survey and will only be revealed when the soil is disturbed. Should excavation or large scale earth moving activities reveal any human skeletal remains, broken pieces of ceramic pottery, large quantities of sub-surface charcoal or any material that can be associated with previous occupation, a qualified archaeologist should be notified immediately. This will also temporarily halt such activities until an archaeologist have assessed the situation. It must also be noted that if such a situation occurs it may have further financial implications for the developers the developers.

## **6. Findings and recommendations**

Mitigation measures were allocated to each site as discussed in section 5: Located sites and their description. Nine sites were recorded. The grave sites are always regarded as of high significance. This is in accordance with section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998). Grave sites HD 1, HD 6 and HD 7 should not be damaged by development activities, it is recommended that they be fenced to safeguard against damage and that relatives be allowed access if they are currently regularly visiting the graves. Sites HD 2, HD 3 and HD 4 are not considered to have archaeological or heritage value and therefore no mitigation is recommended.

In archaeological terms, site HD 5 is probably the most significant. It is possible that the site belong to the Early Iron Age period. These sites do not occur in isolation and it is recommended that development activities be monitored by an archaeologist when foundation trenches are made or any earth moving activities are conducted. If development activities are planned within a radius of 20 metres from this site, a second phase investigation is recommended. This will be done by digging test trenches in order to determine the nature and depth of the deposit.

Information from the farms owner and manager suggest that Sites HD 8 and HD 9 are not older than 60 years and are currently 54 years old at best. Also, the houses do not

represent any significant architectural style, therefore no mitigation is recommended. When development activities commence for instance in six year's time when these structures are 60 years old, they will be protected by the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) under section 34, *Structures*. A permit must then be issued by SAHRA before these structures are in any way altered or demolished.



## **7. Bibliography**

1. Barnard, C. 1975. *Die Transvaalse Laeveld. Komee van 'n Kontrei.*
2. Bergh, J.S. 1998. *Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.* J.L. van Schaik. Arcadia Pretoria.
3. Bornman, H. 1979. *Nelspruit 75 in '80.* Published and distributed by the Town Council of Nelspruit.
4. Bornman, H. 1995. *Pioneers of the Lowveld.*
5. Breutz, P.L. 1985. *Pre-Colonial Africa: The South-Eastern Bantu Cultural Province.*
6. Evers, T.M. 1975. *Recent Iron Age Research in the eastern Transvaal, South Africa.* South African Archaeological Bulletin. 30: 71-83.
7. Evers, T.M. 1977. *Plaston Early Iron Age Site, White River District, Eastern Transvaal, South Africa.* South African Archaeological Bulletin. 32: 170-178.
8. Evers, T.M. in Voight, E.A. 1981. *Guide to Archaeological Sites in the Northern and Eastern Transvaal.* Transvaal Museum, Pretoria.
9. Hampson, J; Blundell, G; Challis, W. 2002. *The Rock Art of Bongani Mountain Lodge and its environs, Mpumalanga Province, South Africa: An Introduction to Problems of Southern African Rock-Art Regions.* South African Archaeological Bulletin 57 (175): 13-30.
10. Huffman, T.N. 1998. *Presidential Address. The Antiquity of Lobola.* South African Archaeological Bulletin 53: 57-62.

11. Myburgh, A.C. 1949. *The Tribes of Barberton District*. Department of Native Affairs. Ethnological Publications No. 25.
12. Pienaar, U. de V. 1990. *Neem uit die Verlede*. Pretoria: Nasionale Parkeraad.
13. Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 2002. *Die Metodiek van Kultuurhulpbronbestuur (KHB)*. S.A. Tydskrif vir Kultuurgeskiedenis 16(2).
14. Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 1995. *Die bydrae van Argeologie tot Kultuurhulpbronbestuur*. Referaat gelewer voor die Suid-Afrikaanse Vereniging vir Kultuurgeskiedenis, Transvaal Streektak, Sunnyside.

## Appendix A

## **Terminology**

**“Alter”** means any action affecting the structure, appearance or physical properties of a place or object, whether by way of structural or other works, by painting, plastering or other decoration or any other means.

**“Archaeological”** means –

- Material remains resulting from human activity which are in a state of disuse and are in or on land and which are older than 100 years, including artifacts, human and hominid remains and artificial features or structures;
- Rock Art, being any form of painting, engraving or other graphic representation on a fixed rock surface or loose rock or stone, which was executed by human agency and which is older than 100 years, including any area within 10m of such representation;
- Wrecks, being any vessel or aircraft, or any part thereof, which was wrecked in South Africa, whether on land, in the internal waters, the territorial waters or in the maritime culture zone of the Republic, as defined respectively in sections 3, 4 and 6 of the Maritime Zones Act, 1994 (Act No. 15 of 1994), and any cargo, debris or artifacts found or associated therewith, which is older than 60 years or which SAHRA considers to be worthy of conservation; and
- Features, structures and artefacts associated with military history which are older than 75 years and the sites on which they are found;

**“Conservation”**, in relation to heritage resources, includes protection, maintenance, preservation and sustainable use of places or objects so as to safeguard their cultural significance;

**“Cultural significance”** means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance;

**“Development”** means any physical intervention, excavation, or action, other than those caused by natural forces, which may in the opinion of a heritage authority in any way result in a change to the nature, appearance or physical nature of a place, or influence its stability and future well-being, including –

- construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change of use of a place or a structure at a place;
- carrying out any works on or over or under a place;
- subdivision or consolidation of land comprising, a place, including the structures or airspace of a place;
- constructing or putting up for display signs or hoardings;
- any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land; and
- any removal or destruction of trees, or removal of vegetation or topsoil;

**“Expropriate”** means the process as determined by the terms of and according to procedures described in the Expropriation Act, 1975 (Act No. 63 of 1975);

**“Foreign cultural property”**, in relation to a reciprocating state, means any object that is specifically designated by that state as being of importance for archaeology, history, literature, art or science;

**“Grave”** means a place of internment and includes the contents, headstone or other marker of such a place, and any other structure on or associated with such place;

**“Heritage resource”** means any place or object of cultural significance;

**“Heritage register”** means a list of heritage resources in a province;

**“Heritage resources authority”** means the South African Heritage Resources Agency, established in terms of section 11, or, insofar as this Act (25 of 1999) is applicable in or in respect of a province, a provincial heritage resources authority (PHRA);

**“Heritage site”** means a place declared to be a national heritage site by SAHRA or a

place declared to be a provincial heritage site by a provincial heritage resources authority;

**“Improvement”**, in relation to heritage resources, includes the repair, restoration and rehabilitation of a place protected in terms of this Act (25 of 1999);

**“Land”** includes land covered by water and the air space above the land;

**“Living heritage”** means the intangible aspects of inherited culture, and may include –

- cultural tradition;
- oral history;
- performance;
- ritual;
- popular memory;
- skills and techniques;
- indigenous knowledge systems; and
- the holistic approach to nature, society and social relationships;

**“Management”** in relation to heritage resources, includes the conservation, presentation and improvement of a place protected in terms of the Act;

**“Object”** means any moveable property of cultural significance which may be protected in terms of any provisions of the Act, including –

- any archaeological artifact;
- palaeontological and rare geological specimens;
- meteorites;
- other objects referred to in section 3 of the Act;

**“Owner”** includes the owner’s authorized agent and any person with a real interest in the property and –

- in the case of a place owned by the State or State-aided institutions, the Minister or any other person or body of persons responsible for the care, management or control of that place;
- in the case of tribal trust land, the recognized traditional authority;

**“Place”** includes –

- a site, area or region;
- a building or other structure which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such building or other structure;
- a group of buildings or other structures which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such group of buildings or other structures;
- an open space, including a public square, street or park; and
- in relation to the management of a place, includes the immediate surroundings of a place;

**“Site”** means any area of land, including land covered by water, and including any structures or objects thereon;

**“Structure”** means any building, works, device or other facility made by people and which is fixed to land, and includes any fixtures, fittings and equipment associated therewith;

## Appendix B



## 9. List of located sites

Sites located during the survey were numbered HD 1 to HD 9. The initials “HD” represent “Hazyview, De Rust” and the following number the number of the site. A spatial location with the aid of a GPS (Global Positioning System) was added to each site.

### 9.1. Site name: HD 1 (Site 1)

Date of compilation: 10/09/2009

GPS reading: Longitude, 31, 13657° E

Latitude, 25, 05398° S

Altitude: 549 m

Photo: Fig. 1.

### 9.2. Site name: HD 2 (Site 2)

Date of compilation: 10/09/2009

GPS reading: Longitude, 31, 15311° E

Latitude, 25, 05020° S

Altitude: 708 m

Photo: Fig. 3.

### 9.3. Site name: HD 3 (Site 3)

Date of compilation: 10/09/2009

GPS reading: Longitude, 31, 15253° E

Latitude, 25, 05039° S

Altitude: 486 m

Photo: Fig. 4.

### 9.4. Site name: HD 4 (Site 4)

Date of compilation: 10/09/2009

GPS reading: Longitude, 31, 15264° E

Latitude, 25, 04993° S

Altitude: 486 m

Photo: Fig. 5.

9.5. Site name: HD 5 (Site 5)

Date of compilation: 10/09/2009

GPS reading: Longitude, 31, 15215° E

Latitude, 25, 05072° S

Altitude: 488 m

Photo: Fig. 6, 7, 8.

9.6. Site name: HD 6 (Site 6)

Date of compilation: 10/09/2009

GPS reading: Longitude, 31, 15167° E

Latitude, 25, 05017° S

Altitude: 497 m

Photo: Fig. 9.

9.7. Site name: HD 7 (Site 7)

Date of compilation: 10/09/2009

GPS reading: Longitude, 31, 15194° E

Latitude, 25, 05019° S

Altitude: 498 m

Photo: Fig. 10.

9.8. Site name: HD 8 (Site 8)

Date of compilation: 10/09/2009

GPS reading: Longitude, 31, 14600° E

Latitude, 25, 05145° S

Altitude: 516 m

Photo: Fig. 11.

9.9. Site name: HD 9 (Site 9)

Date of compilation: 10/09/2009


GPS reading: Longitude, 31, 14232° E

Latitude, 25, 05471° S


Altitude: 542 m

Photo: Fig. 12.

## Appendix C – Maps



1:50 000 2531 AA Kiepersol





## Appendix D





Fig. 1. Site 1. Site HD 1. The location of a grave pointed out by informant Mr Emson Nyalunga.



Fig. 2. The largest part of the farm is covered in mango and citrus orchards. Also see aerial photos Appendix C.



Fig. 3. Site HD 2. The remains of one of a few square structures associated with farm worker's quarters. Arrows indicate wall foundations and remains of the structure.



Fig. 4. Site HD 3. The remains of one of a few square structures associated with farm worker's quarters. The arrows indicate rubble and the foundations of walls.



Fig. 5. Site 4. Site HD 4. The arrows indicate rubble and the foundations of walls.



Fig. 6. Site HD 5. The pottery scatter and burnt daga was found right under the electric fence. It was probably disturbed when the water pipeline was installed. Arrow indicates pipeline. Farm manager Mr Nico Coetzee appears on the photo.



Fig. 7. Site HD 5. A selection of scattered pottery.



Fig. 8. Site HD 6. Location of grave pointed out by informant Mr Joseph Ndlovu.



Fig. 9. Site HD 7. Another grave pointed out by informant Mr Joseph Ndlovu.



Fig. 10. Site HD 8. House of the farm manager.



Fig. 11. Site HD 9. Main house on property. Built in 1955.