

SPECIALIST REPORT

PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED

MAYFLOWER CEMETERY:

PORTION 9 OF THE FARM MAYFLOWER 241 IT, EMPULUZI

MPUMALANGA PROVINCE

REPORT COMPILED FOR

WANDIMA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES cc

MR. MANDLA MBUYANE

P.O. Box 1072,

NELSPRUIT, 1200

Tel: 013 – 7525452 / Fax: 013 – 7526877 / e-mail: mandla@wandima.co.za

JULY 2012

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 Mayflower Cemetery, on portion 9 of the farm Mayflower 241 IT, Empuluzi.

The study area is situated on topographical map 1:50 000, 2630BD BELL'S KOP, which is in the Mpumalanga Province. This area falls under the jurisdiction of the Chief Albert Luthuli Local Municipality, and the Gert Sibande District 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 land belongs to the Chief Albert Luthuli Municipality, who is requesting the development of the Mayflower cemetery for the existing Empuluzi Township. The proposed site is 30, 0178 ha in extent.

The area for the proposed cemetery development (approximately 30 ha), is currently vacant, and zoned as agricultural. It was previously used as an operational farm with some sections used as cultivated maize lands. Since 1982, the land was mainly utilized for pine plantations by Komatiland Forests.

The proposed cemetery development is adjacent to the residential area known as Mayflower in Empuluzi. The locals use this area for planting maize, grazing their livestock (goats, cattle and pigs), and dumping of refuse. Mr. Malangu Nkosi lived in this area since 1958. According to him, his family was moved from this area by Safcol (now Komatiland Forests), towards the west of the study area in 1982. The 1:50 000 topographical map of 1969, revealed that most of this section was already used for commercial plantation purposes at that time. Mr. Nkosi stated that there are no graves on the study area. He was able to assist in the survey and pointed out the remains of a cattle kraal and some clay brick houses. All the features fall outside the study area. The survey revealed no archaeological or historical structures of significance, 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
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
• Stone Age Rock painting	8
• Swazi	10
C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT	11
D. LOCALITY	11
• Description of methodology	11
• GPS Co-ordinates of perimeters	12
E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES	12
F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	14
• Summarised identification & cultural significance assessment of affected Heritage resources: General issues of site and context	14
• Summarised recommended impact management interventions	18
G. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE & EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA	19
• Evaluation methods	19
• NHRA	19
• Significance & evaluation	20
• Field rating	20
H. RECOMMENDATION	21
I. CONCLUSION	21
SOURCES	22
Appendix 1: Topographical map: 2630 BELL'S KOP	23
Appendix 2: Google Earth image: Extension 9, Mayflower in relation to wider area	24
Appendix 3: Google Earth image: Perimeter of study area	25
Appendix 4: Photographs of the study area	26

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED MAYFLOWER
CEMETERY:
PORTION 9 OF THE FARM MAYFLOWER 241 IT, EMPULUZI**

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PROJECT

The Chief Albert Luthuli Local Municipality, (the current owners of Portion 9 of the farm Mayflower 241 IT, is faced with a challenge of providing land for burial purposes and is requesting the development of a proposed cemetery for the residents of the Mayflower township in Empuluzi. The study area is approximately 30 ha in extent.

Adansonia Heritage Consultants were appointed by *WANDIMA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES cc.*, 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 was done, to determine that no archaeological or heritage resources will be impacted upon. (See **Appendix 1**: Topographical Map: 2630BD BELL'S KOP).

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: *WANDIMA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES cc.*, P.O. Box 1072, Nelspruit, 1200, Tel: 013-7525452 / Fax: 013-7526877 / e-mail: mandla@wandima.co.za
- Type of development: 30,0178 ha, are earmarked for a proposed cemetery development, on portion 9 of the farm Mayflower 241 IT, Empuluzi, Mpumalanga Province.
- The site is currently 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 Chief Albert Luthuli Local Municipality, and Gert Sibande District Municipality.
- Land owners: Chief Albert Luthuli Municipality.

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 *WANDIMA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES cc.*, the client (Chief Albert Luthuli Municipality), 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 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, since no archaeological material was found which might be impacted upon by the proposed development.

- **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 construction work. 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 all the foundations which is believed to be older than 60 years and which were identified during the survey, are outside the study area (See Appendix 2 & 3). **One other foundation in the study area is not believed to be older than 60 years, and is of no significance.**

- **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), provide 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

In order to place the study area and Empuluzi in archaeological context, primary and secondary sources were consulted. Ethnographical and linguistic studies by early researchers such as Ziervogel, Theal and Van Warmelo shed light on the cultural groups living in the area since ca 1600. Historic and academic sources were consulted (Bergh), as well as historic sources by Makhura and Webb.

There are no museums in the Empuluzi area which could be consulted, and no historical information was available from the local municipality. The author had to rely on the assistance of local people documenting relevant history in the area, as well as recorded history of Swaziland. The 1969 topographical map 2630BD BELL'S KOP revealed that the study area was highly disturbed before, and utilized for agricultural as well as commercial plantation purposes. The area was also a farm where Mr. Abel Ngwenya lived and farmed (information from Mr. Nkosi).¹ Visibility during the survey was good, the grass was dry and short, and extensive livestock grazing and ploughing of maize is taking place. This section is also utilized as a plantation by Komatiland Forests, with the current trees, less than a year old. (See **Appendix 1, 2, 3 & 4**).

Very little contemporary research has been done on prehistoric African settlements in the study area. According to Bergh, there are a few recorded rock painting sites that date from the Stone Age in the area, although no Early or Late Iron Age sites have been recorded.² The author has documented at least 6 Stone Age rock painting sites in the direct vicinity of Empuluzi.

• STONE AGE ROCK PAINTING

The author has documented six rock painting sites on the Redhill (Lochiel 1 & 2), Jessievale (Ringkink 1a & 1b) and Blairmore (Syde 1 & 2) plantations. Therefore it is appropriate to mention the rock art here as part of the history of the region.

Rock art of southern Africa was part of a remarkable religious tradition. The art was not simply decorative or a record of daily life. Its purpose was deeper, and the trance dance was the central religious ritual of the San. Shamans, or medicine people used supernatural power obtained during trance states to make rain, heal the sick and maintain social harmony. Many rock paintings are depictions of visions experienced while in a trance. Others depict ritual occasions of the animals whose power the shamans hoped to use. The art is also a monument to the San who struggled to retain their rights and their land.³

The disappearance of the San people in this region may be attributed to the greatly increased and rapidly

¹ Personal communication: Mr. M. Nkosi, 2012-07-28.

² J.S. Bergh, *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid-Afrika Die Vier Noordelike Provinsies*, pp. 5-7.

³ SAHRA, Rock Art, <http://www.sahra.org.za/rockart.htm> Access 2008-10-16.

expanding population of black settlers who immigrated to this area, especially since the 17th century, and the arrival of Europeans during the 19th century. Rock paintings and stone artifacts are the main records that remain of the San people's presence.

Information from the National Archives in Pretoria revealed that the resident Magistrate in Ermelo reported that “there are several Bushmen who appear to be thoroughbred” on the farm Bothwell 140, **Chrissiesmeer area**. He also reported that “a small tribe of wild Bushmen were discovered in the kranztes along the” Ingwempizi river, bordering Swaziland (Amsterdam area).⁴ Most of them were already intermarried with Swazis but mention was also made of “Bushmen families which are as near as possible thorough-bred” on the farm Florence of Mr. JW Grimes.⁵ The Native Commission communicated to the resident magistrate to get some of these “Bushmen” for the British Association’s visit, railway fares and subsistence allowance was to be paid by the Native Commission. The resident magistrate of Ermelo sent a telegram on 24 August 1905, to the Native Commission that Mr. Grimes stated the “bushmen absolutely refused to go to Johannesburg” as “they have superstitions if they leave [the] farm their children will die...”⁶

There is very little known on the history of the San people in the Chrissiesmeer area but pioneer work has been done by anthropologist Frans Prins, of the Natal Museum who did some research on the current population of about 50 San individuals still living in the area. Information was discovered in the memoirs of a German, Jacob Filter who described that some “Bushmen left the foothills of the Central KwaZulu-Natal Drakensberg in 1879.” Jacob Filter was a transport rider between Natal and the then Eastern Transvaal. He described two groups of Bushmen – the ‘black’ Bushmen of Natal and the ‘yellow’ Bushmen of Lesotho. Both groups traveled together, and after four years, reached the Lake Chrissie area in Mpumalanga. Jacob Filter became well-known to these Bushmen groups and he also transported them on his ox-wagon.⁷

It is thought that their choice of destination was based on long-standing trade relations with Bushmen already resident in the area. The many overhangs and shelters overlooking the famous pans found in the Lake Chrissie district provided natural habitations and safe havens for the San. The pans themselves were used by the San to conceal themselves from the Swazi impis and Boer commandos. Tradition has it that they could remain submerged for hours at a time, breathing through reed pipes.

The current small Bushman community at Lake Chrissie was known to few ethnologists, but it is clear that

⁴SNA: 260 Letter from Resident Magistrate Ermelo to Secretary for Native Affairs, 13/494, 21 July 1905.

⁵SNA: 260 Letter from Von Dessauer to Marwick, Undated.

⁶SNA: 260 Letter from Von Dessauer to Marwick, Undated.

⁷E. von Fintel (Red.), *Die Nachkommen van Johann Heinrich Jakob Filter 1858-2008: Die Geschiede einer Pionierfamilie in Nordnata*, p. 405.

they were the last remnants of the great painters of the Drakensberg. They have lived in this area for almost five generations and worked as farm labourers on sheep farms and have almost completely lost any link with their rich cultural heritage.

According to Prins, their original Xegwi language has been completely forgotten except for two very old men who could still remember fragments of this speech. They remember stories about their ancestors painting on the rocks, as well as hunting with bows and arrows, but they had no idea of how to do this themselves. But, in spite of this, they regard themselves as Bushmen, “amaBushmana”. They still have the generic traits typical of the San, short body stature and a slant to the eyes, but there is an acute sense of loss of their original cultural identity and way of life.⁸

- **SWAZI**

A recent census (2001) of the Empuluzi district revealed that the most spoken language is Swazi.⁹ The study area is less than 15km from the Swazi border. The Swazi occupied modern Swaziland during the 18th century. They expanded their territory towards the north into what is now Mpumalanga, and by the 1920's, they were already past the Sabie River and the Steenkampsberg (Rossenekal areas).¹⁰

The Swazis are a Bantu-speaking people who are predominantly Nguni in language and culture. They originate from east central Africa.¹¹

According to tradition, the original followers of the present Dlamini clan of Swaziland migrated south before the 16th century to what is now Mozambique. Following a series of conflicts with people living in the area of modern Maputo, the *Ngwane*, as they called themselves, settled in northern Zululand in about 1750. They later moved the center of their kingdom northward in the 1810's and 1820's. Under King Sobhuza I they established themselves in the heartland of modern Swaziland, conquering and incorporating many long- established independent chiefdoms, whose descendants also make up much of the modern Swazi nation.¹²

The Dlamini clan consolidated their hold under several able leaders. The most important was Mwati II, from whom the Swazi derive their name. Under his leadership from the 1840's to 1865, the Swazi expanded their territory to the north and west, and stabilized the southern frontier with the Zulu.¹³

⁸ Personal information: F. Prins, Anthropologist, Natal Museum. Interview by Sian Hall, Sept 1999.

⁹ Wikipedia, *Albert Luthuli Local Municipality*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albert_Luthuli_Local_Municipality, 2012/07/30.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 108.

¹¹ Swaziland National Trust, *Swazi History*, <http://www.sntc.org.sz/cultural/archsd.asp>, 2012/07/30.

¹² Wikipedia, *History of Swaziland*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Swaziland, 2012/07/30.

¹³ *Ibid*, 2012/07/30.

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

The farm is currently being subdivided and approximately 30 hectares will be used for the proposed cemetery. The land is currently vacant and is used as a grazing land for local cattle. It is zoned as agricultural, and was previously used as a pine plantation. Most of the site is covered in grass, and remnants of pine trees. The site slopes east towards the Mpuluzi River and its associated wetlands.¹⁴

The proposed project will involve the following:

- Approximately 30 hectares are earmarked for the development of the Mayflower cemetery.

D. LOCALITY

The proposed project site is located directly north of the Mayflower residential area in Empuluzi. It is located approximately 2km from the Mpuluzi River Bridge. The proposed site is bordered by the farm Redhill 216 IT on the north-east, Farm Ardentinnny 207 IT on the north-west and the Mpuluzi River on the east., The site falls under the Chief Albert Luthuli Local Municipality, which in turn falls within the Gert Sibande District Municipality, in the Mpumalanga Province (**Appendix 1: Topographical Map & Appendix 3**).

The proposed area for development is situated on portion 9 of the farm Mayflower 241 IT and is currently vacant land which belongs to the Chief Albert Luthuli Municipality and is zoned as agricultural.

The general study area is disturbed by cultivated land and commercial plantations. The current pine trees on the site, were recently planted and are not even a year old. The area falls within the Grass and Wetlands region of Mpumalanga, and wetlands are found on the eastern edge of the site. The soil reveals a sandy, sedimentary structure.

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

- **Description of methodology:**

The topographical Map, (**Appendix 1**), 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 historic 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

¹⁴ Wandima, BID (Background Information Document); p. 1.

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 number of books and government publications about prehistory and history of the area were consulted, and revealed some information;

-Archaeological database of SAHRA was consulted.¹⁵

- The fieldwork and survey was conducted extensively on foot and with a vehicle, with two people.
- The entire area was previously an operational farm with cultivated lands, and a commercial pine plantation since +/- 1969. It is currently still used as a pine plantation with sections also used for livestock grazing and agricultural maize lands.
- The terrain was mostly dry, covered with grass, even and accessible and visibility was good. The area consists mainly of sandy soils with small rocky outcrops towards the west of the study area (**Appendix 4**, Fig. 1 - 4).
- 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. A local inhabitant, Mr. Malangu Nkosi, assisted in the survey and was in general a great help.
- **GPS: Co-ordinates of the perimeters of the study area** (Co-ordinates provided by WANDIMA Environmental Services):

CO-ORDINATES		
Location	South	East
SW	S 26° 16' 49.33"	E 30° 45' 40.06"
NW	S 26° 16' 36.76"	E 30° 45' 39.34"
NE	S 26° 16' 46.71"	E 30° 46' 10.15"
SE	S 26° 16' 57.02"	E 30° 46' 05.89"

E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES

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. Visibility was good.

Heritage feature	Description/Comments	Site location
Appendix 3: Foundation stones of a	The poorly defined foundation stones of a structure are visible. It is not believed that this foundation is older than 60 years. It is not	Foundation stones of a structure: S26° 16' 47.7"

¹⁵ E-mail SAHRA P. Hine, 2012/07/30.

structure	believed to have any significance.	E30° 45' 54.8" Fig. 5.
Appendix 3: Earth canal leading to small dam	The poorly defined earth canal is visible, on the north boundary of study area, and is leading to a small dam outside the study area. It is not always visible, as it is already damaged in sections.	Earth canal: S26° 16' 40.5" E30° 45' 50.9" Fig. 7.

The study area was extensively surveyed on foot and per vehicle for any remains of archaeological or historical nature. Visibility was fair and the grass was short and dry. Most of the features were clearly visible (See **Appendix 3**). The area is flat grassland with no rocky outcrops on the study area. The soil is of a sandy sedimentary nature.

The inhabitants of the Mayflower township, utilize the area for livestock grazing, and agricultural land and dumping of refuse also takes place. Mr. Nkosi who was born in 1958 in this area, and lived here all his life, assisted in the survey and helped with information. Mr. Nkosi stated that there are no graves in the study area and the ruins of a nearby cattle kraal belonged to a former resident, Mr. Abel Ngwenya, who had a house to the north of the study area and who farmed here extensively before the area was utilized for commercial plantation by Safcol (now Komatiland Forests).¹⁶ There is also a poorly defined foundation which consists of a few loose stones. The remains of a small earth dam and canal are in close vicinity of the foundation. The dam however, is outside the study area.

Other features just outside the study area (See Appendix 3):

Heritage feature	Description/Comments	Site location
Cattle kraal	A rectangular cattle kraal: 21 x 35m. According to Mr. Nkosi, Abel Ngwenya built the kraal in the 1950's. Most of the stones were carried away by the locals to be used for building.	Kraal: S26° 16' 41.33" E30° 46' 02.36" Fig. 8.
Fence posts	Huge upright stones are visible, which according to Mr. Nkosi, were used as fence posts	Upright stone 1: S26° 16' 39.2" E30° 46' 02.1" Fig. 9. Upright stone 2: S26° 16' 38.9" E30° 45' 52.7"
Structures	House 1: Mud brick house near kraal. According to Mr. Nkosi, this house belonged to Mr. Abel Ngwenya; House 2: 2 x Mud brick structures close to each other. There are also pits near the structures	House 1: Mud brick house near kraal: S26° 16' 41.33" E30° 46' 02.36" S26° 16' 40.6" E30° 45' 58.9" Fig. 10

¹⁶ Personal communication: Mr. M. Nkosi, 2012-07-28.

Pits	Several excavated pits are found throughout the study area in close vicinity to the houses and the kraal. According to Mr. Nkosi, the locals believed that there is treasure buried at these features.	One of the excavated Pits: S26° 16' 42.5" E30° 46' 01.6" Fig. 11.
Small dam	An earth dam with stone outlet. The dam is dry and not in use.	Dam S26° 16' 40.9" E30° 45' 54.5" Fig. 6.

None of the features as described in the table above are of any significance, as they fall outside the study area. They are listed and described here in order to give a clearer picture of the background to the study area.

F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

<i>ACT</i>	<i>COMPONENT</i>	<i>IMPLICATION</i>	<i>RELEVANCE</i>	<i>COMPLIANCE</i>
NHRA	S 34	Impact on buildings and structures older than 60 years	Poorly defined foundation stones of a structure is present; Earth canal	The foundation is not believed to have any significance; Earth canal is of no significance.
NHRA	S35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	None present	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
Rural environmental context	No	Vacant land

Context		
Natural environmental context	No	Highly disturbed area by previous cultivation and plantations
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?	No	NA
Does the general context or any adjoining properties have cultural significance?	No	NA

Property features and characteristics		
Have there been any previous development impacts on the property?	Yes	The site was used as agricultural lands for maize and since 1982 most of it was used as a commercial plantation. Currently the trees planted by Komatiland Forests, are less than a year old.

Property features and characteristics		
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 towards the east and the uMpuluzi river in the valley below, north of the study area.

Heritage resources on the property		
Formal protection (NHRA)		
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
General protection (NHRA)		
Structures older than 60 years (S. 34)	Possible	This foundation is not believed to have any significance; Earth canal is of no significance.
Archaeological site or material (S. 35)	No	NA
Palaeontological site or material (S. 35)	No	NA
Graves or burial grounds (S. 36)	No	NA
Public monuments or memorials (S. 37)	No	NA
Other		

Heritage resources on the property		
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	Foundations encountered	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Foundation and earth canal not believed to be of any significance.
Areas attached to oral traditions / intangible heritage	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	-
Historical settlement / townscapes	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Landscape of cultural significance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Geological site of scientific/ cultural importance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Archaeological / palaeontological sites	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NHRA	ELE-	INDICATORS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE										RISK	
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	Yes	No	Will be impacted upon	Foundation and earth canal not believed to have any significance	Foundation and earth canal not believed to have any significance
Areas attached to oral traditions / intangible heritage	No	None	None	-	-
Historical settlement/ townscape	No	None	None	-	-
Landscape of cultural significance	No	None	None	-	-
Geological site of scientific/ cultural importance	No	None	None	-	-
Archaeological / palaeontological sites	No	None	None	-	-
Grave / burial grounds	No	No	None	-	-

NHRA S (3)2 Heritage	SITE	IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE Cultural significance rating		Impact management	Motivation
Areas of significance related to labour history	No	None	None	-	-
Movable objects	No	None	None	-	-

ACT	COMPO- NENT	IMPLICATION	RELEVANCE	COMPLIANCE
NHRA	S 34	Impact on buildings and structures older than 60 years	Foundations and earth canal of no historic value	Foundation and earth canal not believed to have any significance
NHRA	S35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	None present	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.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸

- **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: Foundation stones of a structure	The poorly defined foundation stones of a structure are visible. It is not believed that this foundation is older than 60 years.	No significance	It is not believed to have any significance.
Appendix 3: Earth canal leading to small dam	The poorly defined earth canal is visible, on the north boundary of study area, and is leading to a small dam outside the study area. It is not always visible, as it is already damaged in sections.	No significance	It is not believed to have any significance.

- **Field rating:**

The poorly defined foundation stones of an unknown structure are visible. But it is not believed to have any historic or cultural value. The earth canal is also poorly defined but damaged in most areas and it is also not believed to have any historic or cultural value. It is believed that these features have no significance which might prevent the proposed cemetery development to continue.

¹⁷National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. p. 2.

¹⁸National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. pp. 12-14

H. RECOMMENDATIONS

Portion 9 of the farm Mayflower 241 IT is situated in an already highly disturbed, cultivated agricultural and commercial plantation area.

The poorly defined features (foundation stones and earth canal) is not believed to have any historic or cultural value and based on the findings in this report, Adansonia Heritage Consultants cc, have no compelling reasons which may prevent the proposed cemetery development, on Mayflower 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.

SOURCES

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.
- DELIUS P, & M. HAY, *Mpumalanga, an illustrated history*, Highveld Press, 2009.
- 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.
- VAN WARMELO, N.J., *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, Pretoria, 1935.
- VOIGHT, E., *Guide to the Archaeological sites in the Northern and Eastern Transvaal*. Transvaal Museum, 1981.
- Von Fintel, E (Red.), *Die Nachkommen van Johann Heinrich Jakob Filter 1858-2008: Die Geschichte einer Pionierfamilie in Nordnatal*.
- 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

- Wikipedia, *Albert Luthuli Local Municipality*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albert_Luthuli_Local_Municipality, 2012/07/30.
- Swaziland National Trust, *Swazi History*, <http://www.sntc.org.sz/cultural/archsd.asp>, 2012/07/30.
- Wikipedia, *History of Swaziland*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Swaziland, 2012/07/30.
- E-mail SAHRA P. Hine, 2012/07/30.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

- Personal communication: Mr. M. Nkosi, 2012-07-28.
- Personal information: F. Prins, Anthropologist, Natal Museum. Interview by Sian Hall, Sept 1999.

MISCELLANEOUS

- SAHRA, Rock Art, <http://www.sahra.org.za/rockart.htm> Access 2008-10-16.
- SNA: 260 Letter from Resident Magistrate Ermelo to Secretary for Native Affairs, 13/494, 21 July 1905.
- SNA: 260 Letter from Von Dessauer to Marwick, Undated.
- Wandima, BID document, 2010.