

**RICHARDS BAY-NSEZI ACCESS ROAD, RICHARDS
BAY, KWAZULU-NATAL**

FOR JEFFARES & GREEN

DATE: 14 APRIL 2015

By Gavin Anderson

**Umlando: Archaeological Surveys and Heritage
Management**

PO Box 102532, Meerensee, 3901

Phone/fax: 035-7531785 Fax: 0865445631

Cell: 0836585362



TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	3
NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT OF 1999	Error! Bookmark not defined.
METHOD	9
Defining significance.....	10
RESULTS	12
DESKTOP STUDY	12
FIELD SURVEY.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CONCLUSION.....	16

TABLE OF FIGURES

FIG. 1 GENERAL LOCATION OF	4
FIG. 2A: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE WESTERN SECTION	5
FIG. 2B: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE MIDDLE SECTION.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
FIG. 2C: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE EASTERN SECTION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
FIG. 3A: TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF THE WESTERN SECTION.....	6
FIG. 3B: TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF THE MIDDLE SECTION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
FIG. 3A: TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF THE EASTERN SECTION.	Error! Bookmark not defined.
TABLE 1: SAHRA GRADINGS FOR HERITAGE SITES	Error! Bookmark not defined.
FIG. 4: SCENIC VIEWS AT SOME OF THE UPGRADE AREAS.....	13

INTRODUCTION

Mhlathuze Water currently utilise the public gravel access road from the Western Arterial (Alton) intersection to access the Nsezi Water Treatment Works (Nsezi WTW). There are currently no black top surfaced roads providing access to Nsezi WTW. The current access road to the Nsezi WTW is of a very poor standard, allowing access during summer rainfall months to 4 x 4 and similar type vehicles only. The gravel roads in the vicinity of the Nsezi WTW are currently utilized by numerous State departments and private companies, such as Mhlathuze, Transnet, Eskom, and Mondi. The maintenance of these roads is limited and makes access to the Nsezi WTW very difficult after heavy rains have been experienced in the area.

Mhlathuze Water is considering the options of constructing a new private access road to service the Nsezi Water Treatment Works or upgrading one of the current access roads.

Two alternative roads were proposed for this project. Alternative 1 consists of making a new road that runs adjacent to several servitudes. Alternative 2 consists of upgrading a gravel road to a tar road.

Umlando was subcontracted by Jeffares and Green to undertake the heritage impact assessment.

Figures 1 – 3 indicate the location of the proposed line.

FIG. 1 GENERAL LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA





FIG. 2: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AREA



FIG. 3: TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF THE STUDY AREA



KWAZULU-NATAL HERITAGE ACT NO. 4 OF 2008

“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.

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. 4). These sites include all types of Stone Age and Iron Age sites. No sites occur in the study area. All of these sites have been recorded by Umlando.

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

FIG. 4: LOCATION OF KNOWN HERITAGE SITES NEAR THE STUDY AREA





FIG. 5: STUDY AREA IN 1937



FIG. 6: STUDY AREA IN 1942



The 1937 aerial photographs indicate that there are settlements in the area however, they occur more than 100m from the footprint.

The 1942 (and 1982) topographical map indicates there is one settlement on the road, and that the rest has been affected by the railway. These sites no longer exist. The railway continues for most of the road route.

FIELD SURVEY

A field survey was undertaken in April 2015.

Our previous experience from surveys in this area is that there is a Late, Middle and Early Stone Age layer ~1m below the surface. Fragments of Late Iron Age has been observed as well on these surveys. These are occurrences of artefacts and not sites.

No heritage sites were observed along the route. This is because much of the development is in already disturbed railway, pipeline and/or road reserves. Figure 7 shows some of these areas. Fig. 2 also indicates the extent of the various developments on this area.

Most of Alternative 2 occurs on an existing gravel road. Alternative 1 runs adjacent to Eskom transmission lines, and a water pipeline.

FIG. 7: VIEWS OF THE PROPOSED ROADS



CONCLUSION

A heritage survey was undertaken for the proposed Richards Bay-Nsezi Road. The area has been disturbed by various other developments and no archaeological or heritage related sites or artefacts were noted. Two alternative roads were given, and either would be accepted in terms of the Heritage Impact Assessment.

No further heritage work will be required for this project.