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A Overall heritage Statement

A1. Introduction

Dr. Debbie Whelan of Archaic Consulting was approached by Mr. Rory Wilkinson of Tongaat Hulett Properties to carry out a full heritage assessment of the current landholdings of the Shongweni Estate, Hillcrest District, Thekweni Municipality Outer West. The heritage assessment is carried out in terms of the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Heritage Act, no 4 of 2008 and the National Heritage Resources Act no 25 of 1999. It aims to identify archaeological sites, as well as structures and elements of the built environment that are either of significance, or over the age of 60 years.

These landholdings include the Remainder of Erf 79 Assagay, Remainder of Portion 2 of the farm Botha’s Half-Way House 921, The farm Shongweni 15346, Remainder of Portion 24 of the farm Summerveld 14226 and the Remainder of the farm Kirkfalls, 14227.

Whilst Archaic Consulting is able to research the built and cultural environment and historic landscapes, it is unable to carry out surveys and comment on heritage of an archaeological nature. Thus, eThembeni Cultural Heritage worked in association. The two reports are presented discretely, with the Executive Summaries of both combined in section A2.

A2. Combined Heritage Executive Summary Statement

Architectural and historical landscape heritage
Of all the architectural sites and historic structures which comprise the Shongweni Estates, little is of profound heritage status. However, the following must be noted:

- The historical landscape is inevitably tied with the production of mono-crops, and its associated labour compounds, and central homestead. Its primary association is with a single family, the McIntoshes, who started the Durban County Wattle Syndicate, and in whose name it remained until the 1960s.
- The house at Waterfall Farm (S29°48'06.66” E30°44'51.40”) and the associated outbuildings have minimal architectural, technical and scientific value. The farmhouse has medium historical and social value, given its association with both James McIntosh and the Durban County Wattle Syndicate.
- However, even though the house has lost much of its architectural appeal, there is little left in the Hillcrest area which fully represents buildings of this period. There is thus an opportunity for reuse of the farmhouse. This would better serve removing the accretions, namely the enclosed portico to the south west, the extended veranda and the addition to the south, in order to arrive at a more compact, architecturally pleasing structure. More research needs to be carried out on the house in this regard. Furthermore, given the topophilic quality of the garden, it is recommended that this be retained in any new development. It is recommended that the outbuildings associated directly with the farmhouse be demolished should this route be pursued.
- For the two main groups of labourers compounds, (S29°48'33.45” E30°45'13.23” and S29°48'35.38” E30°44'33.81”) it is suggested that even though these structures do not fall within the ambit of the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Heritage Act no 4 of 2008, there is opportunity for reuse of what are, at face value, solid and well designed buildings.
- For two of the Estate Management Cottages (S29°48'30.57” E30°44'44.11”) and S29°48'06.62” E30°44'33.74”), it is recommended that the established gardens be retained where possible, as they add to the footprint of history.
- For the site of the ruin by the Umhlutuzana River (S29°47'55.18” E30°45'00.30”), it is recommended that during any bush clearing and excavation, an archaeologist is present in a monitoring capacity.

Archaeological heritage
- There is little remnant on the property of any archaeological value, given the extent and period over which the land has been disturbed. There is, however, concrete evidence of Middle Stone Age occupation at the Mhlutuzana Shelter, close to the site.
- There are 3 known graves on the site at GPS co-ordinates S29°48.166”; E30°43.930’. All graves have high heritage significance and are protected in terms of legislation. In the process of ongoing development of the property it is possible that further human remains may be exposed, and these must be addressed appropriately according to age.
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B1. Introduction:

Debbie Whelan of Archaic Consulting is the lead investigator in this assessment, assisted by Len van Schalkwyk and Elizabeth Wahl from eThembeni Cultural Heritage.

This section of the document deals primarily with the built and historical environment, and the archaeology section will follow in the second part.

B2. Methodology:

Prior to visiting the site, an aerial survey was conducted using both Google Earth and the 1937 aerial photograph of the area in order to pinpoint sites of interest. The aerial photograph (see Fig 3) shows extensive planting of timber. This was supported by the Land Registers which show the Durban and County Wattle Company purchasing up large tracts of land on these farms from the turn of the 20th century. This established that there was little in the way of built structure apart from the main Waterfall farmhouse, which existed at that point in time.

On the 10th April 2012, Debbie Whelan from Archaic Consulting conducted a site inspection of the Shongweni Estate lands, in agreement with the Estates Manager, Mr. Ryan Holmes. This was carried out in the form of inspecting pre-identified areas from Google Earth and the 1937 aerial photograph, as well as identifying any modifications or structures in situ. Areas consisting of clumps of established trees were checked for ruins.

The information garnered in the land registers offered search terms for archival research and this was carried out at the Provincial Archives Repository in Pietermaritzburg, there being little of import on the database for the Durban Archives Repository. Given the dearth of publications in this district on the early history, the two known works ‘Pioneer’s Progress’ (O’Keefe 1988) and Lest We Forget’ (Camp 1999) were consulted. In addition, the books
associated with the railroad, particularly ‘Twentieth Century Impressions of Natal’ (Lloyds, 1906) were also consulted.

This report covers the inspection of all aspects of the built environment, and assesses them in terms of their heritage value. It is to be noted that Archaic Consulting also inspected the site of Delville Wood Station, in order to establish any value in the associated railway tunnels, despite the fact that this is not situated on Tongaat Hulett Shongweni Estate Property.

Fig 1: Sites identified for discussion

1: Waterfall Farmhouse- currently Tongaat Hulett Headquarters
2: Site of ruin by Umhlatuzana River
3: Estate Management House 1
4: 2 Labour Cottages
5: Full time labour cottages
6: Estate Management House 2
7: Seasonal Labour compound
8: Fire Lookout tower
9: Delville Wood Station
10: Signal Tower
11: Estate Management House 3
B3. Executive Summary

Of all of the architectural sites and historic structures which comprise the Shongweni Estates, little is of profound heritage status. However, the following must be noted:

- The historical landscape is inevitably tied with the production of mono-crops, and its associated labour compounds, and central homestead. Its primary association is with a single family, the Mcintoshes, who started the Durban County Wattle Syndicate, and in whose name it remained until the 1960s.

- The house at Waterfall Farm (S29°48'06.66" E30°44'51.40'”) and the associated outbuildings have minimal architectural, technical and scientific value. The farmhouse has medium historical and social value, given its association with both James Mcintosh and the Durban County Wattle Syndicate.

- However, even though the house has lost much of its architectural appeal, there is little left in the Hillcrest area which fully represents buildings of this period. There is thus an opportunity for reuse of the farmhouse. This would be better served removing the accretions, namely the enclosed portico to the south west, the extended veranda and the addition to the south, in order to arrive at a more compact, architecturally pleasing structure. More research needs to be carried out on the house in this regard. Furthermore, given the topophilic quality of the garden, it is recommended that this be retained in any new development. It is recommended that the outbuildings associated directly with the farmhouse be demolished should this route be pursued.

- For the two main groups of labourers compounds, (S29°48'33.45” E30°45'13.23” and S29°48'35.35” E30°44'33.81’”) it is suggested that even though these structures do not fall within the ambit of the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Heritage Act no 4 of 2008, there is opportunity for reuse of what are, at face value, solid and well designed buildings.

- For two of the Estate Management Cottages (S29°48'30.57” E30°44'44.11” and S29°48'06.62” E30°44'33.74”), it is recommended that the established gardens be retained where possible, as they add to the footprint of history.

- For the site of the ruin by the Umhlatuzana River (S29°47'55.18” E30°45'00.30’”), it is recommended that during any bush clearing and excavation, an archaeologist is present in a monitoring capacity.
B4. Background to the properties:

4.1 History

The parent farms which make up the contemporary landholdings of the Tongaat Hulett Shongweni Estate consist of the large properties Waterfall and Kirkman, as well as portions of Albinia. Most of the landholdings are part of those originally purchased/created by Joseph McIntosh, Byrne Settler, who had business interests in the Durban County Wattle Syndicate. James McIntosh had arrived from Scotland in 1869 and first purchased Kirkman. Camp (1999:27) notes that it was a well-known farm in the early 20th century, and was renamed ‘Waterfall’ due to the two ‘magnificent’ falls on the Umhlatsuzana River within its boundaries.

Kirkman 915 was a 2273 acre farm granted to Joseph Kirkman in 1850. He sold this to Clement John Hill in 1874 who created a subdivision of 1815 acres, Sub A which was sold to James McIntosh in 1880. This forms part of the Kirkfalls property. Waterfall 948 was a 3388 acre grant to Francis Collison in 1851. He sold this to James McIntosh in 1880, and in 1907 it was registered in the name of the Durban County Wattle Syndicate, of which McIntosh was a major shareholder. Of this, in 1919 the Subdivision Delville Wood Station of 10 acres was created and sold to Durban Corporation. Other subdivisions were excised, for the rail and road access, and in 1958, the Remainder of Waterfall was transferred to Durban County Wattle Syndicate Ltd, and consolidated into Kirkfalls.

Subdivision A of Albinia, to the north was also an early allotment. It was part of a much larger farm originally granted to James Harrison in 1867. This was sold to William Gillitt in 1879, and remained reasonably intact for some time, until the railway came through at the turn of the 20th century and Subdivisions NGR and NGR2 were created in 1901 and 1906 respectively. Notably, the Subdivision ‘Hillcrest’ forming the core of the current day town was allotted to a number of members of the Gillitt family, and Subdivision A was transferred into the name of Albert Edward Gillitt. William Gillitt had died in 1899 and it took some time before his Estate was wound up. Subdivision A of Albinia appears to have remained relatively undeveloped, as the 1937 aerial photograph in Fig 3 shows. However, the Land Registers show many land transactions and ultimately, the contemporary description, 491 of 3 of Albinia consisting of 267 acres was transferred into his Deceased Estate in the early 1960s.

Other points of interest are the purchase of lands around Summerveld by the Berlin Missionaries in 1894, who sold it to the Durban County Wattle Syndicate in 1930. Other land transactions show increasing use for equine sports and training, establishing the Jockey Academy and the Polo Grounds. In 1969 land was transferred for the Polo Pony Hotel.

1958 appears as a landmark year with consolidation of lands forming Kirkfalls and Summerveld by the Durban County Wattle Syndicate. It is known that at this point, wattle was becoming increasingly unprofitable due to the increase in the manufacture and sophistication of plastics post-World War II. It is suspected that large tracts of the original wattle plantations were put under cane from this time onwards.

A small sliver of land falls adjacent to Subdivision A of Albinia. Although little of significance is found towards the Kirkman farm area, this farm known as Botha’s Half Way House was a grant of 310 acres to Cornelius Botha. O’Keefe describes Cornelius Botha as a runaway serving on British merchant ships. He captained the Eleanor, which was eventually wrecked off Durban Bay in 1839. A recipient of land grants by the Dutch Volksraad, he was also an appointed assistant magistrate, and turned his hand to many other pursuits. He took over the accommodation rooms known as Elliot’s Albany Hotel at the foot of Botha’s Hill in 1847, running it sporadically until it was let to JF Smith (O’Keefe 1988:91). In 1876 this property was transferred to Elizabeth Cato, and to John Coote Field in the same year. In 1886 it was purchased by William Gillitt, and Subdivision A was registered in the name of Albert Gillitt. The Land Register notes that in 1912 the Durban (Natal) Wattle Company Ltd purchased the Remainder from William Gillitt.
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4.2 Historical Landscape

The land in this area being well watered and reasonably sheltered resulted in it being favourable for settlement from early on. These aspects are discussed in the accompanying Archaeological Report by eThembeni Cultural Heritage in section C.

For the European settlers, it is evident that it was similarly desirable land: in this instance it was close to the port at Durban and therefore any markets, but also close to the Durban-Pietermaritzburg wagon road which tracked up Botha’s Hill. From a farming/agricultural perspective there is not much evidence of its use in farming early on, particularly borne out by the fact that McIntosh was a transport rider, and a successful one at that. Many early settlers turned their hands to such pursuits as the land, climate and soils were unfamiliar and difficult to make productive. This is possibly why McIntosh moved so intensively into wattle at the turn of the 20th century, making it one of the largest wattle plantations in the district. The move to sugar was inevitable, and occurred consistently across the province from the end of the 1950s onwards, once the wattle and general timber price had slumped in the face of more practical and enduring plastic goods.

For the homestead, it is most likely that the core of the building was constructed around 1880 when James McIntosh purchased Subdivision A. Its access was not along the current Shongweni Road, but rather dipped down from the centre of Hillcrest beyond where the present day Heritage Centre is situated (See fig 2).

Fig 2: 1940 Topocadastral map 2930DD2931CC showing dotted tracks off towards Waterfall farm.

The hospitality of Waterfall Farm was widely known, and over weekends between twenty and forty guests would arrive by carriage, and later by cars. The bowling green was the only one between Durban and Maritzburg, and amongst the well-known Natal tennis players who used the court, were Colin Robbins and Billy Tapscott. Mrs. McIntosh and friends played croquet, and there were picnics and walks through the beautiful fern-filled bush to the waterfalls. The huge garden was planted with palms and shrubs, the lovely Italian-tiled courtyard was the perfect place for roller-skating and parties. (Camp 1999:29)

Summary: The historical landscape is inevitably tied with the production of monocrops, and its associated labour compounds, and central homestead. Its primary association is with a single family, the McIntoshes, who started the Durban County Wattle Syndicate, and in whose name it remained until the 1960s.
B5. Architectural and historical assessment of sites

5.1: Waterfall Farmhouse- currently Tongaat Hulett Headquarters (S29°48′06.66″ E30°44′51.40″)

![Aerial photograph of Waterfall Farmhouse](image)

*Fig 3: 1937 aerial photograph showing context of Waterfall farmhouse against its old access road (orange) and contemporary landmarks. Note intense afforestation.*

Waterfall farmhouse\(^2\) is currently situated between the M13 highway and the N3. It is located on a knoll overlooking the Mhluzana River to the east. The north-east facing homestead consists of a large, sprawling and much altered farmhouse, and sundry farm buildings, all enclosed by a fence. It is currently the home of the Estate Manager employed by Tongaat Hulett. After an inspection of the many structures on site, it was established that the only buildings of interest in this complex on this site is the old farmhouse house and the stock pen, and for expedience sake, these shall be discussed.

\(^2\) Note that on the 1968 and 1989 topocadastral maps the farmhouse is known as ‘Kirkfalls’.
The house has little evidence of its age remaining. The core section of the house was most probably started in around 1880, but there are very few diagnostic features that support this. It is constructed most likely of brick and mortar, and has currently got a reasonably low pitched Holley Harvey tiled roof. Windows vary in age, style and material.

Fig 5: Entrance aspect to Waterfall Farmhouse

From the driveway the entrance is nondescript, possibly given the realignment of the Hillcrest Shongweni Road, removing the approach from the old road directly to the house. One is greeted with plastered walls containing meranti cottage pane windows.

The north-east façade has a long veranda facing onto the garden, with a section consisting of four Tuscan columns on top of two low slung brick walls that flank an entrance onto the veranda- oddly aligned with a window rather than a door. The veranda has been further extended, and enclosed with louvres, distorting the proportions and the integrity of the façade (See Fig 6).
Fig 6: North East Facade of Waterfall Farmhouse

Fig 7: South East Elevation showing accretions: A, B and C.

The South East façade is equally discombobulated. The addition marked A is in raked pointing and bagwashed with meranti windows. Addition B is a double pitched accretion onto the edge of the veranda and C is a little portico with stone columns which has been enclosed (See Fig 8).

Fig 8: Enclosed portico on double pitched addition to veranda.
Internally, the core of the house retains some of the elegance which it must have had. Panelled doors with fanlights, timber floors (under carpet) and timber ceilings exist in those parts of the house that have not been added to or modernized (see figs 9, 10 and 11).

![Fig 9. Room currently used as a dining room](image)

![Fig 10: Lounge made up of two rooms](image)

![Fig 11: Passage through house from back to front. Fig 12: ‘Stock pen’](image)

The ‘stock pen’ is of random rubble and roughly cemented at a fall close to the house (see Fig 13). It is adjacent to a bagwashed structure of block (see fig 12). It is not certain exactly what function this structure played, given its proximity to the house. Certainly the family is known to have kept ponies, and, one would assume fowls and the like (Camp 1999:29).

![Fig 13: Stock pen looking towards the house](image)
An important aspect of this property is not so much the house, but the quality of the garden, which, certainly was lauded in the past as seen in the earlier quote from Camp’s book. The garden has been well maintained, and provides a strong sense of place around the home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterfall farmhouse Age: parts over 60 years</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: The house at Waterfall Farm and the associated outbuildings have minimal architectural, technical and scientific value. The farmhouse has medium historical and social value, given its association with both James McIntosh and the Durban County Wattle Syndicate.

Even though the house has lost much of its architectural appeal, there is little left in the Hillcrest area which fully represents buildings of this period. There is thus an opportunity for reuse of the farmhouse. This would be better served removing the accretions, namely the enclosed portico to the south west, the extended veranda and the addition to the south, in order to arrive at a more compact, architecturally pleasing structure. More research needs to be carried out on the house in this regard. Furthermore, given the topophilic quality of the garden, it is recommended that this be retained in any new development. It is recommended that the outbuildings associated directly with the farmhouse be demolished should this route be pursued.

Mitigation: Reuse House, Retain garden, demolish outbuildings
5.2: Site of ruin by Umhlatuzana River
(S29°47'55.18” E30°45'00.30”)

Identified by large and established *Bouganvillea* sp. the building that stood in its place was allegedly demolished about 15 years ago (Stroud pers.comm). Given that this was positioned on the old road to Hillcrest, this could have had some value. Nothing further is known about it at this point. It is recommended that during any bush clearing and excavation, an archaeologist is present in a monitoring capacity.

![Site of demolished building](image)

**Fig 18: Site of demolished building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demolished building</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation:** It is recommended that during any bush clearing and excavation, an archaeologist is present in a monitoring capacity.

5.3: Estate Management House 1 (S29°48’03” E30°44’52.30”)

This property was securely fenced and inaccessible. However, it could be seen from its access road, and similar to the property in section 5.6, was difficult to photograph given its position deep onto the site and heavy vegetation. Thus, a photograph is not included.

This is a ranch style suburban building of conventional construction and materials. It is of recent construction, possibly late 1960’s to early 1970’s. It has no architectural merit and is of similar ilk to the house described in section 5.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate Management House 1</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: circa 1960s/1970s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation:** None
5.4: Pair of Labour Cottages (S29°48’04.73” E30°44’56.08”)

These two cottages are located close to the main farmhouse beyond the Estate Management House number 1. They are in a similar architectural mould as the Full-time labour cottages in section 5.5, and are situated on an upper and a lower terrace. They have Marseilles tiled roofs, are bagged and painted, and have standard steel section windows. Half-moon awnings have been positioned over the entrance ways.

The buildings are modest and well considered, well maintained, and are good examples of a labour village idiom. It is suspected that they were constructed in the 1960s, after the consolidation of Kirkfalls.

Fig 19 and 20: Labour cottages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair of labour cottages</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: circa 1960s</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation: None

5.5: Full time labour cottages (S29°48’33.45” E30°45’13.23”)

This is a large complex of cottages used to house the full-time labour, constructed possibly in the 1960s and then in the 1970s. It consists of two sections on terraces.

The upper section has slightly larger accommodation and is constructed in much the same manner as the pair of cottages in 5.4 above, indeed they are most likely contemporaneous. The buildings consist of a couple of large flats in a single structure constructed of brick and painted bagwash. The roof is Marseilles tiled and the windows and doors are all standard stock items. As with the two units in 5.4, the entrances have a half-moon canvas awning above them, are similar modest but well-proportioned and considered buildings.

The structures on the lower terraces are smaller flatlets, most likely constructed at a later date. They are of face brick, with end gables under Marseilles tiles. There is a small patio at the entrance to each complex unit with a decorative low stoep wall defining space. As before, these structures are well designed and very good examples of a labour village.

Labour villages are an important part of the history of KwaZulu-Natal and it is important that there is some record as to their contribution in the labour history of the province. It is suggested that even though these structures do not fall within the ambit of the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Heritage Act No 4 of 2008, there is opportunity for reuse of what are, at face value, solid and well-designed buildings.
Mitigation: None – However, it is suggested that even though these structures do not fall within the ambit of the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Heritage Act no 4 of 2008, there is opportunity for reuse of what are, at face value, solid and well designed buildings.
5.6: Estate Management House 2 (S29°48’30.57” E30°44’44.11”)

This property was securely fenced and inaccessible. However, it could be seen from its access road, and similar to the property in section 5.3, was difficult to photograph given its position deep onto the site and heavy vegetation. Thus, a photograph is not included.

This is a ranch style suburban building of conventional construction and materials. It is of recent construction, possibly late 1960’s to early 1970’s. It has no architectural merit and is of similar ilk to the house described in section 5.3. Note, however, that this house is situated in a well-established garden.

![Fig 27: Estate management house 2](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate management house 2 Age: 1960’s-1970’s</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation: Possibility to retain garden**

5.7: Seasonal Labour compound (S29°48’35.35” E30°44’33.81”)

As with the Labour compound in 5.5 above, this compound is also well appointed and slightly elevated, and situated in the middle of the cane fields. It consists of a number of buildings, arranged around a series of courtyard spaces, with established trees in and around these courtyards. There is a football field to the north east of it.

![Fig 28 & 29: Courtyard in seasonal labour compound](image)

The buildings themselves are utilitarian, constructed out of stretcher bond brickwork, bagged and rule jointed with steel section standard windows, and ‘Big Six’ asbestos sheeting. Flippant elements of Modernism such as brise soleil and screens add privacy. Rooms lead onto the courtyards which assist in constructing a strong sense of place. As with the Full-time labour compound, this complex provides an opportunity for reuse.
Mitigation: None - However, it is suggested that though these structures do not fall within the ambit of the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Heritage Act no 4 of 2008, there is opportunity for reuse of what are, at face value, solid and well designed buildings.

5.8: Fire Lookout tower (S29°49′00.78″ E30°45′33.71″)

This is a circular tower of mixed construction visible from the N3 and situated adjacent to the Ntabankulu trigonometric beacon on top of the hill. It is apparently an old structure, which has been much altered in the past (Stroud: pers.comm). It is suspected that given its inaccessible position, it is generally safe from development, thus retaining its landmark quality.

Mitigation: None.
5.9: Delville Wood Station (S29°50'02.69" E30°44'09.74")

Although this property is not part of the Shongweni Estates, it was subjected to cursory inspection bearing in mind the railway line and its associated tunneling.

The railway tracks came through this area in the early 1920s. Significantly the blasting and tunneling made an impression on local residents, as noted by Camp in her work on the area (Camp 1999:29). However, little of any import remains as the current tunnel is dated to 1974 and the station is reduced to an electrical substation. A single element of its history exists in the square concrete structure in Fig 34 below, possibly used as a reservoir in the past.

![Fig 33: Tunnels dated to 1974](image1)
![Fig 34: Possible reservoir](image2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delville station and surrounds</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 1960’s-1970’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation: None

5.10: Microwave Tower

This is a steel framed tower of recent construction and function in the middle of canelands on the descent to Shongweni. At its base is a small, nondescript and utilitarian plant room constructed of stretcher bond brickwork. This has no architectural nor heritage value.

![Fig 35: Microwave tower](image3)
Mitigation: None

**5.11: Estate Management House 3 (S29°48’06.62” E30°44’33.74”)**

This is a ranch style suburban building of conventional construction and materials. It is of recent construction, possibly late 1960’s to early 1970’s. It has no architectural merit and is of similar ilk and period to the houses described in section 5.3 and 5.6. It is, however, set in a well-established and maintained garden.

![Fig 36: House 3 from drive](image1)

![Fig 37: House 3 from garden](image2)

**Mitigation: Possibility to retain garden.**
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C1. Introduction and methodology:

eThembeni Cultural Heritage inspected the property on 08 and 09 May 2012 and subsequently assessed the study area by close Google Earth scrutiny.

C2. Executive Summary

- There is little remnant on the property of any archaeological value, given the extent and period over which the land has been disturbed. There is, however, concrete evidence of Middle Stone Age occupation at the Mhlathuzana Shelter, close to the site.

- There are 3 known graves on the site at GPS co-ordinates S29° 48.166'; E30° 43.930'. All graves have high heritage significance and are protected in terms of legislation. In the process of ongoing development of the property it is possible that further human remains may be exposed, and these must be addressed appropriately according to age.

C3: General Archaeological Remains

The study area has been subjected to over a century of agricultural activity, primarily wattle production and latterly sugar cane. These activities have largely taken place on land with medium to gentle slopes. Some steeper valley sides were contoured and planted to wattle. Many of these are currently covered with feral eucalyptus stands.

The consequence of these historically more recent agricultural activities has been the complete removal of any Late Iron Age archaeological footprint. Random pot shard fragments observed during the field inspection attest to a Late Iron Age presence. However, such settlements would have been located on the medium and gentler slopes above the incised valleys of the Mhlathuzana and Mlazi drainage basins. It is these same areas that have been subjected to successive episodes of land clearance and ploughing with the consequent removal of any discrete Iron Age archaeological remains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archeological remnant</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological remains</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation: None necessary

Mhlathuzana Shelter (29°48.505'S; 30°45.400'E) is located at the base of a sandstone cliff face within the Mhlathuzana River valley. The shelter contains a significant Middle Stone Age deposit that was excavated and described by Kaplan (1988). Whilst the site can be accessed off the Tongaat Hulett property it falls outside of the boundary and within the surveyed road reserve of the N3.
Summary: There is little remnant on the property of any archaeological value, given the extent and period over which the land has been disturbed. There is, however, concrete evidence of Middle Stone Age occupation at the Mhlatuzana Shelter, close to the site.

C4. Graves and their implications

A grave site with three burials is recorded on the property at S29° 48.166'; E30° 43.930'. The location of the graves was provided to eThembeni from the Tongaat Hulett Graves and Cemeteries Data Base. Field inspection places these on the edge a thicket of uncultivated land above the dam adjacent to the N3. The graves are those of Nkunzi Mgwaba (died 1959), Anelia Mgwaba (died 1971) and a child that died 1965.

![Fig 1: Showing grave sites superimposed on Google Earth](image)

All graves have high heritage significance and are protected in terms of legislation. In the process of ongoing development of the property it is possible that further human remains may be exposed. The following legal guidelines are appended (see Appendix C1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation: removal and reburial through appropriate consultative process – note graves younger than 60 years - protocol as per ‘The Vermillion Accord on Human Remains’ (see Appendix C2)

Summary: There are 3 known graves on the site at GPS co-ordinates S29° 48.166'; E30° 43.930'. All graves have high heritage significance and are protected in terms of legislation. In the process of ongoing development of the property it is possible that further human remains may be exposed, and these must be addressed appropriately according to age.
C5. Appendices

Appendix C1  Management of Graves and Burial Grounds

- **Graves younger than 60 years** are protected in terms of Section 2(1) of the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance 7 of 1925 as well as the Human Tissues Act 65 of 1983. Such graves are the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the relevant Provincial Department of Health and must be submitted for final approval to the Office of the relevant Provincial Premier. This function is usually delegated to the Provincial Member of the Executive Council for Local Government and Planning, or in some cases the MEC for Housing and Welfare.

Authorisation for exhumation and reinterment must also be obtained from the relevant local or regional council where the grave is situated, as well as the relevant local or regional council to where the grave is being relocated. All local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws must also be adhered to. In order to handle and transport human remains the institution conducting the relocation should be authorised under Section 24 of the Human Tissues Act 65 of 1983.

- **Graves older than 60 years situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority** are protected in terms of Section 36 of the NHRA as well as the Human Tissues Act of 1983. Accordingly, such graves are the jurisdiction of SAHRA. The procedure for Consultation Regarding Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36(5) of NHRA) is applicable to graves older than 60 years that are situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority. Graves in the category located inside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority will also require the same authorisation as set out for graves younger than 60 years over and above SAHRA authorisation.

If the grave is not situated inside a formal cemetery but is to be relocated to one, permission from the local authority is required and all regulations, laws and by-laws set by the cemetery authority must be adhered to.

The protocol for the management of graves older than 60 years situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority is detailed in Section 36 of the NHRA:
1. **(3)** (a) No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority—
   (a) destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;
   (b) destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or
   (c) bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.
2. (4) SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for the destruction or damage of any burial ground or grave referred to in subsection (3)(a) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has made satisfactory arrangements for the exhumation and reinterment of the contents of such graves, at the cost of the applicant and in accordance with any regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority.
3. (5) SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for any activity under subsection (3)(b) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has, in accordance with regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority—
   (a) made a concerted effort to contact and consult communities and individuals who by tradition have an interest in such grave or burial ground; and
   (b) reached agreements with such communities and individuals regarding the future of such grave or burial ground.
4. (6) Subject to the provision of any other law, any person who in the course of development or any other activity discovers the location of a grave, the existence of which was previously unknown, must immediately cease such activity and report the discovery to the responsible...
heritage resources authority which must, in co-operation with the South African Police Service
and in accordance with regulations of the responsible heritage resources authority—
(a) carry out an investigation for the purpose of obtaining information on whether or not such
grave is protected in terms of this Act or is of significance to any community; and
(b) if such grave is protected or is of significance, assist any person who or community which
is a direct descendant to make arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the
contents of such grave or, in the absence of such person or community, make any such
arrangements as it deems fit.

Appendix C2. The Vermillion Accord on Human Remains\(^3\) (as
adopted in 1989 at WAC Inter-Congress, South Dakota, USA)

1. Respect for the mortal remains of the dead shall be accorded to all, irrespective of origin,
race, religion, nationality, custom and tradition.
2. Respect for the wishes of the dead concerning disposition shall be accorded whenever
possible, reasonable and lawful, when they are known or can be reasonably inferred.
3. Respect for the wishes of the local community and of relatives or guardians of the dead
shall be accorded whenever possible, reasonable and lawful.
4. Respect for the scientific research value of skeletal, mummified and other human remains
(including fossil hominids) shall be accorded when such value is demonstrated to exist.
5. Agreement on the disposition of fossil, skeletal, mummified and other remains shall be
reached by negotiation on the basis of mutual respect for the legitimate concerns of
communities for the proper disposition of their ancestors, as well as the legitimate concerns of
science and education.
6. The express recognition that the concerns of various ethnic groups, as well as those of
science are legitimate and to be respected, will permit acceptable agreements to be reached
and honoured.

Appendix C3. Statutory Requirements

General

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 of 1996 is the source of all
legislation. Within the Constitution the Bill of Rights is fundamental, with the principle that the
environment should be protected for present and future generations by preventing pollution,
promoting conservation and practising ecologically sustainable development. With regard to
spatial planning and related legislation at national and provincial levels the following
legislation may be relevant:
– Physical Planning Act 125 of 1991
– Municipal Structures Act 117 of 1998
– Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000
– Development Facilitation Act 67 of 1995 (DFA)

The identification, evaluation and management of heritage resources in South Africa is
required and governed by the following legislation:
– National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998 (NEMA)
– KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act 4 of 2008 (KZNHA)
– National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA)
– Minerals and Petroleum Resources Development Act 28 of 2002 (MPRDA)

KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act 4 of 2008 (KZNHA)

This Act is implemented by Amata aKwaZulu-Natali/Heritage KwaZulu-Natal, the provincial
heritage resources authority charged to provide for the conservation, protection and
administration of both the physical and the living or intangible heritage resources of the
province; along with a statutory Council to administer heritage conservation in the Province.

---

\(^3\) http://www.worldarchaeologicalcongress.org/
National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA)

The NHRA established the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) together with its Council to fulfill the following functions:

- co-ordinate and promote the management of heritage resources at national level;
- set norms and maintain essential national standards for the management of heritage resources in the Republic and to protect heritage resources of national significance;
- control the export of nationally significant heritage objects and the import into the Republic of cultural property illegally exported from foreign countries;
- enable the provinces to establish heritage authorities which must adopt powers to protect and manage certain categories of heritage resources; and
- provide for the protection and management of conservation-worthy places and areas by local authorities.

Heritage Impact Assessments

Section 38(1) of the NHRA may require a Heritage Impact Assessment in case of:
- the construction of a road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;
- the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length;
- any development or other activity which will change the character of a site—
  (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent; or
  (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or
  (iii) involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or
  (iv) the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;
- the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000m² in extent; or
- any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority.

Reports in fulfilment of NHRA Section 38(3) must include the following information:

- the identification and mapping of all heritage resources in the area affected;
- an assessment of the significance of such resources in terms of the heritage assessment criteria set out in regulations;
- an assessment of the impact of the development on such heritage resources;
- an evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the sustainable social and economic benefits to be derived from the development;
- the results of consultation with communities affected by the proposed development and other interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources;
- if heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the consideration of alternatives; and
- plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after completion of the proposed development.

It is incumbent upon the developer or Environmental Practitioner to approach the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) or Amata to ascertain whether an HIA is required for a project; what categories of heritage resource must be assessed; and request a detailed motivation for such a study in terms of both the nature of the development and the nature of the environment. In this regard we draw your attention to Section 38(2) of the NHRA which states specifically that ‘The responsible heritage resources authority must … if there is reason to believe that heritage resources will be affected by such development, notify the person who intends to undertake the development to submit an impact assessment report’. In other words, the heritage authority must be able to justify a request for an Archaeological, Palaeontological or Heritage Impact Assessment. The Environmental Practitioner may also submit information to the heritage
authority in substantiation of exemption from a specific assessment due to existing environmental disturbance, for example.

Definitions of heritage resources

The Act defines a heritage resource as any place or object of cultural significance i.e. of aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance. This includes, but is not limited to, the following wide range of places and objects:

- living heritage as defined in the National Heritage Council Act 11 of 1999 (cultural tradition; oral history; performance; ritual; popular memory; skills and techniques; indigenous knowledge systems; and the holistic approach to nature, society and social relationships);
- ecofacts (non-artefactual organic or environmental remains that may reveal aspects of past human activity; definition used in KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act 2008);
- places, buildings, structures and equipment;
- places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
- historical settlements and towns;scapes;
- landscapes and natural features;
- geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;
- archaeological and palaeontological sites;
- graves and burial grounds;
- public monuments and memorials;
- sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa;
- movable objects, but excluding any object made by a living person; and
- battlefields.

Furthermore, a place or object is to be considered part of the national estate if it has cultural significance or other special value because of:

- its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa’s history;
- its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage;
- its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage;
- its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa’s natural or cultural places or objects;
- its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons; and
- its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa.

Archaeological means —

- material remains resulting from human activity which are in a state of disuse and are in or on land and are older than 100 years, including artefacts, human and hominin remains and artificial features and structures;
- rock art, being any form of painting, engraving or other graphic representation on a fixed rock surface or loose rock or stone, which was executed by human agency and is older than 100 years including any area within 10m of such representation;
- wrecks, being any vessel or aircraft, or any part thereof, which was wrecked in South Africa, whether on land, in the internal waters, the territorial waters or in the culture zone of the Republic, as defined respectively in sections 3, 4 and 6 of the Maritime Zones Act 15 of 1994, and any cargo, debris or artefacts found or associated therewith, which is older than 80 years or which SAHRA considers to be worthy of conservation;
- features, structures and artefacts associated with military history which are older than 75 years and the sites on which they are found.

**Palaeontological** means any fossilised remains or fossil trace of animals or plants which lived in the geological past, other than fossil fuels or fossiliferous rock intended for industrial use, and any site which contains such fossilised remains or trace.

**A place** is defined as:
- a site, area or region;
- a building or other structure which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such building or other structure;
- a group of buildings or other structures which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such group of buildings or other structures;
- an open space, including a public square, street or park; and
- in relation to the management of a place, includes the immediate surroundings of a place.

**Public monuments and memorials** means all monuments and memorials:
- erected on land belonging to any branch of central, provincial or local government, or on land belonging to any organisation funded by or established in terms of the legislation of such a branch of government; or
- which were paid for by public subscription, government funds, or a public-spirited or military organisation, and are on land belonging to any private individual.

**Structures** means any building, works, device or other facility made by people and which is fixed to land, and includes any fixtures, fittings and equipment associated therewith.

**Management of Graves and Burial Grounds**

- **Definitions**

  **Grave**
  The NHRA defines a grave as a place of interment and includes the contents, headstone or other marker of such a place, and any other structure on or associated with such a place.
  The KwaZulu-Natal Cemeteries and Crematoria Act 12 of 1996 defines a grave as an excavation in which human remains have been intentionally placed for the purposes of burial, but excludes any such excavation where all human remains have been removed.

  **Burial ground**
  The term ‘burial ground’ does not appear to have a legal definition. In common usage the term is used for management purposes to describe two or more graves that are grouped closely enough to be managed as a single entity.

  **Cemetery**
  The KwaZulu-Natal Cemeteries and Crematoria Act 1996 defines a cemetery as any place
  (a) where human remains are buried in an orderly, systematic and pre-planned manner in identifiable burial plots;
  (b) which is intended to be permanently set aside for and used only for the purposes of the burial of human remains.

- **Protection of graves and cemeteries**

  No person may damage, alter, exhume, or remove from its original position any grave, as defined above, without permission from the relevant authority, as detailed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave type</th>
<th>Relevant legislation</th>
<th>Administrative authority – disinterment</th>
<th>Administrative authority – reburial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graves located within a formal cemetery administered by a local</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal Cemeteries and Crematoria Act 12 of 1996</td>
<td>National and / or Provincial Departments of Health</td>
<td>If relocated to formal cemetery – relevant local authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
authority | Human Tissue Act 65 of 1983 | KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act 4 of 2008 | Amaf reli [sic] KwaZulu-Natal, the provincial heritage resources authority | If relocated to private or communal property – Amafa. If relocated to formal cemetery – Amafa and relevant local authority.

- Procedures required for permission to disinter and rebury graves

The procedure for consultation regarding burial grounds and graves (Section 36 of the NHRA) is applicable to all graves located outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority. The following extract from this legislation is applicable to this policy document:

SAHRA or Amafa may not issue a permit for any alteration to or disinterment or reburial of a grave unless it is satisfied that the applicant has, in accordance with regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority—

(a) made a concerted effort to contact and consult communities and individuals who by tradition have an interest in such grave or burial ground; and

(b) reached agreements with such communities and individuals regarding the future of such grave or burial ground.

Any person who in the course of development or any other activity discovers the location of a grave, the existence of which was previously unknown, must immediately cease such activity and report the discovery to the responsible heritage resources authority which must, in cooperation with the South African Police Services and in accordance with regulations of the responsible heritage resources authority—

(a) carry out an investigation for the purpose of obtaining information on whether or not such grave is protected in terms of this Act or is of significance to any community; and

(b) if such grave is protected or is of significance, assist any person who or community which is a direct descendant to make arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the contents of such grave or, in the absence of such person or community, make any such arrangements as it deems fit.
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