

**DESKTOP SURVEY OF THE EPAYIPINI  
PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE**

**FOR JEFFARES & GREEN AFRIKA**

**DATE: 22 September 2016**

**By Gavin Anderson**

**Umlando: Archaeological Surveys and Heritage  
Management**

**PO Box 102532, Meerensee, 3901**

**Phone/fax: 035-7531785 Fax: 0865445631**

**Cell: 0836585362**



## TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION .....	4
<b>KWAZULU-NATAL HERITAGE ACT NO. 4 OF 2008</b> .....	9
METHOD .....	11
Defining significance.....	12
RESULTS .....	15
DESKTOP STUDY .....	15
PALAEONTOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT .....	19
RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION.....	20

## TABLE OF FIGURES

FIG. 1 GENERAL LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA.....	5
FIG. 2: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AREA .....	6
FIG. 3: TOPOGRAPHICAL OVERVIEW OF THE WESTERN STUDY AREA .....	7
FIG. 4: SCENIC VIEWS OF THE PROPOSED BRIDGE.....	8
TABLE 1: SAHRA GRADINGS FOR HERITAGE SITES .....	15
FIG. 5: LOCATION OF KNOWN HERITAGE SITES NEAR THE STUDY AREA.....	16
FIG. 6: STUDY AREA IN 1937 .....	17
FIG. 7: STUDY AREA IN 1942.....	18
FIG. 8: PALEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY .....	19

## Abbreviations

HP	Historical Period
IIA	Indeterminate Iron Age
LIA	Late Iron Age
EIA	Early Iron Age
ISA	Indeterminate Stone Age
ESA	Early Stone Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
LSA	Late Stone Age
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
PIA	Palaeontological Impact Assessment

## **INTRODUCTION**

The eThekweni Metropolitan Municipality Engineering Unit: Roads Provision, appointed JG Afrika (Pty) Ltd to undertake the environmental service required for the proposed development of a pedestrian bridge over an unnamed river and will connect the communities of 34<sup>th</sup> and 35<sup>th</sup> Avenues, with the KwaDabeka L community, eThekweni, KwaZulu-Natal.

At present, the surrounding community crosses the river on stones placed within the watercourse. During high rainfall events, the community crosses the river over an existing water pipeline. Both of these crossing points have proven to be dangerous and inaccessible during periods of heavy storms. To mitigate this, and ensure safe passage, a pedestrian bridge is proposed. The bridge will be located outside the 1:100 year floodline to allow the pedestrian to utilise the structure during heavy rains, storms and floods. The bridge structure will consist of reinforced concrete deck, 1.5m in width, which will be connected to bedrock using CFA piles and reinforced concrete columns.

The proposed pedestrian bridge alignment passes over an unnamed river and will connect the communities of 34<sup>th</sup> and 35<sup>th</sup> Avenues, with the KwaDabeka L community. The valley in which the pedestrian bridge is located is dominated by informal residential housing which is interspersed by alien vegetation. The proposed pedestrian bridge layout has been designed by the Applicant, and takes into account the nature of the receiving environment and surrounds, and the needs of the community.

Fig 1 – 3 shows the location of the bridge. Figure 4 shows the scenic views of the bridge area.



FIG. 1 GENERAL LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA





FIG. 2: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AREA






FIG. 3: TOPOGRAPHICAL OVERVIEW OF THE WESTERN STUDY AREA






FIG. 4: SCENIC VIEWS OF THE PROPOSED BRIDGE





## KWAZULU-NATAL HERITAGE ACT NO. 4 OF 2008

“General protection: Structures.—

- No structure which is, or which may reasonably be expected to be older than 60 years, may be demolished, altered or added to without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- Where the Council does not grant approval, the Council must consider special protection in terms of sections 38, 39, 40, 41 and 43 of Chapter 9.
- The Council may, by notice in the *Gazette*, exempt—
- A defined geographical area; or
- defined categories of sites within a defined geographical area, from the provisions of subsection where the Council is satisfied that heritage resources falling in the defined geographical area or category have been identified and are adequately protected in terms of sections 38, 39, 40, 41 and 43 of Chapter 9.
- A notice referred to in subsection (2) may, by notice in the *Gazette*, be amended or withdrawn by the Council.

General protection: Graves of victims of conflict.—No person may damage, alter, exhume, or remove from its original position—

- the grave of a victim of conflict;
- a cemetery made up of such graves; or
- any part of a cemetery containing such graves, without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- General protection: Traditional burial places.—
- No grave—
- not otherwise protected by this Act; and
- not located in a formal cemetery managed or administered by a local authority, may be damaged, altered, exhumed, removed from its original

position, or otherwise disturbed without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.

The Council may only issue written approval once the Council is satisfied that—

- the applicant has made a concerted effort to consult with communities and individuals who by tradition may have an interest in the grave; and
- the applicant and the relevant communities or individuals have reached agreement regarding the grave.

General protection: Battlefield sites, archaeological sites, rock art sites, palaeontological sites, historic fortifications, meteorite or meteorite impact sites.—

- No person may destroy, damage, excavate, alter, write or draw upon, or otherwise disturb any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, meteorite or meteorite impact site without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- Upon discovery of archaeological or palaeontological material or a meteorite by any person, all activity or operations in the general vicinity of such material or meteorite must cease forthwith and a person who made the discovery must submit a written report to the Council without delay.
- The Council may, after consultation with an owner or controlling authority, by way of written notice served on the owner or controlling authority, prohibit any activity considered by the Council to be inappropriate within 50 metres of a rock art site.
- No person may exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb, damage, destroy, own or collect any object or material associated with any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, meteorite or meteorite impact site without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- No person may bring any equipment which assists in the detection of metals and archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, or



- excavation equipment onto any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, or meteorite impact site, or use similar detection or excavation equipment for the recovery of meteorites, without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- The ownership of any object or material associated with any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, meteorite or meteorite impact site, on discovery, vest in the Provincial Government and the Council is regarded as the custodian on behalf of the Provincial Government.” (KZN Heritage Act of 2008)

## METHOD

The method for Heritage assessment consists of several steps.

The first step forms part of the desktop assessment. Here we would consult the database that has been collated by Umlando. These databases contains archaeological site locations and basic information from several provinces (information from Umlando surveys and some colleagues), most of the national and provincial monuments and battlefields in Southern Africa (<http://www.vuvuzela.com/googleearth/monuments.html>) and cemeteries in southern Africa (information supplied by the Genealogical Society of Southern Africa). We use 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1:50 000 topographical and 1937 aerial photographs where available, to assist in general location and dating of buildings and/or graves. The database is in Google Earth format and thus used as a quick reference when undertaking desktop studies. Where required we would consult with a local data recording centre, however these tend to be fragmented between different institutions and areas and thus difficult to access at times. We also consult with an historical architect, palaeontologist, and an historian where necessary.

The survey results will define the significance of each recorded site, as well as a management plan.

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 or features. Sites of medium significance have diagnostic artefacts or features and these sites tend to be 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. Sampling usually occurs on most sites. Sites of high significance are excavated and/or extensively sampled. Those sites that are extensively sampled have high research potential, yet poor preservation of features.

### **Defining significance**

Heritage 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.

**8. Other Heritage Significance:**

- 8.1. Palaeontological sites
- 8.2. Historical buildings
- 8.3. Battlefields and general Anglo-Zulu and Anglo-Boer sites
- 8.4. Graves and/or community cemeteries
- 8.5. Living Heritage Sites
- 8.6. Cultural Landscapes, that includes old trees, hills, mountains, rivers, etc related to cultural or historical experiences.

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. This occurs in Phase 2. These test-pit excavations may require further excavations if the site is of significance (Phase 3). 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 above significance ratings allow one to grade the site according to SAHRA's grading scale. This is summarised in Table 1.



TABLE 1: SAHRA GRADINGS FOR HERITAGE SITES

SITE SIGNIFICANCE	FIELD RATING	GRADE	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION
High Significance	National Significance	Grade 1	Site conservation / Site development
High Significance	Provincial Significance	Grade 2	Site conservation / Site development
High Significance	Local Significance	Grade 3A / 3B	
High / Medium Significance	Generally Protected A		Site conservation or mitigation prior to development / destruction
Medium Significance	Generally Protected B		Site conservation or mitigation / test excavation / systematic sampling / monitoring prior to or during development / destruction
Low Significance	Generally Protected C		On-site sampling monitoring or no archaeological mitigation required prior to or during development / destruction

## RESULTS

### DESKTOP STUDY

The desktop study consisted of analysing various maps for evidence of prior habitation in the study area, as well as for previous archaeological surveys. The archaeological database indicates that there are archaeological sites in the general area (fig. 5). These sites include all types of Stone Age and Iron Age sites. No sites occur in the study area.

No national monuments, battlefields, or historical cemeteries are known to occur in the study area.

The 1937 aerial photographs (fig. 6) and 1942 1:50 000 topographical map (fig. 7) indicate that while there are settlements in the general area, these do not occur where the bridge will be placed. Moreover, the area has been affected by more recent dwellings that would have removed any previous heritage sites.



FIG. 5: LOCATION OF KNOWN HERITAGE SITES NEAR THE STUDY AREA






FIG. 6: STUDY AREA IN 1937







FIG. 7: STUDY AREA IN 1942



## PALAEONTOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The study area occurs on the edge low and moderate palaeontological significance (fig. 8). Since the footprint of the bridge will be less than a hectare in size, it would not necessitate a PIA study. However, a protocol for palaeontological finds will be required. The geotechnical surveys will indicate the exact layers that will be affected and this will be sent to Dr Gideon Groenewald for comment.

**FIG. 8: PALEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY**



COLOUR	SENSITIVITY	REQUIRED ACTION
RED	VERY HIGH	field assessment and protocol for finds is required
ORANGE/YELLOW	HIGH	desktop study is required and based on the outcome of the desktop study, a field assessment is likely
GREEN	MODERATE	desktop study is required
BLUE	LOW	no palaeontological studies are required however a protocol for finds is required
GREY	INSIGNIFICANT/ZERO	no palaeontological studies are required
WHITE/CLEAR	UNKNOWN	these areas will require a minimum of a desktop study. As more information comes to light, SAHRA will continue to populate the map.



## **RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION**

A desktop heritage survey was undertaken for the proposed ePayipeni Bridge. The bridge would alleviate safety and health concerns for the local community.

No heritage sites were noted in the desktop study. The desktop study noted that the area has been in use for several decades. Any heritage site that could have occurred in the study area would have been destroyed by now.

I recommend that the bridge is exempt from further HIA work.