



Amafa aKwaZulu-Natali
195 Jabu Ndlovu Street Pietermaritzburg 3200
Telephone 033 3946 543
bernadetp@amafapmb.co.za

07 March 2019

Attention Bernadet Pawandiwa

Heritage Scoping Report

**Proposed Land Sub-Division of Sub 83 (of 43) of Lot WD No. 9734, in extent 20, 7581 ha,
Situated in the Botha's Hill Health Committee Area, Port Natal-Ebhodwe Joint Services Board Area,
Administrative District of Natal.
eThekweni Metro, KwaZulu-Natal**

Project Area and Project description

Sub 83 (of 43) of Lot WD No.9734, in extent 20,7581 ha, situated in the Botha's Hill Health Committee Area, Port Natal-Ebhodwe Joint Services Board Area; has post 2000 fallen under the jurisdiction of the eThekweni Metropolitan Municipality (Outer West), when Health Committees and Joint Services Boards were disbanded.

The parent property, Lot WD No.9734, was a larger land holding of an original Government Grant dated 20 December 1920. Sub 83, the property currently in question was first registered by Certificate of Registered Title No. T2933/1981 to the late Julius Hugo Kietzman. It was purchased by Deed of Sale by Walter Nkinduku Khoza and his wife, Dudu Patience Khoza (married in community of property) from the Kietzman's Estate in 1995.

Sub 83 is located on Main Road 528 one km off the R103 (Old Main Road) at Botha's Hill (see Fig.1). Mrs Dudu Patience Khoza, the widow of the late Mr Walter Nkinduku Khoza, and their children; wish to subdivide Sub 83 in order to facilitate a residential development comprising of freehold plots to be purchased and built upon. This within the bye-laws of the eThekweni Municipality pertaining to clustered residential developments.¹

Observations

eThembeni staff met with family representatives and inspected the aforesaid property on 23 February 2019. Sub 83 lies across two drainage lines on a steep east facing aspect. The dividing interfluvium provides a public access road to the Hlala Kahle private cemetery (D826).

Vegetation cover is largely Sour Coastal Grassveld with remnant Coastal Scarp Forest patches² along riparian lines and less accessible granitic domes. Most of the landholding is however severely infested with alien species, mainly wattle, eucalyptus, lantana, bugweed and Chromolaena sp.

The area is underlain by Maphumulo Group paragneisses and migmatites and are palaeontologically insignificant.³

¹ Information provided by Client, and extracted from Title Deeds (attached).

² Mucina and Rutherford (2012). National Vegetation Types. SANBI. Pretoria.

³ Groenewald, G. 2012. Unpublished Palaeontological Technical Report for KwaZulu-Natal.



Figure 1 Location of Study Area



Figure 2 Two show-platforms had already been cut into the hillslope to attract potential buyers.

Prior to late 19th and early 20th C colonial settlement the study area would have comprised a mosaic of grasslands and coastal scarp forest. The steep aspect would have been eschewed for human settlement in favour of more elevated ridge lines of the escarpment; or the deep colluvial soils along the meanders of the Mgeni river valley, below the steep scarp.

No evidence of archaeological residues and no potential grave locations or evidence of burials was observed. No historical structures are present.

Recommendations

In the absence of any heritage resources of significance, and that no further palaeontological mitigation is required, we accordingly request that Amafa allow the proposed residential development to proceed with no further heritage resource mitigation; suffice that the protocols in Appendix 1 are made binding to any Environmental Authorisations issued.

Please can you notify us timeously, via the loaded SAHRIS Case File, as to the decision of Amafa in this regard.

Yours sincerely



Len van Schalkwyk
Principle Investigator.

Appendix 1

Protocol for the Identification, Protection and Recovery of Heritage Resources During Construction and Operation

It is possible that sub-surface heritage resources could be encountered during the construction phase of this project. The Environmental Control Officer and all other persons responsible for site management and excavation should be aware that indicators of sub-surface sites could include:

- Ash deposits (unnaturally grey appearance of soil compared to the surrounding substrate);
- Bone concentrations, either animal or human;
- Ceramic fragments, including potsherds;
- Stone concentrations that appear to be formally arranged (may indicate the presence of an underlying burial, or represent building/structural remains); and
- Fossilised remains of fauna and flora, including trees.

In the event that such indicator(s) of heritage resources are identified, the following actions should be taken immediately:

- All construction within a radius of at least 20m of the indicator should cease. This distance should be increased at the discretion of supervisory staff if heavy machinery or explosives could cause further disturbance to the suspected heritage resource.
- This area must be marked using clearly visible means, such as barrier tape, and all personnel should be informed that it is a no-go area.
- A guard should be appointed to enforce this no-go area if there is any possibility that it could be violated, whether intentionally or inadvertently, by construction staff or members of the public.
- No measures should be taken to cover up the suspected heritage resource with soil, or to collect any remains such as bone or stone.
- If a heritage practitioner has been appointed to monitor the project, s/he should be contacted and a site inspection arranged as soon as possible.
- If no heritage practitioner has been appointed to monitor the project, the head of archaeology at Amafa's Pietermaritzburg office should be contacted; telephone 033 3946 543.
- The South African Police Services should be notified by an Amafa staff member or an independent heritage practitioner if human remains are identified. No SAPS official may disturb or exhume such remains, whether of recent origin or not.
- All parties concerned should respect the potentially sensitive and confidential nature of the heritage resources, particularly human remains, and refrain from making public statements until a mutually agreed time.
- Any extension of the project beyond its current footprint involving vegetation and/or earth clearance should be subject to prior assessment by a qualified heritage practitioner, taking into account all information gathered during the initial assessment.