

PHASE 1 HERITAGE RESOURCES SCOPING REPORT

PROPOSED FORESTRY PROJECT NGEVU DEVELOPMENT COMPANY SISONKE DISTRICT KOKSTAD MUNICIPAL AREA KWAZULU-NATAL

Enviroxcellence Environmental Services

4b President Paul Kruger Street
Polokwane
0699

Att: N Mugove

8 August 2013

Survey by Frans E. Roodt & Frans Roodt

Principal investigator: Gavin Whitelaw

SHASA HERITAGE CONSULTANTS cc

Liesl Stegmann 073 216 9912
shasa-heritage@mtn.blackberry.com

Frans Roodt 072 544 6611
shasa-heritage@mobileemail.vodafonesa.co.za

54 Wildebeestfontein S/H
Polokwane
0699

PO BOX 1600
Polokwane
0700

CONTENTS

3	1 Introduction and terms of Reference
4	2 Legislation
5	3 Methodology
	2.1 Sources of information
	2.2 Limitations
	2.3 Categories of significance
	2.4 Terminology
6	4 Description of the proposed development and terrain
6	5 Results of the scoping survey and discussion
	5.1. Intangible Heritage and Social consultation
	5.2 Recent Historical Period
	5.3. Graves
	5.4. Iron Age remains
	5.5. Stone Age remains
7	6 Archaeological and Historical Background information
8	7 Discussion and Recommendations
8	8 Bibliography
	<u>List of figures</u>
7	Fig 1. General view of development area
9	Google image of project
10	Locality Map of Project

1. INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

This survey was conducted in support of an application to establish a commercial forestry plantation (KNDAEA Ref No: DC43/0022/2013). The application constitutes an activity, which may potentially be harmful to heritage resources that may occur in the demarcated area. Shasa Heritage Consultants was appointed to conduct a heritage resources scoping survey of the proposed development area located north-east of Kokstad (refer to map, South Africa 1:50 000 3029 BB) on the farm Lourdes 69. The aim was to determine the presence or not of heritage resources such as archaeological and historical sites and features, graves and places of religious and cultural significance, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the cultural resources management measures that may be required at affected sites / features. This will enable the Applicant to take pro-active measures to limit the adverse effects that the development could have on such heritage resources.

The report thus provides an overview of the heritage resources that may occur in the demarcated area where development is intended. The significance of the heritage resources was assessed in terms of criteria defined in the methodology section. The impact of the proposed development on these resources is indicated and the report recommends mitigation measures that should be implemented to minimize the adverse impact of the proposed development on these heritage resources.

2. LEGISLATION

The management of heritage resources is controlled by the **KWAZULU-NATAL HERITAGE ACT NO. 4 OF 2008**:

Section 2. Application of Act.—(1) The provisions of this Act apply to heritage matters, which includes both the physical and the living or intangible heritage, in the Province.

(2) Where this Act does not regulate a matter pertaining to the protection or management of heritage resources in the Province, the provisions of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999), and the National Heritage Council Act, 1999 (Act No. 11 of 1999), apply in the Province and any reference to “**provincial heritage resources authority**” in the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999, must, unless clearly inappropriate, be construed as reference to the Council.

Section 33. General protection: Structures.—(1) (a) 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.

(b) 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.

(2) The Council may, by notice in the *Gazette*, exempt—

(a) a defined geographical area; or

(b) defined categories of sites within a defined geographical area, from the provisions of subsection

(1) 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.

(3) A notice referred to in subsection (2) may, by notice in the *Gazette*, be amended or withdrawn by the Council.

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

- (a) the grave of a victim of conflict;
- (b) a cemetery made up of such graves; or
- (c) 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.

35. General protection: Traditional burial places.—(1) No grave—

- (a) not otherwise protected by this Act; and
- (b) 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.

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

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

36. General protection: Battlefield sites, archaeological sites, rock art sites, palaeontological sites, historic fortifications, meteorite or meteorite impact sites.—(1) 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.

(2) 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.

(3) 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.

(4) 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.

(5) 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.

(6) (a) 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.

(b) The Council may establish and maintain a provincial repository or repositories for the safekeeping or display of—

- (i) archaeological objects;
- (ii) palaeontological material;
- (iii) ecofacts;
- (iv) objects related to battlefield sites;
- (v) material cultural artefacts; or

(vi) meteorites.

(7) The Council may, subject to such conditions as the Council may determine, loan any object or material referred to in subsection (6) to a national or provincial museum or institution.

(8) No person may, without the prior written approval of the Council having been obtained on written application to the Council, trade in, export or attempt to export from the Province—

(a) any category of archaeological object;

(b) any palaeontological material;

(c) any ecofact;

(d) any object which may reasonably be regarded as having been recovered from a battlefield site;

(e) any material cultural artefact; or

(f) any meteorite.

(9) (a) A person or institution in possession of an object or material referred to in paragraphs

(a) – (f) of subsection (8), must submit full particulars of such object or material, including such information as may be prescribed, to the Council.

(b) An object or material referred to in paragraph (a) must, subject to paragraph (c) and the directives of the Council, remain under the control of the person or institution submitting the particulars thereof.

(c) The ownership of any object or material referred to in paragraph (a) vest in the Provincial Government and the Council is regarded as the custodian on behalf of the Provincial Government.

Chapter 9 of the Act makes provision for Special protection of heritage resources, and Chapter 10 makes provision for heritage resources management requirement.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sources of information

The source of information was primarily the field reconnaissance and referenced literary sources.

A pedestrian survey of the demarcated area was undertaken, during which standard methods of observation were applied. The area was traversed to cover as much of the area as possible. As most archaeological material occur in single or multiple stratified layers beneath the soil surface, special attention was given to disturbances, both man-made such as roads and clearings, as well as those made by natural agents such as burrowing animals and erosion. Locations of heritage remains, when detected, were recorded by means of a GPS (Garmin Etrex 10). Such heritage remains and the general conditions on the terrain were photographed with a Nikon Coolpix L25 Digital camera.

3.2 Limitations

The scoping survey was thorough, but limitations were experienced due to the fact that archaeological sites are generally subterranean and mostly only visible when disturbed. Vegetation was moderate and visibility fair. It is thus possible that sites have been missed.

3.3 Categories of significance

The significance of archaeological sites is ranked into the following categories.

• No significance: sites that do not require mitigation.
• Low significance: sites, which <i>may</i> require mitigation.
• Medium significance: sites, which require mitigation.
• High significance: sites, which must not be disturbed at all.

The significance of an archaeological site is based on the amount of deposit, the integrity of the context, the kind of deposit and the potential to help answer present research questions. Historical structures are defined by Section 34 of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999, while other historical and cultural significant sites, places and features, are generally determined by community preferences.

A crucial aspect in determining the significance and protection status of a heritage resource is often whether or not the sustainable social and economic benefits of a proposed development outweigh the conservation issues at stake. Many aspects must be taken into consideration when determining significance, such as rarity, national significance, scientific importance, cultural and religious significance, and not least, community preferences. When, for whatever reason the protection of a heritage site is not deemed necessary or practical, its research potential must be assessed and mitigated in order to gain data / information which would otherwise be lost. Such sites must be adequately recorded and sampled before being destroyed. These are generally sites graded as of low or medium significance.

3.4 Terminology

- Early Stone Age:** Predominantly the Acheulean hand axe industry complex dating to + 1Myr yrs – 250 000 yrs. before present.
- Middle Stone Age:** Various lithic industries in SA dating from ± 250 000 yr. - 30 000 yrs. before present.
- Late Stone Age:** The period from ± 30 000-yr. to contact period with either Iron Age farmers or European colonists.
- Early Iron Age:** Most of the first millennium AD
- Middle Iron Age:** 10th to 13th centuries AD
- Late Iron Age:** 14th century to colonial period. *The entire Iron Age represents the spread of Bantu speaking peoples.*
- Historical:** Mainly cultural remains of western influence and settlement from AD1652 onwards – mostly structures older than 60 years in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA, though more recent remains can be termed historically significant should the remains hold social significance for the local community. In terms of the East Coast of Southern Africa, influence by the Portuguese in the last 500 years have played a role in the historical past.
- Phase 1 assessment:** Scoping surveys to establish the presence of and to evaluate heritage resources in a given area
- Phase 2 assessments:** In depth culture resources management studies which could include major archaeological excavations, detailed site surveys and mapping / plans of sites, including historical / architectural structures and features. Alternatively, the sampling of sites by collecting material, small test pit excavations or auger sampling is required.
- Sensitive:** Often refers to graves and burial sites although not necessarily a heritage place, as well as ideologically significant sites such as ritual / religious places. *Sensitive* may also refer to an entire landscape / area known for its significant heritage remains.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND TERRAIN

The area can be described as undulating. The geology underlying the study area is dominated by mudstones and sandstones of the Tarkastad Subgroup and the Molteno Formation. In a few places, rocky dolerite outcrops were noted. Vegetation in the area consists of predominantly sour grassland of the Midlands Mistbelt Grassland and Drakensberg Foothill Moist Grassland units (Mucina & Rutherford 2006). The area has been utilized for grazing in the past.

193 ha total area

General GPS co-ordinate: S30° 13' 13.5" E29° 47' 29.1"



Fig 1. General view of proposed development area- North to South

4. RESULTS OF THE SCOPING SURVEY AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INTANGIBLE HERITAGE AND SOCIAL CONSULTATION

No areas of significance were noted in the area.

The author was present during the Public Participation meetings (17 July 2013) and had one-on-one interviews with the farm owners during the survey. Meaningful discussion was held whereby it was understood that in most cases the current owner is descended from the previous owner who occupied the land.

4.2 HISTORICAL PERIOD

No areas or features relating to the historical period were recorded.

4.3 GRAVES

No graves were noted on the site.

4.4 IRON AGE REMAINS

No remains from the Iron Age were recorded in the area. On record in the KwaZulu-Natal Museum is the discovery of a 30 cm long spearhead from a depth of 18–22 inches, somewhere in the vicinity of the Malenga Trading Store west of the Ngevu project site (record dated December 1974). This spearhead is probably of a relatively recent date (i.e. 1800s) because the wider area, with its relatively limited grazing potential, is not especially favourable for Iron Age agriculturists

4.5 STONE AGE REMAINS

No remains from the Stone Age period were recorded in the area. On record in the KwaZulu-Natal Museum are seven Stone Age sites. Artefacts were recovered from originally buried contexts, exposed by erosion or other disturbances. In one case the artefact came from a river gravel. In all cases but one the material represents the Early and Middle Stone Ages.

5. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Early, Middle and Later Stone Age material occurs in KwaZulu-Natal. Early Stone Age material occurs primarily along the coast and in savanna areas, most especially in the river valleys, and generally in secondary contexts. The occurrences include artefacts at least as old as 2 million years. Middle Stone Age artefacts have a wider distribution that extends into and across the Drakensberg. Many of the recorded 'sites' comprise artefacts in a secondary context, but more important factory and knapping sites exposed in donga erosion also occur. Even more important are rock shelters with deep Middle Stone Age deposits, found both east and west of the escarpment. The Later Stone Age is better known, with evidence of shelter occupation in the southern Drakensberg between 12000 and 8000 years ago. There are also, of course, more than 600 known Later Stone Age rock-art sites in the Drakensberg and elsewhere. The wider Kokstad area – 'Nomansland' – is particularly well-known for its exquisite rock art. Based on research in the Thukela Basin, it seems Later Stone Age people preferred grassland environments; good evidence of occupation in savanna areas occurs only from about 2000 years ago when Iron Age farmers first settled in the region (G.Whitelaw pers comm).

According to the most recent archaeological cultural distribution sequences by Huffman (2007), KwaZulu-Natal falls within the distribution area of various Iron Age groupings originating out of both the Urewe Tradition (eastern stream of migration) and the Kalundu Tradition (western stream of migration). Because Iron Age farmers favoured areas with arable soil, sweetveld grazing, and wood for industrial and domestic use, Iron Age sites are unlikely to occur in the project area. The possible exceptions are sites of the Moor Park and subsequent facies, dating from AD 1300. African farmers, however, did settle in sourveld grasslands during the 1800s as a result of various colonial and other forces.

The area around Kokstad, also known as East Griqualand, can be directly attributed to the Griqua diaspora over South Africa and to the Mfecane/Difacane period of South Africa's history.

Adam Kok III, left Griquatown in 1820 with a group of tribesmen to escape the advancing Voortrekkers and British. After a group settled in Phillipolis, a further group under his leadership crossed the Drakensberg and entered what was called "Nomansland".

"Nomansland" derived its name from the fact that it lay between the Cape and Natal colonies, and was largely without settled communities, either European or African. Instead, Nomansland was

occupied by hunter-gatherer-raider communities such as the AmaTola. Various factors can be contributed to this state, such as Shakan wars, climatic changes and the various roles that slavery played in the formation of the area's history. These issues are the subject of ongoing research.

Adam Kok III, the leader of the group of impoverished Griquas who settled in the Kokstad area, proclaimed the area Griqualand East.

The Griqua people had always been a small, ruling minority of the population of Griqualand East. Once independent Griqua rule was ended, the Xhosa-speaking Pondo people, who had long constituted the majority of the Griqualand East population, came to own increasing amounts of land in the area, together with newly-arriving European settlers. These demographic factors led to a further dilution of Griqua identity and a century later, under Apartheid, the territory was incorporated into the Xhosa "homeland" of the Transkei.

Prior to British annexation of Griqualand East, King Mdotyana became the king over all the tribes in the Umzimkhulu, Harding, Bulwer, Underberg and IXopo districts.

AmaBhaca are mainly found in the small towns such as Mount Frere, uMzimkhulu, Xopo and some surrounding areas.

Thus it can be construed that the area has a rich, albeit contested, history of settlement, by all population groups, amaBhaca, Griqua and colonial peoples.

The "Nomansland" region also bears testimony to the 'creolisation' of marginalised groups during the 1800s, giving rise to the so-called AmaTola. Often described as raiding "bushmen", they had access to horses, carried muskets, and wore wide-brimmed hats. Many who were rainmakers found favour as 'wardoctors' with local groups. A mixture of historical record and rock art in the area bears testimony to this (Challis 2012).

6. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey was conducted with the assistance of GPS co-ordinates provided by the environmental consultants, as the owners were unavailable on the day. For consultative purposes we relied on the public participation meeting where no objections were raised with regard to the development.

No management or mitigation measures are required. This report serves to confirm that *no significant heritage resources* such as archaeological or historical material or places of social or religious significance were found on the site of the proposed development. *From a heritage resources management point of view, we have no objection with regard to the development.*

The discovery of previously undetected subterranean heritage remains on the terrain must be reported to the KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Authority or the archaeologist, and may require further mitigation measures.

7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Challis, S. 2012. *Creolisation on the Nineteenth-century Frontiers of Southern Africa: A Case Study of the AmaTola 'Bushmen' in the Maloti-Drakensburg*. Journal of Southern African Studies 38;2 p265-280.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age. The Archaeology of Pre-colonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa*. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Mucina, L and Rutherford, M.C. 2006. *The Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland*. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

www.sahistory.org

www.tokencoins.com/article/kokstad.htm




FRANS E ROODT(*BA Hons Archaeology, UNISA*)




FRANS ROODT (*BA Hons, MA Archaeology, Post Grad. Dip. Museology; UP*)
Principal Investigator for SHASA Heritage Consultants

GAVIN WHITELAW



Google image of project area

Topographical Map of cluster 5



1:50 000

0 0.5 1 2 Kilometers

LEGEND	
	River
	Road
	Powerline
	Contour
	Cluster 5
	Vegetation
	Farm Boundary
	Water-body

CLUSTER SITES
Nggokozweni Farm - 193 ha
Ngevu Development company - 100ha

Prepared By:
ENVIROXCELLENCE
Date: 2013/01/28
Producer: Kgalalelo Shai
Topo sheet: 3029BB

Locality Map of Project