

**PHASE ONE CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT  
ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSED  
SUBDIVISION OF ERF 215, MOOI RIVER,  
MPOFANA MUNICIPALITY, KWAZULU-NATAL.**



**ACTIVE HERITAGE cc.**

**Frans Prins  
MA (Archaeology)  
P.O. Box 947  
Howick  
3290**

**For: Mr John Armstrong**

**Activeheritage@gmail.com**  
Fax: 0867636380  
www.ativeheritage.webs.com

**February 2014**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF AREA</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF THE SURVEY</b> .....	<b>4</b>
3.1	Methodology .....	4
3.2	Restrictions encountered during the survey .....	4
3.2.1	<i>Visibility</i> .....	4
3.2.2	<i>Disturbance</i> .....	4
3.3	Details of equipment used in the survey.....	4
<b>4</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF SITES AND MATERIAL OBSERVED</b> .....	<b>5</b>
4.1	Locational data .....	5
4.2	Description of the general area surveyed.....	5
<b>5</b>	<b>STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE (HERITAGE VALUE)</b> .....	<b>7</b>
5.1	Field Rating.....	7
<b>6</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>MAPS AND FIGURES</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>14</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Background information.....	1
Table 2.	Heritage sites located during the survey.....	6
Table 3.	Field rating and recommended grading of sites (SAHRA 2005) .....	7

**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

EIA	Early Iron Age
ESA	Early Stone Age
HISTORIC PERIOD	Since the arrival of the white settlers - c. AD 1820 in this part of the country
IRON AGE	Early Iron Age AD 200 - AD 1000 Late Iron Age AD 1000 - AD 1830
LIA	Late Iron Age
LSA	Late Stone Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998 and associated regulations (2006).
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) and associated regulations (2000)
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency
STONE AGE	Early Stone Age 2 000 000 - 250 000 BP Middle Stone Age 250 000 - 25 000 BP Late Stone Age 30 000 - until c. AD 200

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A first phase cultural heritage survey of Erf 215, Mooi River, and Mpofana Local Municipality identified one heritage site, a stone walled enclosure. This colonial-era structure has been rated as locally significant. Mitigation will be required before this structure may be altered. A second phase heritage impact assessment, by a built heritage specialist, will be required in order to motivate for the relevant permit from Amafa – the provincial heritage agency. There is no archaeological reason why development may not proceed on the remainder of the study area as planned. However, attention is drawn to the South African Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) and the KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act (Act no 4 of 2008) which, requires that operations that expose archaeological or historical remains should cease immediately, pending evaluation by the provincial heritage agency.

## 1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT

**Table 1. Background information**

Consultant:	Frans Prins (Active Heritage cc) for Mr John Armstrong
Type of development:	Subdivision of Erf 215 (Fig 2)
Rezoning or subdivision:	Subdivision
Terms of reference	To carry out a Heritage Impact Assessment
Legislative requirements:	The Heritage Impact Assessment was carried out in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and following the requirements of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA) and the KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act, 1997 (Act No. 4 of 2008)

### 1.1. Details of the area surveyed:

Erf 215 is located near Mooi River, KwaZulu-Natal. The project area is situated adjacent to the R 622 approximately 2 km to the west of Mooiriver (Fig 1). The GPS coordinates for the project area is given as: S 29° 12' 29.10" E 30° 01' 31.37". It covers an area of approximately 170m X 65m (Figs 2 & 3).

## 2 BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF AREA

The greater Mooi River, including the Drakensberg portion of the area to the east, has been relatively well surveyed for archaeological sites in the past. Some sites have been recorded by cultural resource consultants who have worked in the area during the last two decades whilst archaeologists from the then Natal Museum have made sporadic visits to the area. The adjacent areas of Muden and Weenen to the west have also been well surveyed for archaeological sites. These low altitude and densely wooded areas have been intensely occupied by Iron Age farmers since the Early Iron Age around 500 AD. Some of these sites have also been excavated by Dr Tim Maggs of the Natal Museum in the 1980's (Huffman 2007). The footprint is centrally located between the Drakensberg with its abundance of Later Stone Age rock art sites to the east and the low altitude river valleys that were favoured by Iron Age farmers, to the west.

The available evidence, as captured in the KwaZulu-Natal Museum heritage site inventories, indicates that the area in the near vicinity to the footprint contains a wide spectrum of archaeological sites covering different time-periods and cultural traditions. These include one Early Stone Age site, four Middle Stone Age sites, twenty Later Stone Age sites, eight Later Iron Age sites, and numerous historical sites dating back to the colonial period. Some of the farms in the area contain graves and structures relating to early Voortrekker settlement such as those at the nearby Dargle Valley on the farm Maritzdaal and at La Lampara near Balgowan, however, the majority of older buildings on farmsteads were erected by British colonists after 1850 who occupied farms previously inhabited by Voortrekker pioneers (Bizley & McKenzie 2007). Some historical buildings, such as those at Weston College approximately 1 km to the west of the project area, were actively used by British imperial forces during the Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902. Various graves in the area belonged to British soldiers who died during the War. The old church cemetery at Bruntville, approximately 1 km to the east of the project area, contains the graves of numerous British soldiers who died during the Anglo-Boer War (Fig 1). These are also protected by heritage legislation.

Most of the Stone Age sites in the near vicinity of the footprint occur in open air contexts as exposed by donga and sheet erosion. Some Middle Stone Age flakes, probably dating back to ca. 40 000 – 200 000 years ago, occur in disturbed context in dongas and road cuttings. The majority of Later Stone Age sites as well as rock art

sites occur further west in the foothills of the Drakensberg. These typically occur in small shelters in the sandstone formations some leading up to the Drakensberg.

The San were the owners of the land for almost 30 000 years but the local demography started to change soon after 2000 years ago when the first Bantu-speaking farmers crossed the Limpopo River and arrived in South Africa. Around 400 years ago, if not earlier, Bantu-speaking farmers also settled in the greater Mooi River area. Although the majority of sites constructed by these African farmers consisted of stone walling not all of them were made from stone. Sites located in the Dargle and Karkloof Valley areas also show that many settlements just consisted of wattle and daub structures. These Later Iron Age sites were most probably inhabited by Nguni-speaking groups such as the Wushe, Thembu, Mncunu and related groups (Bryant 1965). The Wushe was known to be excellent metal workers and it is not surprising that some archaeological evidence for early metal working has been found in the Karkloof, Nottingham road, and Dargle areas. However, by 1820 the Wushe was dispersed from this area due to the expansionistic policies of the Zulu Kingdom of King Shaka. African refugee groups and individuals were given permission to settle in the area by the British colonial authorities after 1845 where most of them became farm labourers. After the Anglo-Zulu war of 1879 and the Bambatha Rebellion of 1911 many of the African people in the study area adopted a Zulu ethnic identity.

European settlement of the area started soon after 1838 when the first Voortrekker settlers marked out large farms in the area. However, most of these farms were abandoned in the 1840's when Natal became a British colony only to be reoccupied again by British immigrants. The first permanent British settlement in the area occurred in 1852 at the drift in the Mooi River, the Mooi River Drift. This occurred approximately 18km from the project area. In 1866 the location was formally named Weston after the first Governor of Natal, Martin West. In 1879, an Irishman named Alexander Lawrence purchased the farm "Grantleigh" upstream from Weston, on the banks of the Mooi River. In 1884, the railway line from Durban to Johannesburg reached the area and was built across the Grantleigh farm of Alexander Lawrence. He subsequently laid out and establish a village on his farm, called Lawrenceville. In 1921, the village was renamed Mooi River when it was declared a town. Lawrence is known as "The Father of Mooi River".

### **3 BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF THE SURVEY**

#### **3.1 Methodology**

A desktop study was conducted of the archaeological databases housed in the KwaZulu-Natal Museum. In addition, the available archaeological and historical literature covering the greater Mooiriver area was also consulted. The SAHRIS website was consulted to locate additional heritage sites and features near the study area.

A ground survey, following standard and accepted archaeological procedures, was conducted.

#### **3.2 Restrictions encountered during the survey**

##### **3.2.1 Visibility**

Visibility was good.

##### **3.2.2 Disturbance**

No disturbance of any potential heritage features was noted.

#### **3.3 Details of equipment used in the survey**

GPS: Garmin Etrek

Digital cameras: Canon Powershot A460

All readings were taken using the GPS. Accuracy was to a level of 5 m.

## **4 DESCRIPTION OF SITES AND MATERIAL OBSERVED**

### **4.1 Locational data**

*Province:* KwaZulu-Natal

*Town:* Mooi River

*Municipality:* Mpofana Local Municipality

### **4.2 Description of the general area surveyed**

The project area is an open piece of land situated directly adjacent to the R622 and overlooking the Mooi River to the west and north. A large livestock enclosure demarcated by a stone wall occurs in the south central section of the property. This structure dates back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century and is protected by national and provincial heritage legislation. A detailed and contextual description of this site is given in Table 2.

Three known heritage sites occur within 1km from the footprint. These are the Bruntville Military Graveyard situated approximately 1km to the west of the study area, a historical bridge over the Mooi River situated approximately 350m to the west of the study area and various buildings and features at Weston Agricultural College (Fig1). All these features dates back to the late nineteenth century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. They most probably form part of a cultural landscape associated with the Anglo-Boer War era of 1899-1901.



### 4.3 Description and distribution of heritage sites found on the study area

The various heritage sites identified are described in Table 2 below.

**Table 2. Heritage sites located during the ground survey.**

	Heritage site category	Brief description	Significance (Table 3)	Mitigation	GPS Latitude and Longitude
1	Stone walled livestock enclosure (Figs 3, 4 & 5).	A large rectangular stone walled livestock enclosure. It is situated in the south central section of the project area in portion 215 of Erf 462. It measures approximately 30m x 80m. The wall is made with cut dolerite boulders and it is approximately 1.6m tall and almost 1m thick at places. The wall has been damaged and it is broken in places. It was most probably part of the original farmstead in the area. The livestock enclosure appears to have been built in the mid to late 19 <sup>th</sup> century.	The site is considered to be of high significance locally (Table 3). There are similar examples elsewhere in the greater Mooi River area. However, it forms part of a greater cultural landscape with colonial features dating back to the 19 <sup>th</sup> century and early 20 <sup>th</sup> century	The general ruling is that no development may occur within 20m of identified heritage sites. And a buffer of at least 10m must be maintained around this site. No alteration of the site is allowed. However, mitigation may be considered by Amafa. A second phase heritage impact assessment, by a built heritage specialist, will be required. This second phase assessment will provide recommendations as to the possible alteration and	S 29° 12' 34.36" E 30° 1' 31.80"

				demolition of a section of this structure.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

#### 4.4 Summary of findings

One heritage sites was located on Erf 215 namely a rectangular livestock enclosure. This feature most probably dates back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century although it has been used for a great portion of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In addition, the study area forms part of a larger cultural landscape (Appendix 1). Cultural landscapes and heritage sites are protected by heritage legislation. However, the identified livestock enclosure has not been rated as highly significant and mitigation may be possible once a second phase heritage assessment has been conducted by a built heritage specialist.

## 5 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE (HERITAGE VALUE)

### 5.1 Field Rating

- The stone walled livestock enclosure has been rated as locally significant i.e. Local Grade 111b (Table 3).

**Table 3. Field rating and recommended grading of sites (SAHRA 2005)**

Level	Details	Action
National (Grade I)	The site is considered to be of National Significance	Nominated to be declared by SAHRA
Provincial (Grade II)	This site is considered to be of Provincial significance	Nominated to be declared by Provincial Heritage Authority
Local Grade IIIA	This site is considered to be of HIGH significance locally	The site should be retained as a heritage site
Local Grade IIIB	This site is considered to be of HIGH significance locally	The site should be mitigated, and part retained as a heritage site
Generally Protected A	High to medium significance	Mitigation necessary before destruction
Generally Protected B	Medium significance	The site needs to be recorded before destruction
Generally Protected C	Low significance	No further recording is required before destruction

## 6 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Strictly maintain a buffer of at least 10m around the stone walled livestock enclosure. This feature may not be altered or demolished as it is protected by heritage legislation.
- Mitigation may be possible but a second phase heritage impact assessment by a built heritage specialist must be conducted of the study area. The second phase heritage impact assessment will include recommendations as to the possible alteration of the original structure. This will include obtaining a relevant permit from Amafa.
- Attention is drawn to the South African Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) and the KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act (Act no 4 of 2008) which, requires that operations that expose archaeological or historical remains should cease immediately, pending evaluation by the provincial heritage agency.

7 MAPS AND FIGURES



Figure 1. Google aerial photograph showing the location of the Project Area.



**Figure 2. Aerial photograph showing the proposed subdivision of Erf 462, Mooi River. Portion 215 occurs in the south eastern section (Source: John Armstrong)**



Figure 3. Location of stone walled enclosure on Erf 215, Mooi River.



**Figure 4.** *Stone walled livestock enclosure. This feature has been damaged in parts.*



**Figure 5.** *Northern section of the stone walled livestock enclosure*



*Figure 6. Bruntville Military Cemetery: view from the study area*



## 8 REFERENCES

Bizley, B. & McKenzie, P. 2007. *An Historical Meander through the Midlands of KwaZulu-Natal*. Midlands Meander Association, Howick.

Bryant, A. T. 1965. *Olden times in Zululand and Natal*. Cape Town: C. Struik.

Huffman, T. N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age: The Archaeology of Pre-colonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa*. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press. Pietermaritzburg.

Maggs, T. The Iron Age farming communities. In Duminy, A. and Guest, B. 1989. *Natal and Zululand: from Earliest Times to 1910. A New History*. Pg. 28-46. University of Natal Press. Pietermaritzburg.

SAHRA, 2005. *Minimum Standards For The Archaeological And The Palaeontological Components Of Impact Assessment Reports, Draft version 1.4*.

## APPENDIX 1

The American National Parks Services sets out various criteria for the identification and management of cultural landscapes:

'Cultural landscapes are complex resources that range from large rural tracts covering several thousand acres to formal gardens of less than an acre. Natural features such as landforms, soils and vegetation are not only part of the cultural landscape, they provide the framework within which it evolves. In the broadest sense, a cultural landscape is a reflection of human adaptation and use of settlement, land use, systems of circulation and the natural resources and is often expressed in the way land is organised and divided, patterns of types of structures that are built. The character of a cultural landscape is defined both by physical materials, such as roads, buildings, walls and vegetation, and by use reflecting cultural values and traditions.

'Identifying the character-defining features in a landscape and understanding them in relation to each other and to significant historic events, trends and persons allows us to read the landscape as a cultural resource. In many cases, these features are dynamic and change over time. In many cases, too, historical significance may be ascribed to more than one period in a landscape's physical and cultural evolution.

'Cultural landscape management involves identifying the type and degree of change that can occur while maintaining the character-defining features. The identification and management of an appropriate level of change in a cultural landscape is closely related to its significance. In a landscape significant for its association with a specific style, individual, trend or event, change may diminish its integrity and needs to be carefully monitored and controlled. In a landscape significant for the pattern of use that has evolved, physical change may be essential to the continuation of the use. In the latter case, the focus should be on perpetuating the use while maintaining the general character and feeling of the historic period(s), rather than on preserving a specific appearance.

'A cultural landscape is a geographic area, including both natural and cultural resources, associated with a historic event, activity or person. The National Park Services recognises four cultural landscape categories: historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, historic sites and ethnographic landscapes. These categories are helpful in distinguishing the values that make landscapes cultural resources and in determining how they should be treated, managed and interpreted...

'The four cultural landscape categories are not mutually exclusive. A landscape may be associated with a significant event, include designed or vernacular characteristics and be significant to a specific cultural groups.

