

SPECIALIST REPORT

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED
ALTERATION OF VIRGIN NATURAL LAND FOR AGRICULTURAL USE:
PORTION 1 OF SIERAAD 386 JU,
KOMATIPOORT AREA
MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

**REPORT COMPILED FOR
RHENGU ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

MR. RALF KALWA

P.O. Box 1046,

MALELANE, 1320

Tel: 0824147088 / Fax: 0866858003 / e-mail: rhengu@mweb.co.za

JULY 2013

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

C. VAN WYK ROWE

E-MAIL: christinevwr@gmail.com

Tel: 0828719553 / Fax: 0867151639

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) regarding archaeological and other cultural heritage resources was conducted on the footprint for the proposed alteration of virgin natural land for agricultural use: *portion 1 of the farm SIERAAD 386 JU*, Komatipoort area in the Mpumalanga Province.

The study area is situated on topographical map 1:50 000, 2531DB TONGA (2003), which is in the Mpumalanga Province. This area falls under the jurisdiction of the Ehlanzeni District Municipality, and Nkomazi Local Municipality.

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.

The applicant, Mr. Colin Poulton in co-operation with Rhengu Environmental Services, is requesting the alteration of virgin natural land for agricultural purposes (sugar cane). An area of 132ha of a 200ha portion will be developed of which 110ha will be used for agriculture and 22ha for the development of a farm road network to access the various cane fields. Large areas on adjacent properties are commercial farms used for agricultural purposes, mainly sugar cane since the 1950's (see **Appendix 2**).

The area for the proposed agricultural development (approximately 132ha), is currently virgin natural land which is fenced as game camps. It is zoned as agricultural. The Komati River is situated to the east of the proposed agricultural development and a drainage line runs through the middle section, which will be kept as a game camp (See google image in **Appendix 3**). The area comprises natural land with grass veld, scattered trees and areas of dense scrub belonging to the Northern Lebombo Bushveld ecozone.

The proposed agricultural development is situated on an existing commercial farm, approximately 15km from Komatipoort. The site is accessed off the N4 national road, towards Coopersdal on the right (11km). Sections of the study area were burnt to make visibility easier.

The survey revealed no archaeological or historical structures of significance in the study area. One indistinct Later Stone age (LSA) artifact, tentatively identified as a borer was found in a soil sample which was taken at an approximate depth of 1m, but it is believed to be of no significance. Mr. Colin Poulton as well as Mr. Poulton Sr. who lived on the farm for 31 years, confirmed that they were not aware of any graves, archaeological or historical structures in the study area.

Based on the survey and the findings in this report, Adansonia Heritage Consultants states that there are no compelling reasons which may prevent the proposed development to continue.

Disclaimer: *Although all possible care is taken to identify all sites of cultural significance during the investigation, it is possible that hidden or sub-surface sites could be overlooked during the study, Christine Rowe trading as Adansonia Heritage Consultants will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred by the client as a result.*

Copyright: *Copyright in all documents, drawings and records whether manually or electronically produced, which form part of the submission and any subsequent report or project document shall vest in Christine Rowe trading as Adansonia Heritage Consultants. None of the documents, drawings or records may be used or applied in any manner, nor may they be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means whatsoever for or to any other person, without the prior written consent of the above. The Client, on acceptance of any submission by Christine Rowe, trading as Adansonia Heritage Consultants and on condition that the Client pays the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit and for the specified project only:*

- 1) The results of the project;*
- 2) The technology described in any report;*
- 3) Recommendations delivered to the Client.*

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
DISCLAIMER	3
A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PROJECT	5
• Terms of Reference	5
• Legal requirements	6
B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE STUDY AREA	8
• Literature review, museum databases & previous relevant impact assessments	8
• The Nhlangu and Tshangana	11
• The Swazi	12
• History of Komatipoort and the study area	12
C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT	13
D. LOCALITY	13
• Description of methodology	14
• GPS Co-ordinates of perimeters	14
E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES	15
F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	16
• Summarised identification & cultural significance assessment of affected Heritage resources: General issues of site and context	16
• Summarised recommended impact management interventions	20
G. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE & EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA	22
• Evaluation methods	22
• NHRA	22
• Significance & evaluation	22
• Field rating	23
H. RECOMMENDATIONS	23
I. CONCLUSION	23
REFERENCES	24
Appendix 1a: Topographical map: 2531DB TONGA (2003)	25
Appendix 1b: 1926 Official map Province of Transvaal: Komati Poort no. 22	26
Appendix 2: Google Earth image: Wider view surrounding study area	27
Appendix 3: Google Earth images: Perimeters of the study area A & B	28
Appendix 4: Photographs of the study area	30
Appendix 5: 1935 Map: Van Warmelo	37
Appendix 6: Extract on Stone Age; Iron Age and Historical Age for the Komatipoort area from: AC Van Vollenhoven (October 2012) pp. 18 – 20.	38

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED
ALTERATION OF VIRGIN NATURAL LAND FOR AGRICULTURAL USE:
PORTION 1 OF SIERAAD 386 JU, KOMATIPOORT AREA, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PROJECT

Mr. Colin Poulton, the applicant and owner of *portion 1 of the farm SIERAAD 386JU*, in co-operation with Rhengu Environmental Services, is requesting the alteration of virgin natural land for agricultural purposes (sugar cane). An area of 132ha of a 200ha portion is proposed to be developed of which 110ha will be used for agriculture and 22ha for the development of a farm road network to access the various cane fields.

Adansonia Heritage Consultants were appointed by *RHENGU ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES*, to conduct a Phase 1 heritage impact assessment (HIA) on archaeological and other heritage resources on the study area. A literature study, relevant to the study area as well as an extensive foot survey was done, to determine that no archaeological or heritage resources will be impacted upon. (See **Appendix 1**: Topographical Map: **2531DB TONGA**).

The aims of this report are to source all relevant information on archaeological and heritage resources in the study area, and to advise the client on sensitive heritage areas as well as where it is viable for the development to take place in terms of the specifications as set out in the National Heritage Resources Act no., 25 of 1999 (NHRA). Recommendations for maximum conservation measures for any heritage resource will also be made. The study area is indicated in **Appendix 1, 2, & 3**. Photographic evidence is in **Appendix 4**.

- This study forms part of an EIA, Consultant: *RHENGU ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES*, P.O. Box 1046, Malelane, 1320, Cell: 0824147088 / Fax: 0866858003 / e-mail: rhengu@mweb.co.za
- Type of development: 132ha, are earmarked for a proposed agricultural development, on *portion 1 of the farm SIERAAD 386JU*, Komatipoort area, Mpumalanga Province.
- The site is currently virgin natural land and zoned as agricultural.
- Location of Province, Magisterial district / Local Authority and Property (farms): The area falls within the Mpumalanga Province under the jurisdiction of the Ehlanzeni District Municipality and Nkomazi Local Municipality, *portion 1 of the farm SIERAAD 386 JU*.
- Land owner: Mr. Colin Poulton.

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 where applicable;

- b) Assessment of the significance of the resources;
- c) Alternatives given to affected heritage resources by the development;
- d) Plans for measures of mitigation.

Legal requirements:

The legal context of the report is grounded in the National Heritage Resources Act no. 25, 1999, as well as the National Environmental Management Act (1998) (NEMA):

- **Section 38 of the NHRA**

This report constitutes a heritage impact assessment investigation linked to the environmental impact assessment required for the development. The proposed development is a listed activity in terms of Section 38 (1) of the NHRA. Section 38 (2) of the NHRA requires the submission of a HIA report for authorisation purposes to the responsible heritage resources agency, (SAHRA).

Heritage conservation and management in South Africa is governed by the NHRA and falls under the overall jurisdiction of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and its provincial offices and counterparts.

Section 38 of the NHRA requires a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to be conducted by an independent heritage management consultant, for the following development categories:

- Any development or other activity which will change the character of a site:
 - exceeding 5000m² in extent;
 - the rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000m² in extent

In addition, the new EIA regulation promulgated in terms of NEMA, determine that any environmental report will include cultural (heritage) issues.

The end purpose of this report is to alert *RHENGU ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES*, as well as the client Mr. Colin Poulton, and interested and affected parties about existing heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed development, and to recommend mitigation measures aimed at reducing the risks of any adverse impacts on these heritage resources. Such measures could include the recording of any heritage buildings or structures older than 60 years prior to demolition, in terms of section 34 of the NHRA and also other sections of this act dealing with archaeological sites, buildings and graves.

The NHRA section 2 (xvi) states that a “heritage resource” means any place or object of cultural significance, and in section 2 (vi) that “cultural significance” means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance.

Apart from a heritage report assisting a client to make informed development decisions, it also serves to provide the relevant heritage resources authority with the necessary data to perform their statutory duties under the NHRA. After evaluating the heritage scoping report, the heritage resources authority will decide on the status of the resource, whether the development may proceed as proposed or whether mitigation is acceptable, and whether the heritage resource require formal protection such as a Grade I, II or III resource, with relevant parties having to comply with all aspects pertaining to such a grading.

- **Section 35 of the NHRA**

Section 35 (4) of the NHRA stipulates that no person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA, destroy, damage, excavate, alter or remove from its original position, or collect, any archaeological material or object. This section may apply to any significant archaeological sites that may be discovered. In the case of such chance finds, the heritage practitioner will assist in investigating the extent and significance of the finds and consult with an archaeologist about further action. This may entail removal of material after documenting the find or mapping of larger sections before destruction. This section does not apply, for the current study area, since no archaeological material was found apart from an indistinct Later Stone Age (LSA) artifact from a soil sample, which is believed to be of not significance.

- **Section 36 of the NHRA**

Section 36 of the NHRA stipulates that no person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA, destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years, which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority. It is possible that chance burials might be discovered during development of the road infrastructure or agricultural activities. This section does not apply since no graves were identified during the survey.

- **Section 34 of the NHRA**

Section 34 of the NHRA stipulates that no person may alter, damage, destroy, relocate etc, any building or structure older than 60 years, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority. This section does not apply since no structure older than 60 years was identified during the survey.

- **Section 37 of the NHRA**

This section deals with public monuments and memorials but does not apply in this report.

- **NEMA**

The regulations in terms of Chapter 5 of the National Environmental Management Act, (107/1998), provides for an assessment of development impacts on the cultural (heritage) and social environment and for specialist studies in this regard.

B BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE STUDY AREA

• Literature review, museum databases & previous relevant impact assessments

The study area is located close to the town of Komatipoort. The name Komati appears in historical records for the first time in 1589, in the form *Macomates*. It was recorded by a traveler on board the Portuguese ship *Sao Thome*, which sailed from Cochin, South India and ran aground on the shores of the *Land of the Makomati*, near *Lake Sibayi*, in what became known as KwaZulu Natal. The *Land of Makomati* comprised the entire hinterland as far north as the Limpopo River, as far south as St Lucia, and as far west as the Drakensberg escarpment. It was the trading zone of the Komati gold and ivory traders who had established themselves in Delagoa Bay (which was known up to the 17th century as *Makomati*), long before the arrival of the first Portuguese in 1498. The name of the Komati River came from *Makomati* who used the river for trading purposes.¹

In order to place the areas around Komatipoort in an 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 Küsel, Meyer, Voight, Bergh, De Jongh, Evers, Myburgh, Thackeray and Van der Ryst were consulted, as well as historic sources by Makhura and Webb.

Primary sources were consulted from the Pilgrim's Rest Museum Archives for a background on the pre-history and history of the study area. Several circular stone-walled complexes and terraces as well as graves have been recorded in the vicinity of Hazyview², Bushbuckridge, Graskop and Sabie, clay potsherds and upper as well as lower grinders, are scattered at most of the sites.³ Many of these occur in caves as a result of the Swazi attacks on the smaller groups. The 1926 topographical map of Komatipoort revealed quite a few black settlements along the Komati River close to the study area (**Appendix 1b**).⁴ These black settlements were recorded by their Shangaan names such as *Mangai's*, *Sitombi*, *Mangwegana*, *Snakanaka*, and *Machinane* to name but a few (See **Appendix 1b**). They settled along the fertile river and hunted in the dense bush further away.

The author was also involved in desktop studies and surveys such as: a *Study for the Proposed Eskom Powerlines, Hazyview – Dwarsloop* (2008), *Inspection of Umbhaba Stone-walled settlement, Hazyview*, (2001), a *Phase 1 Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment for 132Kv Powerlines from Kiepersol substation (Hazyview), to the Nwarele substation Dwarsloop* (2002), as well as a *Phase 1 Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment for a proposed traffic training academy, Calcutta, Mkhuhlu, Bushbuckridge* (2013). A Phase 1 Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment for a *Development*

¹ Bornman, H., *The Pioneers of the Lowveld*, p. 9.

²PRMA: Information file 9/2.

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

⁴ Map: 1926 Topographical Map: Komati Poort no. 22.

on the farm Agricultural Holding no 56 JU, White River(2013) was done in the wider area. The SAHRA database for archaeological and historical impact assessments was consulted and revealed four recent Archaeological Impact assessment reports in the Komatipoort region:

- J. Van Schalkwyk: *Proposed new Lebombo Port of Entry and upgrade of Komatipoort railway station between Mpumalanga (SA) and Mozambique (2008)* – Some historic building were identified but no archaeological remains;
- A. Van Vollenhoven: *Report on a cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Kangwane Antracite Mine, Komatipoort (2012)* – An archaeological site with Middle and Late Stone Age tools were identified as well as some Iron Age artifacts and decorated pottery. Mitigation measures were recommended by exclusion from the development or a Phase 2 study;
- JP Celliers: *Report on Phase 1 Archaeological Impact assessment on erven at Komatipoort 182 JU Extension 4, Komatipoort (2012)* – Revealed two pieces of undecorated sherds of pottery which was of low significance. It was recommended that any earthmoving activities be monitored by a qualified archaeologist.
- A. Van Vollenhoven: *Archaeological Impact Assessment for Border site at Komatipoort (2012)* – Revealed historic remains linked to the Steinaeker's Horse regiment during the South African War.

Very little contemporary research has been done on prehistoric African settlements in the study area. Later Stone Age sites in the Kruger National Park date to the last 2500 years and are associated with pottery and microlith stone tools.⁵ The only professionally excavated Early Iron Age site near the area, besides those in the Kruger National Park, is the Plaston site near White River, dating ca 900 AD.⁶ No other archaeological excavations have been conducted to date within the study area, which have been confirmed by academic institutions and specialists in the field.^{7 8} A stone walled settlement with terracing was recorded by C. van Wyk (Rowe) close to Hazyview,⁹ as well as several which were documented in the southern parts of the Kruger National Park.¹⁰ (See also **Appendix 6.**) The southern Kruger Park and Nelspruit areas have an abundance of San rock art sites,¹¹ but none were identified in the direct vicinity of the study area.

Several early ethnographical and linguistic studies by early researchers such as D. Ziervogel and N.J. Van Warmelo, revealed that the study area was mainly inhabited by the Tsonga (Nhlangu and

⁵ J.S. Bergh (red)., *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*, p. 95.

⁶ M.M. Van der Ryst., *Die Ystertydperk*, in J.S. Bergh (red)., *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*. p. 97.

⁷ Personal information: Dr. J. Pistorius, Pretoria, 2008-04-17.

⁸ Personal information: Dr. MS. Schoeman, University of Pretoria, 2008-03-27.

⁹ C. Van Wyk, *Inspection of Umbhaha Stone-walled settlement, Hazyview*, pp. 1-2.

¹⁰ Eloff J.F., *Verslag oor Argeologiese Navorsing in die Krugerwildtuin*, June / July, 1982.

¹¹ Hampson, J., et al., *The rock art of Bongani Mountain Lodge and its environs*, *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 57: pp. 17-28.

Tshangana), as well as Swazi from before the 18th century.^{12 13} (See **Appendix 5**: 1935 Map of Van Warmelo.) However, when concentrating on ethnographical history, it is important to include a slightly wider geographical area in order for it to make sense. Van Warmelo based his 1935 survey of *Bantu Tribes of South Africa* on the amount of taxpayers in an area. The survey does not include the extended households of each taxpayer, so it was impossible to actually indicate how many people were living in one area.¹⁴

A map of the “Transvaal” (Bradford’s pre-1926: *Map of black settlement in the Transvaal*) indicated that the areas east and south of Pilgrim’s Rest towards the current Kruger National Park, were extensively occupied by African people before 1926.¹⁵

The whole district is divided in two, with the Drakensberg Escarpment in the west, and the Low Veld (in which the study area is situated) towards the east. Today, we found that the boundaries of groups are intersected and overlapping.¹⁶ Languages such as Zulu, Xhosa, Swazi, Nhlangu, Nkuna, sePedi, hiPau and seRôka, are commonly spoken throughout this area.¹⁷

During the middle of the 18th century some Sotho and Swazi groups combined under a fighting chief Simkulu. The tribe so formed became known as the BakaNgomane. The principal settlement of Simkulu was in the vicinity of the confluence of the Crocodile and Komati Rivers. It is believed that the BakaNgomane chiefs are buried there.¹⁸

The Swazi under Mswati II (1845), commenced on a career of large scale raids on the prosperous tribal lands to the north of Swaziland. His regiments such as the *Nyatsi* and the *Malelane* brought terror to African homes as far afield as Mozambique.¹⁹ During their northern expansion they forced the local inhabitants out of Swaziland, or absorbed them.²⁰ There is evidence of resistance, but the Eastern Sotho groups who lived in the northern parts of Swaziland, moved mainly northwards.²¹ This appears to have taken place towards the end of the 18th century,²² when these groups fled from Swaziland to areas such as Nelspruit, Bushbuckridge, Klaserie, Blyde River and Komatipoort.²³

¹²N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. pp. 90-92 & 111.

¹³H. S. Webb, *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld, in Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*. p.16.

¹⁴N.J. van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p.9.

¹⁵H. Bradford, *A Taste of Freedom*, p. 147.

¹⁶N.J. van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p. 51.

¹⁷M. De Jongh (ed)., *Swatini*, p. 21.

¹⁸Bornman, H., *The Pioneers of the Lowveld*, pp. 10-11.

¹⁹Bornman, H., *The Pioneers of the Lowveld*, p.11.

²⁰A.C. Myburgh, *The Tribes of Barberton District*, p. 10.

²¹N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. p. 111.

²²H. S. Webb, *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld, in Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*. p. 14

²³*Ibid.*, p. 16.

Mswati II built a line of military outposts from west to east of the upper Komati River and the Mlambongwane (Kaap River). At each outpost he stationed regiments to watch and stop the BaPedi returning to their old haunts.²⁴

In 1819, Shaka in the course of his military actions, an amalgamation of the Zulu clans came into conflict with Zwide Mkhathshwa. Notwithstanding Zwide's numerical superiority, Shaka's military genius defeated him. The remnants of Zwide's tribe fled into the Eastern Transvaal where they settled. They ultimately found a new kingdom in Gaza land, which extended from just north of the current Maputo, up the east coast as far as the Zambezi river.²⁵

Soshangane was a very powerful chief of the Gaza people, even though he was under the rule of Zwide. Soshangane decided to leave and was given full passage through Swaziland. He passed on his way through the Komati gorge, today known as Komatipoort, taking with him a great booty of cattle and women. Meanwhile more Shanganes arrived and by 1896 some 2000 refugees settled between Bushbuckridge and Acornhoek where they are still living today. With the establishment of the Sabie Game Reserve (later known as the Kruger National Park), the BakaNgomane, their Shangaan protégés and Swazis who lived within its borders, were evicted in 1902, and went westward into Klaserie and Bushbuckridge areas, or south of the Crocodile River and established themselves in the Tenbosch and Coal Mine (Strijdom Block) areas (in the current study area), west and south of Komatipoort.²⁶ (See also: **Appendix 5: 1935 Map of Van Warmelo**).

Tsonga groups: The Nhlanganu and Tšhangana

The Nhlanganu and Tšhangana (also generally known as the Shangaan-Tsonga)²⁷ form part of the larger Tsonga group of which the original group occupied the whole of Mozambique (Portuguese East Africa), and it has been recorded that by 1554, they were already living around the Delagoa Bay area (Maputo).²⁸ They fled from the onslaughts of the Zulu (Nguni) nation from the Natal area, and great numbers of emigrants sought safety in the "Transvaal" as recently as the 19th century, especially in the greater Pilgrim's Rest district (including the study area that we are concerned with). The Tsonga also moved west from Mozambique into the "Transvaal". They have never formed large powerful tribes but were mostly always subdivided into loosely-knit units, and absorbed under the protection of whichever chief would give them land.²⁹ They were originally of Nguni origin.³⁰ The term "Shangaan" is commonly

²⁴ Bornman, H., *The Pioneers of the Lowveld*, p.12.

²⁵ Bornman, H., *The Pioneers of the Lowveld*, p.17.

²⁶ Bornman, H., *The Pioneers of the Lowveld*, p.19.

²⁷ M. De Jongh (ed.), *Swatini*, p. 24.

²⁸ N.J. Van Warmelo, Grouping and Ethnic History, in Schapera I., *The Bantu-Speaking Tribes of South Africa. An Ethnographical survey*, p. 55.

²⁹ N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, pp. 90-91.

³⁰ N.J. Van Warmelo, Grouping and Ethnic History, in Schapera I., *The Bantu-Speaking Tribes of South*

employed to refer to all members of the Tsonga division.³¹

The **Nhlanganu** occupied the Low Veld area in their efforts to escape the Zulu raids during 1835-1840. They lived side by side with the Tšhangana, and the differences between the two are inconsiderable. They have mixed extensively with other tribes.³²

The **Tšhangana** are also of Nguni origin who fled in the same way as the Nhlanganu, settled in the “Transvaal” a little later than the former. Most of the Tsonga were subjects to *Soshangane*, who came from Zululand.³³ The downfall of *Ngungunyana* (son of *Soshangane*) saw his son seeking sanctuary in the “Transvaal”, and the latter became known as *Thulamahashi*,³⁴ the name that is still used for the area east of Busbuckridge.

The historical background of the study area confirms that it was occupied since the 17th century by the Tsonga groups (Nhlanganu and Tšhangana). These groups have intermarried extensively or were absorbed by other groups in time.³⁵

Swazi

The Swazi people descend from the southern Bantu (Nguni) who migrated from central Africa in the 15th and 16th centuries.³⁶ The differences between the Swazi and the Natal Nguni were probably never great, their culture as far as is known from the comparatively little research being carried out, does not show striking differences. Their language is a ‘Tekeza’ variation of Zulu, but through having escaped being drawn into the mainstream of the Zulus of the Shakan period, they became independent and their claim to be grouped apart as a culture is now well founded.³⁷

- **History of Komatipoort and the study area**

Komatipoort is situated near the Kruger National Park, on the western slopes of the Lebombo Mountains which form a natural barrier between South Africa and Mozambique. Komatipoort in the 1890’s was hot and feverous and malaria was endemic. It was a wild and uproarious construction camp for the railway being built from Lourenco Marques (current Maputo). The railway line reached Komatipoort in July 1891.

³⁸ During the Anglo Boer War the town was used as a base by Lieutenant-Colonial Steinaecker of the

Africa. An Ethnographical survey, p. 55.

³¹ N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p. 92

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 91-92.

³³ N.J. Van Warmelo, Grouping and Ethnic History, in Schapera I., *The Bantu-Speaking Tribes of South Africa. An Ethnographical survey*, p. 57.

³⁴ N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p. 92.

³⁵ M. De Jongh (ed), *Swatini*, p. 40.

³⁶ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Swaziland> p.1.

³⁷ Van Warmelo p. 83.

³⁸ Bornman, H., *The Pioneers of the Lowveld*, p. 23.

later “Steinaecker’s Horse” regiment. They were recruited by the British in order to fight Boer guerillas in the bushveld.³⁹ Today Komatipoort is a railway and customs centre as well as producing agricultural products like vegetables, subtropical fruits and sugar cane.⁴⁰

The study area is situated in the *Strijdomblok* with *Tenbosch and Koolmyn* as adjacent areas. These areas were allocated to the South African Trust in 1936. A large scale irrigation scheme was launched and it was decided that these areas which were inhabited by the Bunwaneni tribes, be swapped for areas to the south of the Komati River in 1948, for agricultural purposes.⁴¹

C. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed project will involve the following:

- Approximately 132 ha are earmarked for the proposed agricultural development, of which approximately 110ha will be used for agriculture and some 22ha for the development of a farm road network to access the various cane fields.

D. LOCALITY

The proposed project site is located on *Portion 1 of the farm SIERAAD, 386JU* near Komatipoort in Mpumalanga Province. It is located approximately 11km south of the N4, 15km west of Komatipoort and approximately 60km north of Swaziland. The site is accessed off the N4 national road, about 11km on the Coopersdal road. The site falls under the Nkomazi Local Municipal jurisdiction, which in turn falls within Ehlanzeni District Municipality, in the Mpumalanga Province (**Appendix 1:** Topographical Map & **Appendix, 2 & 3** Google images of sites).

The proposed area for development is currently virgin natural land which is fenced game camps and falls within the Northern Lebombo Bushveld ecozone.⁴² It is divided by a drainage line which enters into the Komati River system to the east. The rest of the farm *SIERAAD* as well as most neighbouring farms are commercial sugar cane land. The area is zoned as agriculture and no rezoning will take place. There is a vast variation of vegetation and trees. The vegetation is characterized by tall woodlands made up of knob-thorn and other acacia species mixed in with trees such as marulas, leadwoods, bushwillow, apple-leafs, silver cluster-leafs, tambotis, and jackalberry along the drainage lines. There are shallow gravel, as well as dark clay soils.^{43 44}

GPS co-ordinates were used to locate the perimeters and any heritage features within the study area.

³⁹ Bornman, H., *The Pioneers of the Lowveld*, p. 29.

⁴⁰ <http://nelspruitarea.co.za/komatipoort.html> p.1.

⁴¹ Bornman, H., *The Pioneers of the Lowveld*, pp. 70-71.

⁴² Personal information: Mr. R. Kalwa, 2013-07-05.

⁴³ SANPARKS, *Visitors Guide to the Kruger National Park*, p. 2.

⁴⁴ Van Wyk, B., & Van Wyk P., *Field Guide to Trees of Southern Africa*, 1997, p. 500.

- **Description of methodology:**

The topographical Map, (2531 DB TONGA, 2003 **Appendix 1a**), as well as a topographical map of 1926 (**Appendix 1b**), and Google images of the site (**Appendix 2 & 3**), indicate the study area of the proposed development. These were intensively studied to assess the current and historically disturbed areas and infrastructure. In order to reach a comprehensive conclusion regarding the cultural heritage resources in the study area, the following methods were used:

- The desktop study consists mainly of archival sources studied on distribution patterns of early African groups who settled in the area since the 17th century, and which have been observed in past and present ethnographical research and studies.
- Literary sources, books and government publications, which were available on the subject, have been consulted, in order to establish relevant information.
- Several specialists currently working in the field of anthropology and archaeology have also been consulted on the subject.

-Literary sources: A list of books and government publications about prehistory and history of the area were consulted, and revealed some information;

-Archaeological database of SAHRA as well as the National Cultural History Museum were consulted.

- The fieldwork and survey was conducted extensively on foot and with a vehicle, with two people.
- The entire study area is virgin natural land, and belongs to a private owner, Mr. Colin Poulton. It is currently used as game camps.
- The terrain was even and accessible although there is a variation of medium sized bushes and trees. The owner burnt the study area to make visibility easier.
- The relevant data was located with a GPS instrument (Garmin Etrex) datum WGS 84, and plotted. Co-ordinates were within 4-6 meters of identified sites.
- Evaluation of the resources which might be impacted upon by the footprint, was done within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 (1999);
- Personal communication with relevant stakeholders on the specific study area, were held, such as the owner Mr. Colin Poulton, Mr. Poulton (Sr.) who lived on the farm for 31 years.

- **GPS: Co-ordinates of the perimeters of the study area** (Co-ordinates provided by RHENGU Environmental Services): (**See Appendix: 2 & 3**, site maps)

GPS CO-ORDINATES		
Location: Study area	South	East
A = 1	S 25° 30' 07.65"	E 31° 49' 23.33"
2	S 25° 30' 21.76"	E 31° 50' 06.36"
3	S 25° 30' 34.75"	E 31° 50' 01.17"
4	S 25° 30' 30.68"	E 31° 49' 17.22"
B = 5	S 25° 30' 53.28"	E 31° 49' 11.56"
6	S 25° 30' 45.60"	E 31° 49' 56.45"
7	S 25° 31' 09.28"	E 31° 49' 46.76"
8	S 25° 31' 01.04"	E 31° 49' 09.44"

E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES

The alteration of virgin natural land for agricultural purposes (sugar cane) is requested. An area of 132ha of a 200ha portion is proposed to be developed of which 110ha will be used for agriculture and 22ha for the development of a farm road network to access the various cane fields.

The study area falls within the Strijdomblok section which has historically been known for agricultural farming as a government irrigation scheme during the late 1940's. Modern topographical maps also clearly show extensive farming activities in the surrounding area. A 1926 topographical map does not indicate any historic settlements directly in the study area.

The study area is situated on two sections as indicated in **Appendix 3**. Section A (the perimeters are indicated as 1, 2, 3 & 4) and Section B (perimeters are 5, 6, 7 & 8) (See **Appendix 3**). Both sections are accessible by internal roads. The bush was quite dense but the owner burnt the two sections to make visibility clearer (see photographs in **Appendix 4**).

The two sections were extensively surveyed on foot and per vehicle (Fig. 1 - 11). The terrain was even and visibility was fair (after being burnt), but no archaeological or heritage features of any significance were identified.

Soil samples were taken throughout the study area by a soil specialist, at a general depth of 1m. Only one indistinct LSA artifact was identified in one of the soil samples in section A (see **Appendix 3**). This stone artifact is out of context and is not believed to be of any significance which will be impacted upon by the proposed development.

All comments should be studied in conjunction with the appendices, which indicate the areas, and which corresponds with the summary below. Photographs in **Appendix 4** show the general view of the study area. No archaeological sites of significance, stone walls or graves were identified, and this was confirmed by the owner.

Heritage Feature	Description / Comments	Site Location
Appendix 4 LSA indistinct stone artifact	An indistinct LSA stone artifact was identified in a soil sample at an approximate depth of 1m in Section A of the study area.	LSA tool S25° 30' 15.5 E31° 49' 44.7" Fig. 3

The study area was extensively surveyed on foot by two people, and per vehicle for any remains of archaeological or historical nature. The terrain was even, visibility was fair and the veld was burnt. (See **Appendix 4**). The area consists of a vast variation of vegetation and trees. The vegetation is characterized by tall woodlands and dense scrub, with no rocky outcrops. Paths criss-cross the entire

section. The soil is mainly of a sandy and sedimentary nature.

The owner currently utilizes the sections for keeping game. His family has owned the farm for 31 years and they confirm that there are no graves in the study area and no ruins of any nature.⁴⁵

One indistinct artifact belonging to the Later Stone Age, was found in a soil sample at an approximate depth of 1m. Under a 10x magnification by microscope, this stone artifact was tentatively identified as a borer. This stone artifact is however out of context and not believed to have any significance which will be impacted upon by the proposed development. No other features of archaeological or heritage significance were identified in the study area.

F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

<i>ACT</i>	<i>COMPO-NENT</i>	<i>IMPLICATION</i>	<i>RELEVANCE</i>	<i>COMPLIANCE</i>
NHRA	S 34	Impact on buildings and structures older than 60 years	None present	None present
NHRA	S35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	One indistinct LSA artifact was found below the soil surface at an approximate depth of 1m	None
NHRA	S36	Impact on graves	None present	None
NHRA	S37	Impact on public monuments	None present	None
NHRA	S38	Developments requiring an HIA	Development is a listed activity	HIA done
NEMA	EIA regulations	Activities requiring an EIA	Development is subject to an EIA	HIA is part of EIA

- **Summarised identification and cultural significance assessment of affected heritage resources: General issues of site and context:**

<i>Context</i>		
Urban environmental context	No	NA

⁴⁵ Personal communication: Mr. C. Poulton, 2013-07-09.

Context		
Rural environmental context	No	Vacant land
Natural environmental context	No	Virgin land utilized to keep game.
Formal protection (NHRA)		
(S. 28) Is the property part of a protected area?	No	NA
(S. 31) Is the property part of a heritage area?	No	NA
Other		
Is the property near to or visible from any protected heritage sites	No	NA
Is the property part of a conservation area of special area in terms of the Zoning scheme?	No	NA
Does the site form part of a historical settlement or townscape?	No	NA
Does the site form part of a rural cultural landscape?	No	NA
Does the site form part of a natural landscape of cultural significance?	No	NA
Is the site adjacent to a scenic route?	No	NA
Is the property within or adjacent to any other area which has special environmental or heritage protection?	Yes	Close to the Kruger National Park – approximately 30km.
Does the general context or any adjoining properties have cultural significance?	No	NA

<i>Property features and characteristics</i>		
Have there been any previous development impacts on the property?	No	The land is vacant
Are there any significant landscape features on the property?	No	NA
Are there any sites or features of geological significance on the property?	No	NA
Does the property have any rocky outcrops on it?	No	NA
Does the property have any fresh water sources (springs, streams, rivers) on or alongside it?	Yes	A drainage line with a seasonal stream is situated in the middle section between A & B (see Appendix 3)

<i>Heritage resources on the property</i>		
<i>Formal protection (NHRA)</i>		
National heritage sites (S. 27)	No	NA
Provincial heritage sites (S. 27)	No	NA
Provincial protection (S. 29)	No	NA
Place listed in heritage register (S. 30)	No	NA
<i>General protection (NHRA)</i>		
Structures older than 60 years (S. 34)	No	NA
Archaeological site or material (S. 35)	Yes	One indistinct LSA artifact of no significance
Palaeontological site or material (S. 35)	No	NA
Graves or burial grounds (S. 36)	No	NA

Heritage resources on the property		
Public monuments or memorials (S. 37)	No	NA
Other		
Any heritage resource identified in a heritage survey (author / date / grading)	No	NA
Any other heritage resources (describe)	No	NA

NHRA S (3)2 Heritage resource category	ELEMENTS	INDICATORS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE										RISK	
		Historical	Rare	Scientific	Typical	Technological	Aesthetic	Person / community	Landmark	Material condition	Sustainability		
Buildings / structures of cultural significance	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Areas attached to oral traditions / intangible heritage	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	-
Historical settlement / townscapes	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Landscapes of cultural significance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NHRA	ELE-	INDICATORS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE										RISK	
Geological site of scientific/cultural importance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Archaeological / palaeontological sites	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	One indistinct LSA artifact is not believed to be of any significance.
Grave / burial grounds	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Areas of significance related to labour history	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Movable objects	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

- **Summarised recommended impact management interventions**

NHRA S (3)2 Heritage resource category	SITE	IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE		Impact management	Motivation
		Cultural significance rating			
		Cultural significance	Impact significance		
Buildings / structures of cultural significance	No	No	None	-	-
Areas attached to oral traditions / intangible heritage	No	None	None	-	-
Historical settlement/ townscape	No	None	None	-	-

NHRA S (3)2 Heritage	SITE	IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE Cultural significance rating		Impact management	Motivation
Landscape of cultural significance	No	None	None	-	-
Geological site of scientific/cultural importance	No	None	None	-	-
Archaeological / palaeontological sites	Yes	None	None	No impact	One indistinct LSA artifact is not believed to be of any significance.
Grave / burial grounds	No	No	None	-	-
Areas of significance related to labour history	No	None	None	-	-
Movable objects	No	None	None	-	-

ACT	COMPONENT	IMPLICATION	RELEVANCE	COMPLIANCE
NHRA	S 34	Impact on buildings and structures older than 60 years	None present	None
NHRA	S35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	One indistinct LSA tool has no relevance	None
NHRA	S36	Impact on graves	None present	None
NHRA	S37	Impact on public monuments	None present	None
NHRA	S38	Developments requiring an HIA	Development is a listed activity	Full HIA
NEMA	EIA regulations	Activities requiring an EIA	Development is subject to an EIA	HIA is part of EIA

G. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE & EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA

Section 38 of the NHRA, 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 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.⁴⁶ It promotes previously neglected research areas.

All archaeological and other cultural heritage resources are evaluated according to the NHRA, section 3(3). A place or object is considered to be part of the national estate if it has cultural significance or other special value in terms of:

- (a) its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- (c) its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- (g) its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- (h) its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa.⁴⁷

- **The significance and evaluation of the archaeological and cultural heritage features in the study area, can be summarised as follows:**

Site no	Cultural Heritage features	Significance	Measures of mitigation
Appendix 3: Indistinct LSA artifact	One indistinct LSA tool Fig. 3.	No significance	It is not believed to have any significance and will not be impacted upon by the proposed development.

⁴⁶National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. p. 2.

⁴⁷National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. pp. 12-14

- **Field rating:**

The single indistinct LSA artifact was identified in a soil sample which was taken at an approximate depth of 1m. This artifact is not in context and is also not situated near or in the vicinity of any visible archaeological sites. It is not believed that the artifact which was identified during the survey has any significance in terms of historic or cultural value which might prevent the proposed agricultural development to continue. (See also **Appendix 6**).

H. RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed project site, *portion 1 of the farm SIERAAD 386 JU* is situated on virgin natural land which is currently used for keeping game. The property is zoned as agricultural. It is bordered by a drainage line and a dam (both of which will not form part of the proposed development). Most of the surrounding land had been used for agriculture since the early 1950's.

The single poorly defined LSA artifact (tentatively identified as a borer), was identified in a soil sample which was taken at a depth of approximately 1m. No other archaeological features or graves were identified during the survey and the owner and his family during their 31 years on the property, were also not aware of any such features.

It is not believed that the stone artifact which was identified during the survey has any significance in terms of historic or cultural value which might prevent the proposed agricultural development to continue.

Based on the findings in this report, Adansonia Heritage Consultants, have no compelling reasons which may prevent the proposed agricultural development to continue.

I. CONCLUSION

Archaeological material or graves are not always visible during a field survey and therefore some significant material may only be revealed during construction activities of the proposed development. It is therefore recommended that the developers 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 then be necessary in this regard for which the developer will be responsible.

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

REFERENCES

NATIONAL LEGISLATION

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

LITERARY SOURCES

- BERGH J.S., Swart gemeenskappe voor die koms van die blankes, in *J.S. Bergh (red.)*, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*. J.L. van Schaik, 1999.
- BORNMAN, H, *Pioneers of the Lowveld*, 1994.
- BRADFORD, H., *A Taste of Freedom, the ICU in rural South Africa, 1924-1930*.
- DE JONGH (ed.), *Swatini*, UNISA. 1987.
- DELIUS P, & M. HAY, *Mpumalanga, an illustrated history*, Highveld Press, 2009.
- Eloff J.F., Verslag oor Argeologiese Navorsing in die Krugerwildtuin, June / July, 1982.
- Hampson, J., Challis, W., Blundell, G. & De Rosner, C. 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: 17-28.
- KÜSEL, U.S., *Survey of Heritage sites in the Olifants Catchment area*, 2009.
- MAKHURA, T., Early Inhabitants, in Delius, P. (ed.), *Mpumalanga: History and Heritage*. Natal University Press, 2007.
- MYBURG, A.C., *The Tribes of Barberton District*, 1949.
- VAN WARMELO, N.J., *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, Pretoria, 1935.
- VAN WYK, B., & VAN WYK, P., *Field Guide to Trees of Southern Africa*, 1997.
- VOIGHT, E., *Guide to the Archaeological sites in the Northern and Eastern Transvaal*. Transvaal Museum, 1981.
- WEBB, H. S., *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld*, in *Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*. Cape Times Limited. 1954.
- ZIERVOGEL, D. *The Eastern Sotho: A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey with Ethnographical notes on the Pai, Kutswe and Pulana Bantu Tribes*. Pretoria, 1953.

ELECTRONIC INFORMATION SOURCES

- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Swaziland> Access: 2013-06-13.
- <http://nelspruitarea.co.za/komatipoort.html> Access: 2013-07-08.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

- Personal communication: Mr. R. Kalwa, 2013-07-05.
- Personal communication: Dr. J. Pistorius, Pretoria, 2008-04-17.
- Personal communication: Mr. C. Poulton, 2013-05-08.
- Personal communication: Dr. M.S. Schoeman, University of Pretoria, 2008-03-27.

MISCELLANEOUS

- SANPARKS, *Visitors Guide Kruger National Park*, 2006.
- PRMA: C. Van Wyk, *Inspection of Umbhaba Stone-walled settlement, Hazyview*, 2001.
- RHENGU Environmental Services, BID document for proposed alteration of virgin natural land for agricultural use: Portion 1 of SIERAAD 386JU: Komatipoort area, Mpumalanga April 2013.