

SPECIALIST REPORT

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED
CONSTRUCTION OF MPUMALANGA CULTURAL AND CREATIVITY HUB:
ON THE REMAINDER OF THE FARM AGRICULTURAL HOLDING NO 56 JU,
WHITE RIVER, 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 construction of the Mpumalanga Cultural and Creativity Hub, on the *remainder of the farm Agricultural Holding no 56 JU* in White River, Mbombela Local Municipality.

The study area is situated on topographical map 1:50 000, 2531AC, *WITRIVIER*, 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, the Department of Public Works, has seen the need for the community of White River to have a place where they can have a cultural experience that will also cater for recreational activities. They decided that a Cultural and Creativity Hub will meet this need. The proposed site is approximately 20 ha in extent.

The area for the proposed White River Cultural and Creativity Hub (approximately 20 ha in extent), is currently vacant and situated on transformed agricultural lands, which are not in use. It is zoned as agricultural and is bordered by the *White River* to the north and the R538 road to the south. It was until recently a working farm, belonging to the Department of Public Works, Roads and Transport. The 1984 topographical map indicates cultivated agricultural land in the eastern section. The 2012 Google image indicated that the entire farm was since recently cultivated with the exclusion of a few granite rocky outcrops, and residences. There is an earth dam and a variation of matured trees on the property. The property is situated on the border of the town of White River.

The survey revealed no graves, archaeological or historical features in the study area. The residences are of a recent nature, as well as a water canal that runs from east to west, and a circular brick dam. Ruins of two other structures were found but it is also of a recent nature. Mr. Steven Sibiya is currently a security guard at the property and confirmed that he is not aware of any graves or archaeological features.

Based on the survey and the findings in this report, Adanson 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
• History of White River	13
C. DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT	14
D. LOCALITY	14
• Description of methodology	14
• GPS Co-ordinates of perimeters	15
E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES	16
F. DISCUSSION ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	18
• Summarised identification & cultural significance assessment of affected Heritage resources: General issues of site and context	18
• Summarised recommended impact management interventions	22
G. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE & EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA	24
• Evaluation methods	24
• NHRA	24
• Significance & evaluation	24
• Field rating	24
H. RECOMMENDATION	25
I. CONCLUSION	25
REFERENCES	26
Appendix 1: Topographical map: 2531 AC WITRIVIER	27
Appendix 2: Portion 56 of White River Estates, WANDIMA	28
Appendix 3: Google Earth image: Perimeter of study area & features	29
Appendix 4: Photographs of the study area	30

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED
CONSTRUCTION OF MPUMALANGA CULTURAL AND CREATIVITY HUB:
ON THE REMAINDER OF THE FARM AGRICULTURAL HOLDING NO 56 JU,
WHITE RIVER, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE**

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PROJECT

The Department of Public Works, (the applicants of the project), has identified a need for the community of White River to have a place where they can have a cultural experience that will also cater for recreational activities. They have decided that a Cultural and Creativity Hub be constructed to meet this need. The study area is approximately 20ha 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: *2531AC WITRIVIER*).

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: 20ha, are earmarked for the construction of the proposed Cultural and Creativity Hub, on the remainder of the farm Agricultural Holding no 56JU, White River, 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: Department of Public Works, Roads and Transport.

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 (Department of Public Works), 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 on the property.

- **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 structure 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 White River / Hazyview 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)* and a *Phase 1 Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Nkambeni cemetery, Hazyview (2013)*. The SAHRA database for archaeological and historical impact assessments was consulted and revealed no reports for the White River 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 (east of White River), 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 / 2013-05-23.

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

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

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 and close to White River), to

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.

Bushbuckridge, west of this road as far as Klaserie, south of a line drawn from Klaserie to the confluence of the Blyde and Orighstad rivers, and 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, Calcutta 51, Madras 50, Alexandria 251, Cork 60 and Ronoldsey 273. They intermarried with Nhlanganu (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)

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.

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

Tsonga groups: The Nhlangu and Tšhangana

The Nhlangu 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 were 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 **Nhlangu** 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 Nhlangu, 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 (Nhlanganu 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, around bigger towns such as Hazyview and **White River**.

- **History of White River**

Just after the Anglo-Boer War, the High Commissioner of South Africa, Lord Alfred Milner, was investigating areas with favourable and healthy climates, fertile soil and lots of water, for farming. The ideal area that was identified was White River (or the White River Valley as it was then known).⁴⁴ Today citrus from this area is one of the main forms of agriculture in the Province.⁴⁵ Massive timber plantations were planted around White River and one of the biggest timber mills with the latest technology was built in 1982 in the town.⁴⁶



White River in 1905, consisted of a hotel, a general dealer and the managers' house. Photo copied from:
Baanbrekers van die Laeveld, p. 39: Photo by Shirley Swanepoel.

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

⁴⁴Borman, H., *Baanbrekers van die Laeveld*, p. 39.

⁴⁵Delius, P. & Hay, M., *Mpumalanga, an illustrated history*, p. 156.

⁴⁶*Ibid.* p. 162.

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

The proposed project will involve the following:

- Approximately 20 ha are earmarked for the construction of the proposed new Cultural and Creativity Hub, which will include housing facilities, a training facility, two workshops, business incubators, four studios for recreational use and an administrative section.

D. LOCALITY

The proposed project site is located on the remainder of the farm *Agricultural Holding no 56 JU* in White River. The site is accessed off the R538 provincial road. 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. It is bordered by the *White River* in the north, the R538 provincial road to the south, and operational farms (Macadamia orchards) to the east and west. It is zoned as agricultural, and the entire farm was recent transformed agricultural farm land. From the middle section of the farm towards the east, it was already cultivated farm land as the 1984 topographical map indicated (see **Appendix 1**). There are a few granite rocky outcrops on the farm as well as clusters of indigenous trees. The area is classified as the Sabie River Thicket ecozone. The granite and dolerite plains have shallow sandy soils, and clay sodic soils along the footslopes.⁴⁷ Some foothill elements are present like the trees and shrubs that were identified in the study area, such as Fever Tree (*Acacia xanthophloea*), Paperbark Thorn (*Acacia sieberiana*) Marula (*Sclerocarya birrea*), Broom cluster fig (*Ficus sur*), Coral tree (*Erythrina lysistemon*), Common Cabbage tree (*Cussonia spicata*), Sickie bush (*Dichrostachys cinerea*), and Water berry (*Syzygium cordatum*), near the *White River*.⁴⁸ There are relatively few alien species in general on the terrain, although Jacaranda and Lantana were observed apart from other alien trees and plants in the gardens of the homesteads.

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**), indicates 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.

⁴⁷ SANPARKS, Visitors Guide to the Kruger National Park, p. 2.

⁴⁸ Van Wyk, B., & Van Wyk P., Field Guide to Trees of Southern Africa, 1997, p. 500.

- 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, but revealed sparse information;

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

- The fieldwork and survey was conducted extensively on foot (where vegetation permitted) and with a vehicle, with two people.
- The entire area is vacant land, and belongs to the Department of Public Works, Roads and Transport. The entire study area were cultivated farm lands until recently (see Appendix 2), when it was purchased for the purpose of development. The structures on the site are all of recent origin.
- The terrain was even but sections were overgrown with tall grass and pioneer weeds. The western section in the study area has burnt which made visibility excellent.
- 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.

- **GPS: Co-ordinates of the perimeters of the study area** (Co-ordinates provided by WANDIMA Environmental Services): **(See Appendix 2: Portion 56 of White River Estates, WANDIMA.**

GPS CO-ORDINATES		
Location	South	East
Study area:		
A	S 25° 19' 19.66"	E 31° 02' 17.43"
B	S 25° 19' 18.13"	E 31° 02' 16.72"
C	S 25° 19' 15.69"	E 31° 02' 21.76"
D	S 25° 19' 09.51"	E 31° 02' 14.27"
E	S 25° 19' 04.42"	E 31° 02' 14.89"
F	S 25° 19' 2.73"	E 31° 02' 20.39"
G	S 25° 18' 57.02"	E 31° 02' 27.31"
H	S 25° 19' 12.92"	E 31° 02' 33.21"

E. DESCRIPTION OF IDENTIFIED SITES

The proposed Cultural and Creativity Hub (20ha), will consist of the construction of housing facilities for a training academy, two workshops, business incubators and four studios for recreational use. There will also be administrative blocks.

The study area is indicated in **Appendix 2 & 3**, points A – G, and Photographic evidence in **Appendix 4**. The terrain was even but range in visibility from very good (burnt areas, Fig. 2, 3 & 4) to bad (in the fallow and overgrown sections of the cultivated land, Fig. 1). Geotechnical studies were done previously at several points on the site and all the exposed areas were also studied for evidence of archaeological material (Fig. 1 & 16). None was however found in the exposed sections in the study area. There are a few residences (three modern cottages, a thatch roofed house, and a pump house) on the property, but they are all of a recent nature (Fig. 9, 11 & 12), as well as the ruins of two other structures in the centre of the property (Fig. 13). These were all dated of a recent nature. A concreted water canal, which runs from east to west through the study area, is also of a recent nature (Fig. 10). A round burnt brick- and concrete dam (Fig. 7) was identified towards the western section close to a granite rocky outcrop, but this is also dated as recent. There is also a dam situated below the modern cottages (Fig. 8). None of these features have any historic or cultural value, which will be impacted upon by the proposed development. No graves or other historical or archaeological material were found in the study area.

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 guards on the property, Mr. Steven Sibiya.⁴⁹

Feature	Description / Comments	Site Location
Appendix 4 Residences: Thatch roofed house; 3 x Cottages with carports; Pump house;	These modern structures all of a recent nature and have no historic or cultural value.	Thatch House: S25° 19' 12.74" E31° 02' 23.90" Fig. 11. Cottages & carports: S25° 19' 10.67" E31° 02' 29.18" Fig. 12. Pump House: S25° 19' 09.72" E31° 02' 26.16" Fig. 9.
Appendix 4 Ruins of previous residence;	The ruins of a previous residence are also of a recent nature. Note the casted concrete brick in the photograph.	S25° 19' 10.29" E31° 02' 23.20" Fig. 13.

⁴⁹ Personal communication, Mr. Steven Sibiya, 2013-05-25.

Ruin of L-shaped structure.	The ruins of the L-shaped structure are clearly visible on the Google image (Appendix 3).	Position close, and east of the above co-ordinate. Fig. 17.
Appendix 4 Round Concrete and burnt brick dam; Farm dam (post 1984);	The dams are of a recent nature. The 1984 topographical map did not indicate the dams and it is assumed that they are both post 1984.	Concrete dam: S25° 19' 13.06" E31° 02' 22.23" Fig. 7. Farm dam: S25° 19' 09.76" E31° 02' 27.02" Fig. 8.
Appendix 4 Concrete water canal.	The concrete water canal is also not indicated on the 1984 topographical map and it is possible that it is also dated post 1984.	Entering property: S25° 19' 08.96" E31° 02' 31.76" Fig. 10. Exiting property: S25° 19' 14.75" E31° 02' 21.26"

The study area was surveyed on foot and per vehicle by two people for any remains of archaeological or historical nature. Visibility was good in the burnt areas but not good in some sections. The entire area was previously used for agricultural purposes and the land was ripped and cultivated. Currently most sections are overgrown with tall grass and weeds. There are a few structures and ruins of a recent nature on the study area but none have any historic or archaeological significance (**Appendix 3**). The area is located on the southern slope of the *White River*. There are a few low granite rocky outcrops in the study area with scattered trees.⁵⁰ The soil is of a sandy and sedimentary nature. No features of heritage significance were identified in the study area.

⁵⁰ WANDIMA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, BID document for proposed construction of the Mpumalanga Cultural and Creativity Hub, November 2012, p. 2.

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	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:**

Context		
Urban environmental context	No	Vacant land
Rural environmental context	No	NA
Natural environmental context	No	Previous cultivated farm land
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

Context		
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 entire farm was previous cultivated land with a water canal, a dam, a pump house, 4 x residences and the ruins of a previous residence.
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?	Yes	A few low granite rocky outcrops
Does the property have any fresh water sources (springs, streams, rivers) on or alongside it?	Yes	It is bordered by the <i>White River</i> to the north

<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)	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
<i>Other</i>		
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	Person / com munity	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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Landscape of cultural significance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Geological site of scientific/cultural importance	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Archaeological / palaeontological sites	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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			
		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	-	-
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	None present	None
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.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:**

Please note that no archaeological or cultural heritage features were identified in the study area.

- **Field rating:**

None of the features as described in section E, such as the modern cottages, the thatched roof house, ruins of recent structures, pump house, water canal or concrete dam, 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, remainder of the farm *AGRICULTURAL HOLDING no 56JU*, is situated on vacant agricultural land (smallholding), bordering the town of White River. The property is zoned as agricultural and was until recently a working cultivated farm. It is bordered by the *White River* in the north, the R538 in the south and current operational farms to the east and west.

The features that were identified, are all of a modern or recent nature (see sections above) and have no historic or cultural value. They are not close to or in the vicinity of any visible archaeological sites. The geotechnical studies that were done on the property, were investigated for any archaeological remains, but none were present. Mr. Steven Sibiya, who was questioned during the survey, was not aware of any archaeological features or graves in the study area. Based on the findings in this report, Adansonia Heritage Consultants, have no compelling reasons which may prevent the proposed construction of the White River Cultural and Creativity Hub 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., *Baanbrekers van die Laeveld*, SA Country Life Uitgewers, 1994.
- 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 information: Dr. J. Pistorius, Pretoria, 2008-04-17 / 2013-05-23.
- Personal information: F. Prins, Anthropologist, Natal Museum. Interview by Sian Hall, Sept 1999.
- Personal information: Dr. MS. Schoeman, University of Pretoria, 2008-03-27.
- Personal communication: Mr. S. Sibiya, 2013-05-25.

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 construction of the Mpumalanga Cultural and Creativity Hub, November 2012.