

SPECIALIST REPORT
**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED
NKAMBENI CEMETERY:
PORTION A (PORTION OF PORTION 148) OF THE FARM KAAP BLOCK section F,
NUMBI
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**

MAY 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 Nkambeni Cemetery, on portion A (portion of portion 148), of the farm Kaap Block, section F, Numbi.

The study area is situated on topographical map 1:50 000, 2531AA KIEPERSOL, which is in the Mpumalanga Province. This area falls under the jurisdiction of the Mbombela Local Municipality, and the Ehlanzeni 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 applicant, Mbombela Municipality, who is requesting the development of the new Nkambeni cemetery (with access roads, parking and ablution facilities), is faced with a challenge of providing land for burial purposes. The current cemetery, servicing the Nkambeni community is already running out of burial space. The proposed site is 41 ha in extent.

The area for the proposed cemetery development (approximately 41 ha), is currently vacant and not in use. It is zoned as agricultural and is bordered by rivers and drainage buffers north and south and the Hazyview Comprehensive School and residential area on the west. The area comprises virgin ground with grass veld, scattered trees and areas of dense scrub.

The proposed cemetery development is adjacent to the residential area known as Nkambeni approximately 7km from Hazyview and 1km from the Hazyview Comprehensive School. The site is accessed off the R538 provincial road. The locals use this area for grazing their livestock (mainly cattle), dumping of refuse and collecting of firewood.

The survey revealed no archaeological or historical structures of significance in the study area. One broken lower grinder, an upper grinder and a few rough clay potsherds were observed and are believed to be of no significance. Mr. Billy Mphanga confirmed that he is also not aware of any graves or 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	6
• Legal requirements	6
B. BACKGROUND TO ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE STUDY AREA	8
• Literature review, museum databases & previous relevant impact assessments	8
• The Eastern Sotho	10
• The Nhlanganu and Tšhangana	11
C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT	13
D. LOCALITY	13
• Description of methodology	14
• GPS Co-ordinates of perimeters	15
E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES	15
F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	17
• Summarised identification & cultural significance assessment of affected Heritage resources: General issues of site and context	17
• Summarised recommended impact management interventions	21
G. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE & EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA	22
• Evaluation methods	22
• NHRA	23
• Significance & evaluation	23
• Field rating	23
H. RECOMMENDATION	24
I. CONCLUSION	24
REFERENCES	25
Appendix 1: Topographical map: 2531 AA KIEPERSOL	26
Appendix 2: Mbombela Regional cemetery: Nkambeni site map	27
Appendix 3: Google Earth image: Perimeter of study area & heritage features	28
Appendix 4: Photographs of the study area	29
Appendix 5: Summarised conventions	35

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED NKAMBENI
CEMETERY AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE:
PORTION A (PORTION OF PORTION 148) OF THE FARM KAAP BLOCK section F,
NUMBI, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PROJECT

The Mbombela Local Municipality, (the applicants of the project), are faced with a challenge of providing land for burial purposes and is requesting the development of a proposed cemetery for the residents of Nkambeni, and nearby communities near Hazyview. The current cemetery, servicing the Nkambeni community, is already running out of burial space, hence a need for another burial site. The study area is approximately 41 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: 2531AA KIEPERSOL).

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: 41ha, are earmarked for a proposed cemetery development, on portion A (portion of portion 148) of the farm Kaap Block section F, Hazyview, Mpumalanga Province.
- The site is currently vacant 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 Mbombela Local Municipality, and Ehlanzeni District Municipality.
- Land owners: Mbombela 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 (Mbombela 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 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, since no archaeological material was found apart from a few rough clay potsherds, a broken lower grinder and an upper grinder of no significance and which will not 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 no structures older than 60 years were 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**

In order to place the areas in and around Hazyview and Bushbuckridge 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. The author was involved in a *Desktop Study for Proposed Eskom Powerlines, Hazyview – Dwarsloop* in 2008, *Inspection of Umbhaba Stone-walled settlement, Hazyview*, in 2001, as well as 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). The SAHRA database for archaeological and historical impact assessments was consulted and revealed no reports for the Hazyview region. One report for Bushbuckridge (F. Roodt), and one for Acornhoek (JP Celliers) revealed no archaeological sites of significance. Research has been done by the Pilgrim's Rest Museum on San rock art as well as rock art made by Bantu speakers in the Escarpment area, but none have been recorded to date in the study area.¹

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.² The only professionally excavated Early Iron Age site in the immediate area, besides those in the Kruger National Park, is the Plaston site towards the south-west, dating ca 900 AD.³ 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.^{4 5} A stone walled settlement with

¹PRMA: Information file 9/2.

² J.S. Bergh (red)., *Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*, p. 95.

³M.M. Van der Ryst., *Die Ystertydperk, in J.S. Bergh (red)., Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*. p. 97.

⁴Personal information: Dr. J. Pistorius, Pretoria, 2008-04-17.

⁵Personal information: Dr. MS. Schoeman, University of Pretoria, 2008-03-27.

terracing was recorded by C. van Wyk (Rowe) close to Hazyview,⁶ as well as several others further west and north-west,⁷ outside 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 inhabited by Eastern Sotho groups (Pulana, Kutswe and Pai), the Tsonga (Nhlanganu and Tšhangana), from before the 18th century.^{8 9} However, when concentrating on ethnographical history, it is important to include a slightly wider geographical area in order for it to make sense.

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.¹⁰ Languages such as Zulu, Xhosa, Swazi, Nhlanganu, Nkuna, sePedi, hiPau and seRôka, are commonly spoken throughout this area.¹¹

When the Swazi began to expand northwards they forced the local inhabitants out of Swaziland, or absorbed them.¹² There is evidence of resistance, but the Eastern Sotho groups who lived in the northern parts of Swaziland, moved mainly northwards.¹³ This appears to have taken place towards the end of the 18th century,¹⁴ when these groups fled from Swaziland to areas such as Nelspruit, Bushbuckridge, Klaserie, Blyde River and Komatipoort.¹⁵

Several circular stone-walled complexes and terraces as well as graves have been recorded in the vicinity of Hazyview¹⁶, Bushbuckridge, Graskop and Sabie, clay potsherds and upper as well as lower grinding stones, are scattered at most of the sites.¹⁷ Many of these occur in caves as a result of the Swazi attacks on the smaller groups.

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

⁶C. Van Wyk, *Inspection of Umbhaba Stone-walled settlement, Hazyview*, pp. 1-2.

⁷PRMA: Information file 9/2.

⁸N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. pp. 90-92 & 111.

⁹H. S. Webb, *The Native Inhabitants of the Southern Lowveld, in Lowveld Regional Development Association, The South-Eastern Transvaal Lowveld*. p. 16.

¹⁰N.J. van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p. 51.

¹¹M. De Jongh (ed)., *Swatini*, p. 21.

¹²A.C. Myburgh, *The Tribes of Barberton District*, p. 10.

¹³N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. p. 111.

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

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁶PRMA: Information file 9/2.

¹⁷D. Ziervogel, *The Eastern Sotho, A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey*, p. 3.

actually indicate how many people were living in one area.¹⁸

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 1926.¹⁹

The only early trade route mentioned, which crossed this section, was a footpath used by the African groups from Delagoa Bay towards Bushbuckridge (Magashulaskraal as it was previously named), along the Sabie river, up the Escarpment, and further north to the Soutpansberg.²⁰ There is however, no physical evidence left of this early route.

Eastern Sotho group: The Pai

Van Warmelo identified the groups in northern Swaziland and the Pilgrim’s Rest district before 1886, as Eastern Sotho (Pulana, Pai and Kutswe). According to Von Wielligh, the **Pai** occupied the area as far south as the Komati River (umLumati). Most of the younger generation has adopted the Swazi language.²¹

The Swazi constantly attacked the Eastern Sotho groups during the nineteenth century. The Pai fled to the caves in the mountains near MacMac (between Sabie and Pilgrim’s Rest), while some of them (which were subjugated by a Swazi leader) fled from *Mswazi* in about 1853 to Sekukuniland (Steelpoort area), but decided to turn back towards their country along the Sabie River (1882). By this time, Europeans had already settled in this area when gold was discovered in 1873.²²

Eastern Sotho group: The Pulana

The history of the **Pulana** goes back to the Barberton area from where they trekked via Krokodilpoort (Nelspruit district) to settle north-east of Pretoriuskop. When the Swazi invaded them, they moved on and split up under several chieftainships,²³ of who chief Kobêng (after which Kowyns’ Pass was named), is well-known in the area’s history.

The Pulana roughly lived in the following areas: north of the Crocodile River, west of the western boundary of the Kruger National Park as far north as its crossing the Sabie River, south of the Sabie river until its cutting through the main road from Pretoriuskop (including Hazyview), to Bushbuckridge, west of

¹⁸N.J. van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p.9.

¹⁹H. Bradford, *A Taste of Freedom*, p. 147.

²⁰L. Changuion & J.S. Bergh, *Swart gemeenskappe voor die koms van die blankes*, in *J.S. Bergh (red)., Geskiedenis Atlas van Suid Afrika: Die vier Noordelike Provinsies*. p. 104.

²¹D. Ziervogel, *The Eastern Sotho, A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey*, pp. 3-5.

²²D. Ziervogel, *The Eastern Sotho, A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey*, p. 11.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 108.

this road as far as Klaserie, south of a line drawn from Klaserie to the confluence of the Blyde and Orighstad rivers, east of the Blyde River. This large area is divided in two by the main road from Pilgrim's Rest to Bushbuckridge. This road was since ancient times the only connection between the Low Veld and Escarpment, and became known as "Kowyns' Pass".²⁴ The majority of Pulana lived to the north of this line, while south of this line the Pulana are scattered in groups into which are wedged Pai groups on both sides of the Sabie River, and Swazi peoples in the south, and south-eastern portions.^{25 26}

It was the Pulana clans who, under chief Maripi Mashile, defeated the Swazi at Mariepskop in the Blyde River Canyon, ca 1864.²⁷

Eastern Sotho group: The Kutswe

The **Kutswe** trekked from the northern parts of Swaziland northwards as a result of pressure from the Swazi in the south.²⁸ The Kutswe settled north-east of the present Nelspruit at a river called Kutswe (Gutshwa)²⁹ from where they got their present name. From here they moved on and settled at various places, and ruins of their kraals are scattered from Pretoriuskop, **Hazyview (Phabeni)** as well as on the farms Welgevonden 364, Lothian 258, Boschhoek 47, Sandford 46, Culcutta 51 and Oakley 262.³⁰ They occupied additional areas between White River and Sabie, and had sufficient influence amongst the Pai during the early 20th century, to establish authority over more than 2000 individuals living on farms on both sides of the Sabie River from the town of Sabie as far as the main road from White River / **Hazyview** to Bushbuckridge.³¹ They had chief jurisdiction over the following farms near Bushbuckridge: Oakley 262, Culcutta 51, Madras 50, Alexandria 251, Cork 60 and Ronoldsey 273. They intermarried with Nhlangu (Shangaan), Swazi and Pai.^{32 33}

The ruins of the kraals of Kutswe chiefs are still known on the following farms,³⁴ where they were most probably buried as well:

Mogogong:	near Pretoriuskop (KNP)
Senwapitsi	between Pretoriuskop & Skukuza (KNP)
Phabêng	Phabeni gate in KNP (close to Hazyview)
Phandane	Farm Welgevonden

²⁴M. De Jongh, (ed)., *Swatini*, p. 21.

²⁵D. Ziervogel, *The Eastern Sotho, A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey*, p. 107.

²⁶N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. p. 111.

²⁷D. Ziervogel, *The Eastern Sotho, A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey*, p. 107.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 110.

²⁹T. Makhura, Early Inhabitants, in *Delius, P. (ed)., Mpumalanga: History and heritage*. p.105.

³⁰D. Ziervogel, *The Eastern Sotho, A Tribal, Historical and Linguistic Survey*, p. 110.

³¹*Ibid.*, pp. 4-10.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 110.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 110.

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 110.

Makgate	Farm Lothian
gaMoépé	Farm Boschhoek
Lesaba la Mbanyêlé	Farm Sandford
Khubuthamaga	Farm Calcutta
Matsabane	Farm Lothian
Selôkôtšô	Farm Oakley

Tsonga groups: The Nhlanganu and Tšhangana

The Nhlanganu and Tšhangana (also generally known as the Shangaan-Tsonga)³⁵ 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).³⁶ 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.³⁷ They were originally of Nguni origin.³⁸ The term “Shangaan” is commonly employed to refer to all members of the Tsonga division.³⁹

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.⁴⁰

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.⁴¹ The downfall of *Ngungunyana* (son of *Soshangane*) saw his son seeking sanctuary in the “Transvaal”, and the latter became known as *Thulamahashi*,⁴² the name that is still used for the area east of Busbuckridge.

³⁵M. De Jongh (ed)., *Swatini*, p. 24.

³⁶N.J. Van Warmelo, Grouping and Ethnic History, in *Schapera I., The Bantu-Speaking Tribes of South Africa. An Ethnographical survey*, p. 55.

³⁷N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, pp. 90-91.

³⁸N.J. Van Warmelo, Grouping and Ethnic History, in *Schapera I., The Bantu-Speaking Tribes of South Africa. An Ethnographical survey*, p. 55.

³⁹N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p. 92

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 91-92.

⁴¹N.J. Van Warmelo, Grouping and Ethnic History, in *Schapera I., The Bantu-Speaking Tribes of South Africa. An Ethnographical survey*, p. 57.

⁴²N.J. Van Warmelo, *A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*, p. 92.

The historical background of the study area confirms that it was occupied since the 17th century by the Eastern Sotho (Pai, Kutswe and Pulana) as well as Tsonga groups (Nhlangu and Tšhangana). These groups have intermarried extensively or were absorbed by other groups in time, and today groups such as Eastern Sotho, South-Ndebele, Swazi, Tsonga and Northern-Sotho occupy this area.⁴³

These early settlements all developed into larger settlements by the descendants of the groups mentioned above, and the entire area to date, consists of villages, settlements or farms of which some are only a few kilometers apart.

- **History of the Hazyview area**

Hazyview falls within the *Bohlabela district* and was founded in the early 20th century. The area has a subtropical climate and cultivates mainly mangos, avocados and bananas. The town grew around a trading store and is currently situated in a rural area.⁴⁴ It falls under the Mbombela Municipality which is located in Nelspruit. Bushbuckridge, which is close to Hazyview, has a population of 500 000 people.⁴⁵

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

The proposed project will involve the following:

- Approximately 41 ha are earmarked for the proposed new Nkambeni cemetery, access roads and associated infrastructure.

D. LOCALITY

The proposed project site is located on *Portion A (portion of portion 148) of the Farm Kaap Block section F* in Numbi / Hazyview. It is also known as Sand River in the Mbombela Local Municipality. It is located approximately 7km south-southeast of Hazyview, and approximately 1km from the Hazyview Comprehensive School. The site is accessed off the R538 provincial road. It is situated in the rural residential area known as Nkambeni. The site falls under the Mbombela's 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 vacant land which is not in use and is bordered by rivers and drainage buffers north and south, with the Hazyview Comprehensive School and residential area to the west. It is zoned as agricultural, and occupying a spur sloping to the south, east and north, comprises virgin ground with grass veld, scattered trees and areas of dense scrub. There is a vast variation of vegetation and trees. The area is classified as the Sabie River Thicket ecozone. The granite and dolerite

⁴³M. De Jongh (ed)., *Swatini*, p. 40.

⁴⁴ Hazyview, <http://www.medplaces.co.za> Access: 2013-05-19, p. 1.

⁴⁵ Ehlanzeni District Municipality, http://www.mpumalanga.gov.za/municipality_ehlanzeni.htm#bush Access: 16-01-13, p. 1.

plains have shallow sandy soils, and clay sodic soils along the footslopes.⁴⁶ Trees and shrubs that were identified in the study area are Marula (*Sclerocarya birrea*), Red Bushwillow (*Combretum apiculatum*), Sickie bush (*Dichrostachys cinerea*), Weeping wattle (*Peltophorum africanum*), Rosette Cluster leaf (*Terminalia stenostachya*), Black monkey orange (*Strychnos madagascariences*), several Acacia and Rhus species.⁴⁷

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 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 three people.
- The entire area is vacant land, and belongs to the Mbombela municipality. It is now used for cattle grazing, collecting of firewood and dumping of refuse.
- The terrain was even and accessible although there is a variation of medium sized bushes and trees. The grass varied from tall to short. The surface was however, quite visible in between, due to cattle grazing. It is clear that the veld is regularly overgrazed.
- 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 local inhabitants of Nkambeni, Mr. Billy Mpanga and Mr. Malope. Some informants did not

⁴⁶ SANPARKS, Visitors Guide to the Kruger National Park, p. 2.

⁴⁷ Van Wyk, B., & Van Wyk P., Field Guide to Trees of Southern Africa, 1997, p. 500.

want to be mentioned by name, but they confirmed the statements of the others.

- **GPS: Co-ordinates of the perimeters of the study area** (Co-ordinates provided by WANDIMA Environmental Services): **(See Appendix: 2 Mbombela Regional Cemetery: Nkambeni site map)**

GPS CO-ORDINATES		
Location	South	East
Access road from R538		
A	S 25° 06' 29.058"	E 31° 08' 12.554"
B	S 25° 6' 29.22"	E 31° 8' 23.16"
C	S 25° 6' 35.857"	E 31° 8' 39.683"
Study area		
D	S 25° 6' 21.294"	E 31° 8' 33.8"
E	S 25° 6' 17.818"	E 31° 8' 39.149"
F	S 25° 6' 15.125"	E 31° 8' 39.604"
G	S 25° 6' 8.973"	E 31° 8' 48.967"
H	S 25° 6' 8.787"	E 31° 8' 52.058"
J	S 25° 6' 38.588"	E 31° 8' 53.58"
K	S 25° 6' 39.845"	E 31° 8' 33.903"

E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES

The proposed Nkambeni Cemetery consists of access roads (points A – B – C), the cemetery with associated infrastructure such as parking and ablution facilities situated within points D – E – F – G – H – J – K.

The access road was surveyed (Fig. 3 & 4) but no archaeological or heritage features of any significance were found. Point A is situated just off the R538 provincial road and goes in an easterly direction. It is situated in the residential area. Points B – C (Fig. 4) indicate the section of the access road to the proposed cemetery site, starting at Point C (see Appendix 2 & 3). The photo was taken from the east facing west towards point B. No archaeological or heritage features were identified in this section.

The study area is indicated in fig. 1, 2 & 5, (points D – K). The terrain was even and visibility was fair (see fig. 7). A few insignificant artifacts were identified such as a broken lower grinder, and rough clay potsherds. None of these items have any historic or cultural value 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 one of the residents, Mr. Billy Mphanga.

Heritage Feature	Description / Comments	Site Location
Appendix 4 Lower grinder (broken)	A broken lower grinder was found in the northern section of the study area.	Lower grinder (broken) S25° 06' 12.4" E31° 08' 58.8" Fig. 8
Appendix 4 Upper grinder with secondary utility marks (possibly to open hard marula shells)	An upper grinder was found outside the study area towards the east. The upper grinder is of interest as it has secondary utility marks, possibly using it as a hammer stone to open hard marula shells, to access the nuts.	Upper grinder S25° 06' 21.3" E31° 08' 58.2" Fig. 9
Appendix 4 Clay Potsherds	A few rough clay potsherds were found near point C.	Potsherds S25° 06' 34.8" E31° 08' 40.0" Fig. 11
Appendix 4 Clay Potsherd	A smooth clay potsherd was found in the middle of the study area.	Potsherd S25° 06' 22.1" E31° 08' 42.2" Fig. 10

The study area was extensively surveyed on foot by three people, and per vehicle for any remains of archaeological or historical nature. Visibility was fair and the grass varied from tall to short. The grass was sparse and dry and the ground surface was mostly clearly visible. Most of the features were clearly visible (See **Appendix 3**). The area is flat grassland with scattered trees and dense scrub, with no rocky outcrops, and footpaths criss-cross the entire section.⁴⁸ The soil is of a sandy and sedimentary nature.

The inhabitants of the Nkambeni township, utilize the area for livestock grazing, dumping of refuse, and harvesting of firewood. Mr. Billy Mphanga, assisted in the survey and helped with information. He stated that there are no graves in the study area and no ruins of any nature.⁴⁹ Mr. Vusi Malope said that there are graves but they are not situated in the study area.⁵⁰

No features of heritage significance were identified in the study area. The few scattered clay potsherds and broken grinder are items that may have been used recently and is a common feature in this entire rural area which has a settlement history since the 1600's, and a current population of 500 000 people. The upper grinder with secondary markings, **is outside the study area**, and such items are still in use today by the local community to open tough marula shells.

⁴⁸ WANDIMA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, BID document for proposed Nkambeni Cemetery, April 2013, p. 2.

⁴⁹ Personal communication: Mr. B. Mphanga, 2013-05-18.

⁵⁰ Personal communication: Mr. V. Malope, 2013-05-18.

F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

ACT	COMPO- NENT	IMPLICATION	RELEVANCE	COMPLIANCE
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	Some rough potsherds and a broken lower grinder were found in the study area, but are of no significance.	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:**

Context		
Urban environmental context	No	NA
Rural environmental context	No	Vacant land
Natural environmental context	No	Land not in use apart from cattle grazing and harvesting of fire wood by locals.
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		

Context		
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?	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

Property features and characteristics		
Does the property have any fresh water sources (springs, streams, rivers) on or alongside it?	Yes	It is bordered by rivers and drainage buffers north and south

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)	No	NA
Archaeological site or material (S. 35)	Yes	Potsherds and broken lower grinder are of no significance
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		
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	ELE- MENTS	INDICATORS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE										RISK	
		Histo rical	Rare	Sci enti fic	Typi cal	Tech- nolog ical	Aes thetic	Pers on / com munit y	Land mark	Mate rial con dition	Sust aina bility		
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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Landscap e of cultural significance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Geological site of scientific/ cultural importance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Archaeolo gical / palaeontol ogical sites	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Few potsherds and broken lower grinder are not believed to be of any significance.
Grave / burial grounds	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NHRA	ELE-	INDICATORS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE										RISK	
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	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	-	-
Landscape of cultural significance	No	None	None	-	-
Geological site of scientific/ cultural importance	No	None	None	-	-
Archaeological / palaeontological sites	Yes	None	None	No impact	Few potsherds and broken lower grinder are not believed to be of any significance.
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	None present	None
NHRA	S35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	Few potsherds and broken lower grinder 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.⁵¹ 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.⁵²

- **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: Broken lower grinder	No archaeological site near or in the vicinity of the broken lower grinder	No significance	It is not believed to have any significance and will not be impacted upon by the proposed development.
Appendix 3: Rough clay potsherds	Rough clay potsherds are out of context and not near or in the vicinity of any archaeological site	No significance	It is not believed to have any significance and will not be impacted upon by the proposed development.

- **Field rating:**

The broken lower grinder and rough potsherds which were found in the study area are scattered and not in context. It is also not situated near or in the vicinity of any visible archaeological sites. The entire rural area in which the proposed Nkambeni cemetery site is situated, has been in existence since the 1600's. There is currently in the region of 500 000 people living in the area. It is not believed that the items which were identified during the survey have any significance in terms of historic or cultural value which might prevent the proposed cemetery development to continue.

⁵¹National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. p. 2.

⁵²National Heritage Resources Act, no. 25 of 1999. pp. 12-14

H. RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed project site, *Portion A (portion of portion 148) of the Farm Kaap Block section F* in the Numbi / Hazyview area is situated on vacant land in between residential areas. The property is zoned as agricultural and is used by the local inhabitants for cattle grazing, harvesting of firewood and dumping of refuse. It is bordered by rivers and drainage buffers to the north and south.

The poorly defined features (broken lower grinder and rough clay potsherds) are situated out of any archaeological context and are not believed to have any historic or cultural value. They are not close to or in the vicinity of any visible archaeological sites. Mr. Billy Mphanga and Mr. V. Malope who has been staying adjacent to the study area for most of their lives, were also not aware of any archaeological features or graves in the study area. The survey of the access roads as indicated in **Appendix 2 & 3**, (points A – B – C) have revealed no archaeological or historical material. Based on the findings in this report, Adansonia Heritage Consultants, have no compelling reasons which may prevent the proposed cemetery development, on Nkambeni 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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

- Ehlanzeni District Municipality, http://www.mpumalanga.gov.za/municipality_ehlanzeni.htm#bush Access: 16-01-13.
- Hazyview, <http://www.medplaces.co.za> Access: 2013-05-19.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

- Personal communication: Mr. B. Mphanga, 2013-05-08.
- Personal communication: Mr. V. Malope, 2013-05-08.
- Personal information: F. Prins, Anthropologist, Natal Museum. Interview by Sian Hall, Sept 1999.

MISCELLANEOUS

- SANPARKS, Visitors Guide Kruger National Park, 2006.
- 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 Environmental Services, BID document for proposed Nkambeni cemetery, April 2013.