

SOUTH AFRICAN HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY 111 HARRINGTON STREET, CAPE TOWN, 8001 PO BOX 4637, CAPE TOWN, 8000 TEL: 021 462 4502 FAX: 021 462 4509

EOD	ATTENTION	DUDA.	Limnono
FUR	ATTENTION:	PHKA:	Limpopo

#### FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:

SAHRA File No 9/2/269/0017
Date Received: 19 April 2012....
Date of Comment: 30 May 2012 ....
Sent to Peer Review:

Date to Peer Review:

SAHRA Contact Person: Mr. Phillip Hine

DMR Ref No:

## **REVIEW COMMENT ON**

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

BY ARCHAEOLOGY/ PALAEONTOLOGY UNIT OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY

South Africa has a unique and non-renewable archaeological and palaeontological heritage. Archaeological and palaeontological sites are protected in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999) and may not be disturbed without a permit. Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIAs) and Palaeontological Impact Assessments (PIAs) identify and assess the significance of the sites, assess the potential impact of developments upon such sites, and make recommendations concerning mitigation and management of these sites. On the basis of satisfactory specialist reports SAHRA or the relevant heritage resources agency can assess whether or not it has objection to a development and indicate the conditions upon which such development might proceed and assess whether or not to issue permission to destroy such sites.

AlAs and PIAs often form part of the heritage component of an Environmental Impact Assessment or Environmental Management Plan. They may also form part of a Heritage Impact Assessment called for in terms of section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act No. 25, 1999. They may have other origins. In any event they should comply with basic minimum standards of reporting as indicated in SAHRA Regulations and Guidelines.

This form provides review comment from the Archaeologist of the relevant heritage resources authority for use by Heritage Managers, for example, when informing authorities that have applied to SAHRA for comment and for inclusion in documentation sent to environmental authorities. It may be used in conjunction with Form B, which provides relevant peer review comment.

A. PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY: Mr. Donald Lithole В. AUTHOR(S) OF REPORT: Roodt, F. C. ARCHAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: R&R Cultural Resources Management CONTACT DETAILS: P.O. Box 1600, Polokwane 0700 D. DATE OF REPORT: October 2011 E. F. TITLE OF REPORT: Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment: Eskom Power Line Paradise Substation to the proposed Makhado Colliery. G. Please circle as relevant: Archaeological component of EIA / EMP / HIA / CMP Other (Specify)...... H. REPORT COMMISSIONED BY (CONSULTANT OR DEVELOPER): Jacana Environmental Z. CONTACT DETAILS: P.O. Box 31675, Superbia 0759 J. COMMENTS: Please see comment on next page.....

## **REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Roodt. F

Dated: November 2011 Comment: June 2012

# Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment: Eskom Power Line Paradise Substation to the proposed Makhado Colliery

#### INTRODUCTION

Eskom intends to develop the proposed Paradise-Makhado power line on the farms M'pefu 202 MT, Msekwa 194 MT and Njele 193 MT, in Makhado, Limpopo Province. The report does not mention the operating voltage of the power line or its proposed length. It is not clear if any alternatives were considered for this project.

According to the specialist report the entire route was surveyed because it had been pegged out by the surveyor. The project is situated within the Nzhele valley, south to southwest of the Nzhele Dam. The route follows disturbed areas in the vicinity of settlements, an abandoned ploughed field, road tracks and an old power line route. The specialist indicated that the route covers areas of predominantly stony surface with very little topsoil.

Eight heritage sites were identified along the proposed route alignment. Sites 5 and 6 are thought to be archaeological, and site 8 is a formal cemetery. The following sites were identified.

## Structural Remains

Site 1 consists of modern foundation remains and terracing near the ruins of an abandoned school. The site was not considered to hold any significance. Site 2 consists of foundation remains and cement floor associated with modern utensils. Site 3 is similar to site 2. Site 4 shows signs of stone terracing, probably there indicating an abandoned field. The site holds no significance. Site 7 represents the ruin of a clay brick homestead. The homestead falls outside the power line route.

# Archaeological Sites

Site 5 consists of stone walling and terracing at a large rock. Pottery was also identified. The site is of medium significance and the author recommended that the access road be diverted to avoid any impact on the site. Site 6 is characterized by a scatter of pottery over a large sandy area indicative of previous habitation. The archaeologist recommended a Phase 2 mitigation of the Pylon area to inform further management measures for the access road.

## **Burial Grounds**

A formal cemetery at Maangani village was identified. The specialist noted that the power line will not impact the cemetery.

## Stone Age

The specialist indicated that Stone Age material is scarce along the proposed route. The author notes that "some flaked stones were observed", but because of the nature of the linear development the impact on Stone Age material will be negligible. It is not clear from the report if Stone Age material were identified in any sort of concentration or if these represented single spot finds. It is also unclear if the material represents *in situ* deposit or if it was identified 'out of context'. In order for SAHRA APM Unit to make decisions regarding stone age sites, the specialist must provide better descriptions open air sites, ie. their context, approximate size, density etc.

## SAHRA RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the proposed project will have a minimal impact on the heritage resources identified SAHRA APM Unit support the recommendations contained in the specialist report.

- SAHRA APM Unit supports the recommendation that the access must be diverted to avoid any impact on Site 5. A 20m buffer zone must be maintained. The must be taped-off during construction activities and the construction workers must be alerted to its presence and significance.
- Since the author provided little information on the extent and significance of site 6, SAHRA APM Unit recommends an application for limited test excavation to identify the extent and significance of the site. The specialist must submit a report on the findings to the SAHRA APM Unit.
- The author indicated that the cemetery that was identified is a formal cemetery and will not be affected by the proposed power line development.
- Site 1, 2, 3, 4 are all structures in disuse and hold no significance according to the report author. Site 7 falls outside the power line corridor. Decisions in terms of Built Environment must be referred to the Limpopo Provincial Heritage Authority (Mr. Donald Lithole, <a href="mailto:litholek@sac.limpopo.gov.za">litholek@sac.limpopo.gov.za</a>).
- The report did not include a palaeontological impact assessment. Please note that developments must include an assessment on potential palaeontological resources.
- If these recommendations are complied with, SAHRA APM Unit does not object to the proposed development in terms of the archaeological component of the heritage resources. If archaeological or any other heritage resources are uncovered during construction than the SAHRA APM (Mr. Phillip Hine, Mrs Colette Scheermeyer, tel: 021 462 4502), or a professional archaeologist must be contacted immediately. If the finds are regarded as potentially significant then further work in the form of Phase 2 rescue excavation may be required at the expense of the developer.

SIGNATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGIST PROCESSING REF	PORT:
EMAIL:	phine@sahra.org.za
SIGNATURE OF SAHRA HEAD ARCHAEOLOGIST:	MANIM
EMAIL:	cscheermeyer@sahra.org.zaf
NAME OF HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY: SAHR	4