

**DESKTOP HERITAGE SURVEY OF THE WIDENING
OF PARTS OF THE R618, NONGOMA, KWAZULU-
NATAL**

FOR WSP

DATE: 27 MARCH 2014

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
KWAZULU-NATAL HERITAGE ACT NO. 4 OF 2008	7
METHOD	9
Defining significance.....	10
RESULTS	12
CONCLUSION.....	17

TABLE OF FIGURES

FIG. 1 GENERAL LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA.....	4
FIG. 2: AERIAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AREA	5
FIG. 3: TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF THE STUDY AREA	6
FIG. 4: LOCATION OF KNOWN HERITAGE SITES NEAR THE STUDY AREA.....	13
FIG. 5: STUDY AREA IN 1969	14
FIG. 6: PLAN OF ROAD WIDENING 0 – 1 KM.....	15
FIG. 7: PLAN OF ROAD WIDENING 1 – 2 KM.....	16

INTRODUCTION

Umlando was requested by WSP to undertake an HIA for the proposed road widening of a section of the R618 20km northwest of Nongoma, Kwa-Zulu-Natal (fig.'s 1 – 3). Umlando suggested that since the area has very low archaeological and palaeontological sensitivity, a desktop study requesting an exemption from a full HIA was undertaken.

The road widening will make the corner less sharp, and thus decrease the amount of traffic accidents.

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- A notice referred to in subsection (2) may, by notice in the *Gazette*, be amended or withdrawn by the Council.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

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 sites and Late Iron Age and Historical Period sites. No sites occur in the study area.

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

The 1969 topographical map (fig. 5) indicates that the road was already in existence, and that no houses occur in the study area.

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



FIG. 5: STUDY AREA IN 1969




FIG. 6: PLAN OF ROAD WIDENING 0 – 1 KM





FIG. 7: PLAN OF ROAD WIDENING 1 – 2 KM



The widening will be a maximum of ~30m (from one side) (fig. 6-7), and will thus have a small footprint. We were not informed of any quarries or borrow pits related to the road widening.

The road works occurs on a slight slope. The slope drops ~20m from the western to the eastern side of the bend in the road. This would be mostly unsuitable for human houses unless the area was terraced. Fig. 5 also indicates that the buildings that occur near the road today do not predate 1969.

The Ngome Forest was declared in 1905 and thus there should be no (in)formal human occupation in the study area for at least 100 years.

SAHRA's Palaeontological sensitive map indicates that this area is in the "grey" zone and is thus insignificant in terms of palaeontology. The grey zone borders the red zone: a highly sensitive area, however the project does not affect this area.

If any archaeological sites did occur in the area, then they would have been cleared during the various previous road works and upgrades.

CONCLUSION

A desktop heritage survey was undertaken for the road widening of a bend on the R618, 20km northwest of Nongoma. Umlando suggested that a desktop study requesting an HIA exemption be undertaken, rather than a Phase 1 survey.

No heritage sites were noted in the area during the desktop study. There was also very low chance of archaeological and palaeontological sites occurring in the affected area.

We suggest that the road upgrade be exempt from a full HIA.