

**DESKTOP HERITAGE SURVEY OF THE
DEVELOPMENT OF A HOUSING ESTATE -
QUEENSBURGH, KWAZULU-NATAL**

FOR K2M ENVIRONMENTAL

DATE: 22 MAY 2019

By Gavin Anderson

**Umlando: Archaeological Surveys and Heritage
Management**

PO Box 102532, Meerensee, 3901

Phone/fax: 035-7531785

Cell: 0836585362



TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	4
KWAZULU NATAL AMAFA AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE, ACT 05, 2018	10
METHOD	12
Defining significance.....	13
RESULTS	16
DESKTOP STUDY	16
PALAEONTOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT.....	21
FIELD SURVEY.....	22
CONCLUSION.....	22
REFERENCES	22
EXPERIENCE OF THE HERITAGE CONSULTANT	23
DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.....	23

TABLE OF FIGURES

Fig. 1 General Location Of The Study Area	5
Fig. 2: Aerial Overview Of The Study Area.....	6
Fig. 3: Topographical Overview Of The Study Area.....	7
Fig. 4a: Scenic Views Of The Study Area	8
Fig. 4b: Scenic Views Of The Study Area	9
Table 1: SAHRA Gradings For Heritage Sites	15
Fig. 5: Location Of Known Heritage Sites Near The Study Area	17
Fig. 6: Original Surveyor General Map Of The Property To The South (1847).....	18
Fig. 7: Study Area In 1937	19
Fig. 8: Study Area In 1942.....	20
Fig. 9: Palaeontological Sensitivity Map	21

Abbreviations

HP	Historical Period
IIA	Indeterminate Iron Age
LIA	Late Iron Age
EIA	Early Iron Age
ISA	Indeterminate Stone Age
ESA	Early Stone Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
LSA	Late Stone Age
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
PIA	Palaeontological Impact Assessment

INTRODUCTION

The applicant, Mr. Jose Froes proposes the construction of an Estate Development which involves the Construction of 47 sectional title units which includes supporting infrastructure. The extent of the project area is 7.8 ha, however, only a portion of land will be utilized for the Estate Development whilst the balance of the land will be set aside for the eThekweni Municipality and form part of the Durban Open Space System (D'MOSS).

The site for the proposed development is situated on the Rem of Erf 1414 Queensburgh, that being on 37 Middleton Road, eThekweni Municipality. This Erf used to be called Roose Fontein 85.

The land on the proposed project area is currently vacant and comprises of two drainage lines. The project area is surrounded by housing infrastructure on the east, west and north bounds, with the M7 forming part of the southern boundary.

The proposed activity will constitute:

- a. Construction of 47 housing units.
- b. Removal of vegetation on certain portions of the land.

K2M Environmental (Pty) Ltd has been appointed by the applicant as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) responsible for undertaking the Basic Assessment. K2M Environmental subcontracted Umlando to undertake the HIA for this project.

Fig.'s 1 – 4 show the location of the development.

Fig. 1 General Location Of The Study Area




Fig. 2: Aerial Overview Of The Study Area



Fig. 3: Topographical Overview Of The Study Area




Fig. 4a: Scenic Views Of The Study Area



Fig. 4b: Scenic Views Of The Study Area



KWAZULU NATAL AMAFA AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE, ACT 05, 2018

“General protection: Structures.—

- No structure which is, or which may reasonably be expected to be older than 60 years, may be demolished, altered or added to without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- Where the Council does not grant approval, the Council must consider special protection in terms of sections 38, 39, 40, 41 and 43 of Chapter 9.
- The Council may, by notice in the *Gazette*, exempt—
- A defined geographical area; or
- defined categories of sites within a defined geographical area, from the provisions of subsection where the Council is satisfied that heritage resources falling in the defined geographical area or category have been identified and are adequately protected in terms of sections 38, 39, 40, 41 and 43 of Chapter 9.
- A notice referred to in subsection (2) may, by notice in the *Gazette*, be amended or withdrawn by the Council.

General protection: Graves of victims of conflict.—No person may damage, alter, exhume, or remove from its original position—

- the grave of a victim of conflict;
- a cemetery made up of such graves; or
- any part of a cemetery containing such graves, without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- General protection: Traditional burial places.—
- No grave—
- not otherwise protected by this Act; and
- not located in a formal cemetery managed or administered by a local authority, may be damaged, altered, exhumed, removed from its original position, or otherwise disturbed without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.

The Council may only issue written approval once the Council is satisfied that—

- the applicant has made a concerted effort to consult with communities and individuals who by tradition may have an interest in the grave; and
- the applicant and the relevant communities or individuals have reached agreement regarding the grave.

General protection: Battlefield sites, archaeological sites, rock art sites, palaeontological sites, historic fortifications, meteorite or meteorite impact sites.—

- No person may destroy, damage, excavate, alter, write or draw upon, or otherwise disturb any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, meteorite or meteorite impact site without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- Upon discovery of archaeological or palaeontological material or a meteorite by any person, all activity or operations in the general vicinity of such material or meteorite must cease forthwith and a person who made the discovery must submit a written report to the Council without delay.
- The Council may, after consultation with an owner or controlling authority, by way of written notice served on the owner or controlling authority, prohibit any activity considered by the Council to be inappropriate within 50 metres of a rock art site.
- No person may exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb, damage, destroy, own or collect any object or material associated with any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, meteorite or meteorite impact site without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- No person may bring any equipment which assists in the detection of metals and archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, or excavation equipment onto any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, or meteorite impact site, or

- use similar detection or excavation equipment for the recovery of meteorites, without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council.
- The ownership of any object or material associated with any battlefield site, archaeological site, rock art site, palaeontological site, historic fortification, meteorite or meteorite impact site, on discovery, vest in the Provincial Government and the Council is regarded as the custodian on behalf of the Provincial Government.” (KZN Heritage Act of 2008)

METHOD

The method for Heritage assessment consists of several steps.

The first step forms part of the desktop assessment. Here we would consult the database that has been collated by Umlando. These databases contains archaeological site locations and basic information from several provinces (information from Umlando surveys and some colleagues), most of the national and provincial monuments and battlefields in Southern Africa (<http://www.vuvuzela.com/googleearth/monuments.html>) and cemeteries in southern Africa (information supplied by the Genealogical Society of Southern Africa). We use 1st and 2nd edition 1:50 000 topographical and 1937 aerial photographs where available, to assist in general location and dating of buildings and/or graves. The database is in Google Earth format and thus used as a quick reference when undertaking desktop studies. Where required we would consult with a local data recording centre, however these tend to be fragmented between different institutions and areas and thus difficult to access at times. We also consult with an historical architect, palaeontologist, and an historian where necessary.

The survey results will define the significance of each recorded site, as well as a management plan.

All sites are grouped according to low, medium, and high significance for the purpose of this report. Sites of low significance have no diagnostic artefacts or features. Sites of medium significance have diagnostic artefacts or features and these sites tend to be sampled. Sampling includes the collection of artefacts for future analysis. All diagnostic pottery, such as rims, lips, and decorated sherds are sampled, while bone, stone, and shell are mostly noted. Sampling usually occurs on most sites. Sites of high significance are excavated and/or extensively sampled. Those sites that are extensively sampled have high research potential, yet poor preservation of features.

Defining significance

Heritage sites vary according to significance and several different criteria relate to each type of site. However, there are several criteria that allow for a general significance rating of archaeological sites.

These criteria are:

1. State of preservation of:

- 1.1. Organic remains:
 - 1.1.1. Faunal
 - 1.1.2. Botanical
- 1.2. Rock art
- 1.3. Walling
- 1.4. Presence of a cultural deposit
- 1.5. Features:
 - 1.5.1. Ash Features
 - 1.5.2. Graves
 - 1.5.3. Middens
 - 1.5.4. Cattle byres
 - 1.5.5. Bedding and ash complexes

2. Spatial arrangements:

- 2.1. Internal housing arrangements
- 2.2. Intra-site settlement patterns
- 2.3. Inter-site settlement patterns

3. Features of the site:

- 3.1. Are there any unusual, unique or rare artefacts or images at the site?
- 3.2. Is it a type site?
- 3.3. Does the site have a very good example of a specific time period, feature, or artefact?

4. Research:

- 4.1. Providing information on current research projects
- 4.2. Salvaging information for potential future research projects

5. Inter- and intra-site variability

- 5.1. Can this particular site yield information regarding intra-site variability, i.e. spatial relationships between various features and artefacts?
- 5.2. Can this particular site yield information about a community's social relationships within itself, or between other communities?

6. Archaeological Experience:

- 6.1. The personal experience and expertise of the CRM practitioner should not be ignored. Experience can indicate sites that have potentially significant aspects, but need to be tested prior to any conclusions.

7. Educational:

- 7.1. Does the site have the potential to be used as an educational instrument?
- 7.2. Does the site have the potential to become a tourist attraction?
- 7.3. The educational value of a site can only be fully determined after initial test-pit excavations and/or full excavations.

8. Other Heritage Significance:

- 8.1. Palaeontological sites
- 8.2. Historical buildings
- 8.3. Battlefields and general Anglo-Zulu and Anglo-Boer sites
- 8.4. Graves and/or community cemeteries

8.5. Living Heritage Sites

8.6. Cultural Landscapes, that includes old trees, hills, mountains, rivers, etc related to cultural or historical experiences.

The more a site can fulfill the above criteria, the more significant it becomes. Test-pit excavations are used to test the full potential of an archaeological deposit. This occurs in Phase 2. These test-pit excavations may require further excavations if the site is of significance (Phase 3). Sites may also be mapped and/or have artefacts sampled as a form of mitigation. Sampling normally occurs when the artefacts may be good examples of their type, but are not in a primary archaeological context. Mapping records the spatial relationship between features and artefacts.

The above significance ratings allow one to grade the site according to SAHRA's grading scale. This is summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: SAHRA Gradings For Heritage Sites

SITE SIGNIFICANCE	FIELD RATING	GRADE	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION
High Significance	National Significance	Grade 1	Site conservation / Site development
High Significance	Provincial Significance	Grade 2	Site conservation / Site development
High Significance	Local Significance	Grade 3A / 3B	
High Medium Significance	/ Generally Protected A		Site conservation or mitigation prior to development / destruction
Medium Significance	Generally Protected B		Site conservation or mitigation / test excavation / systematic sampling / monitoring prior to or during development / destruction
Low Significance	Generally Protected C		On-site sampling monitoring or no archaeological mitigation required prior to or during development / destruction

RESULTS

DESKTOP STUDY

The desktop study consisted of analysing various maps for evidence of prior habitation in the study area, as well as for previous archaeological surveys. The archaeological database indicates that there are archaeological sites in the general area (fig. 5). These sites include all types of Stone Age, Iron Age and Historical sites. No sites occur in the study area.

No national monuments, battlefields, or historical cemeteries are known to occur in the study area.

The Surveyor General maps for Roose Fontein 85 have not been uploaded onto their system. However, the property to the south, Bellair indicates that Roose Fontein was surveyed around 1847 ACE (fig. 6).

The 1937 aerial photographs indicate that there are no settlements or buildings in the study area (fig. 7).

The 1942 1:50 000 topographical map indicates that there are no buildings or settlements in the study area (fig. 8).

The desktop suggests that it is unlikely that there will be heritage sites in the study area.

Fig. 5: Location Of Known Heritage Sites Near The Study Area




Fig. 6: Original Surveyor General Map Of The Property To The South (1847)





Fig. 7: Study Area In 1937¹



¹ 117B_051_36540

Fig. 8: Study Area In 1942



PALAEONTOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The proposed effected area is in an area of low palaeontological sensitivity (fig. 9). No further PIA assessment is required.

Fig. 9: Palaeontological Sensitivity Map



COLOUR	SENSITIVITY	REQUIRED ACTION
RED	VERY HIGH	field assessment and protocol for finds is required
ORANGE/YELLOW	HIGH	desktop study is required and based on the outcome of the desktop study, a field assessment is likely
GREEN	MODERATE	desktop study is required
BLUE	LOW	no palaeontological studies are required however a protocol for finds is required
GREY	INSIGNIFICANT/ZERO	no palaeontological studies are required
WHITE/CLEAR	UNKNOWN	these areas will require a minimum of a desktop study. As more information comes to light, SAHRA will continue to populate the map.

FIELD SURVEY

A field survey was undertaken on the 19 May 2019. The area is under dense vegetation and there had been some clearance (Fig. 4a – 4b). Most of the study area is on a steep incline that would not support human occupation.

There were several transects made by Heavy Mobile Equipment along the one contour. This area was surveyed and only modern debris was noted.

No archaeological material was noted.

The development should be exempt from further HIA work.

CONCLUSION

A heritage survey was undertaken for the proposed Middleton Road housing development. While the area was under dense vegetation some areas had been cleared enough for an adequate survey. Most of the property occurs on steep slopes that would not have been conducive for archaeological sites.

No heritage sites were observed in the study area and no further mitigation is required.

REFERENCES

Maps

2930DD_2931CC Durban 1942, 2000

117B_051_36540

Database:

Natal Museum Site Record Database

SAHRIS Database

Umlando Database

EXPERIENCE OF THE HERITAGE CONSULTANT

Gavin Anderson has a M. Phil (in archaeology and social psychology) degree from the University of Cape Town. Gavin has been working as a professional archaeologist and heritage impact assessor since 1995. He joined the Association of Professional Archaeologists of Southern Africa in 1998 when it was formed. Gavin is rated as a Principle Investigator with expertise status in Rock Art, Stone Age and Iron Age studies. In addition to this, he was worked on both West and East Coast shell middens, Anglo-Boer War sites, and Historical Period sites.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

I, Gavin Anderson, declare that I am an independent specialist consultant and have no financial, personal or other interest in the proposed development, nor the developers or any of their subsidiaries, apart from fair remuneration for work performed in the delivery of heritage assessment services. There are no circumstances that compromise the objectivity of my performing such work.



Gavin Anderson
Archaeologist/Heritage Impact Assessor