

**DESKTOP HERITAGE SURVEY OF THE PROPOSED
MINZOMANZI MINE, UGU DISTRICT
MUNICIPALITY, VULAMEHLO LOCAL
MUNICIPALITY, KZN**

FOR TRIPLO4 SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS

DATE: 17 SEPTEMBER 2019

By Gavin Anderson

**Umlando: Archaeological Surveys and Heritage
Management**

PO Box 10153, Meerensee, 3901

Phone/fax: 035-7531785 Cell: 0836585362

umlando@gmail.com



TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	4
KWAZULU NATAL AMAFA AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE, ACT 05, 2018	8
METHOD	10
Defining significance.....	11
RESULTS	13
DESKTOP STUDY	13
GENERAL COMMENT	17
PALAEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY	17
MANAGEMENT PLAN	18
CONCLUSION.....	18
REFERENCES	18

TABLE OF FIGURES

FIG. 1 GENERAL LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED MINE	5
FIG. 2: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED MINE	6
FIG. 3: TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF THE PROPOSED MINE	7
FIG. 4: LOCATION OF KNOWN HERITAGE SITES IN THE GENERAL AREA	14
FIG. 5: LOCATION OF SETTLEMENTS NEAR THE PROPOSED MINE IN 1937	15
FIG. 6: LOCATION OF SETTLEMENTS NEAR THE PROPOSED MINE IN 1968	16
FIG. 7: PALAEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY MAP	17

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 proposed Minzomanzi mine, is located in the Ugu District Municipality, and Vulamehlo Local Municipality, KZN, about 25km northwest of Umkomaas. The area is referred to as Nthsekombo on the topographical maps and is noticeable for a large granite outcrop.

Umlando was contracted by Triplo4 Sustainable Solutions (PTY) Ltd to undertake the desktop heritage survey of the proposed mining area. It is assumed that open cast mining will occur.

Figures 1 – 3 show the location of the proposed Minzomanzi mine

FIG. 1 GENERAL LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED MINE





FIG. 2: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED MINE



FIG. 3: TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF THE PROPOSED MINE



**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.”

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. This 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.

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. Fig. 4 indicates that there have been no heritage surveys in the study area or surrounds. The area does appear to be in a very sensitive archaeological area, especially for EIA and LIA sites.

Fig. 5 indicates that there are three possible human settlements on the study area in 1937. The 1968 map (fig 6) indicates that there is no settlements in the area, but there are surrounding it. The buildings in fig. 2 post-date 1968.

FIG. 4: LOCATION OF KNOWN HERITAGE SITES IN THE GENERAL AREA





FIG. 5: LOCATION OF SETTLEMENTS NEAR THE PROPOSED MINE IN 1937



FIG. 6: LOCATION OF SETTLEMENTS NEAR THE PROPOSED MINE IN 1968



GENERAL COMMENT

The area is referred to as Ntshekombo. The exact meaning will require further research however it could refer to ‘Ostrich point’ or ‘Rock point’. Regardless of its meaning, large outcrops such as this one tend to be associated with oral history, living heritage and/or the cultural landscape. No information was readily available on the internet regarding this rock; however, interviews with the local community would clarify its significance.

Ntshekombo has also been noted as a potential cultural tourism area (Aurecon 2016).

PALAEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY

The study area is rated as having no palaeontological sensitivity (fig. 7). No mitigation will be required.

FIG. 7: PALAEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY MAP



MANAGEMENT PLAN

The area will need to be surveyed for possible human graves and archaeological sites. The access road will also need to be surveyed once finalised. A Public Participation Process will need to be undertaken regarding the large granite boulder in order to determine its cultural significance. If the boulder has cultural significance, then permission for the mine might not be allowed.

CONCLUSION

A desktop heritage survey was undertaken for the proposed Minzomanzi mine. The desktop noted that human settlements occur in the area abutting the proposed mine. The survey will confirm the presence of these features in relation to the mine footprint. The local community would also need to be interviewed regarding the large granite boulder that might have cultural significance.

REFERENCES

117B_048_35635

3030BA Dududu 1968, 1993

Auecon 2016. Development of a Climate Change Response Strategy for the Ugu District Municipality.