



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

FOR ATTENTION: **PHRA: Northern Cape**

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:

SAHRA File No: **9/2/032/0004**
Date Received: **30 May 2012**
Date of Comment: **5 June 2012**
Sent to Peer Review:
Date to Peer Review:
SAHRA Contact Person: **Ms Katie Smuts**
DEA Ref. no: **14/12/16/3/3/1/428**

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

BY ARCHAEOLOGY, PALAEOLOGY AND METEORITES UNIT OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN 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.

AIAs 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: **NORTHERN CAPE**
- B. AUTHOR OF REPORT: **Mr Wouter Fourie**
- C. ARCHAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: **PGS Heritage and Grave Relocation Consultants**
- D. CONTACT DETAILS: **PO Box 32542, Totiusdal 0134, email Wouter@gravesolutions.co.za**
- E. DATE OF REPORT: **27 March 2012**
- F. TITLE OF REPORT: **HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT: THE PROPOSED 10MW PHOTOVOLTAIC (PV) POWER PLANT ON THE FARM ARRIESFONTEIN (FARM 267) NEAR DANIËLSKUIL, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE**
- G. AUTHOR(S) OF REPORT: **Dr John Almond**
- H. PALAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: **Natura Viva CC**
- I. CONTACT DETAILS: **Natura Viva CC, PO Box 12410, Mill Street, Cape Town 8010**
- J. DATE OF REPORT: **November 2011**
- K. TITLE OF REPORT: **PALAEOLOGICAL SPECIALIST STUDY - DESKTOP ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED SOLAR THERMAL ENERGY POWER PARK ON**

**FARM ARRIESFONTEIN, NEAR DANIELSKUIL, POSTMASBURG DISTRICT,
NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE**

L. Please circle as relevant: Archaeological component of EIA / EMP / HIA / CMP/
Other (Specify) **Basic Assessment Report**.....

M. REPORT COMMISSIONED BY (CONSULTANT OR DEVELOPER): **SiVest**

N. CONTACT DETAILS: **SiVEST Environmental Division, PO Box 2921, Rivonia
2128, email: shaunt@sivest.co.za**

O. COMMENTS:

Please see following page for comments

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

Author: Mr W. Fourie

Dated: March 2012, Received: May 2012

TITLE

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT: THE PROPOSED 10MW PHOTOVOLTAIC (PV) POWER PLANT ON THE FARM ARRIESFONTEIN (FARM 267) NEAR DANIËLSKUIL, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

Author: Dr John Almond

Dated: November 2011, Received: May 2012

TITLE

PALAEOLOGICAL SPECIALIST STUDY - DESKTOP ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED SOLAR THERMAL ENERGY POWER PARK ON FARM ARRIESFONTEIN, NEAR DANIËLSKUIL, POSTMASBURG DISTRICT, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

INTRODUCTION

Solar Reserve South Africa (Pty) Ltd is proposing to establish a 19 MW Photovoltaic energy facility on 20 ha of the Remainder of Farm Arriesfontein 267, near Daniëlskuil, Northern Cape Province. As well as an array of Photovoltaic panels connected by underground cabling, this project will also entail the construction of a 50m² substation, a 30m² meteorological station, a 100m² site office, a 100m² temporary lay down area and a 100m² temporary construction camp. In addition, there will be a 50m² visitor centre, a 50m² car park, internal access roads, a security system and site fencing.

Two alternative locations within the same property have been proposed for the development, and both of these areas were considered in the specialist reports. The study area is predominantly flat and covered with shrubs and bushes; some areas are under fine pebbles and calcrete. There are no significant landscape features on the site.

DISCUSSION

The archaeologist reviewed the relevant literature and conducted a site visit. The literature review revealed that Northern Cape Stone Age material is generally found near water sources. The most significant site in the area is Wonderwerk Cave, between Daniëlskuil and Kuruman, which contains occupation evidence from the Early, Middle and Later Stone Age, as well as historical period material. There are also several rock engravings in the Daniëlskuil area. There is evidence for the presence of Late Iron Age people from the seventeenth century, Sotho-Tswana agro-pastoralists who were displaced in the eighteenth century by the Korana pastoralists. Historically, missionaries arrived in the area in the early nineteenth century, leading to the establishment of the Griqua nation. European farmers began to arrive in the 1860s and settlement of the area increased after the discovery of diamonds shortly thereafter. Several important skirmishes were fought in the area during the South African War as both sides vied for control of Daniëlskuil town. The farm itself was granted in the late 1800s, and the current occupant is a descendant of the Roux family who have been associated with the farm from then. Two of the three gravestones in the farm graveyard bear the Roux family name.

The archaeologist acknowledges that recent survey work within the same property yielded archaeological heritage resources, predominantly low concentrations of artefacts around the pans and drainage channels. The field survey of the study area, however, revealed no heritage resources. While the impact on heritage resources of this project will be low, the cumulative effect of the development of the wider Solar Park on the property will be greater.

The palaeontologist conducted a desktop survey of the study area and concluded that it is underlain by Precambrian marine sediments of the sparsely fossiliferous Campbell

Rand Subgroup of the Ghaap Group. Most of the area is mantled by Quaternary to Recent Age calcretes and surface deposits of soils, sheet wash and alluvium, with some exposures of surface limestone to the east. These are all of low palaeontological significance. The palaeontologist notes that the excavations for the solar panels will not be deep or extensive and are unlikely to have a great impact on the palaeontological resources.

CONCLUSION

As there is apparently no evidence of any significant archaeological material in this area, the SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites Unit has no objection to the development (in terms of the archaeological component of the heritage resources) on condition that, if any new evidence of archaeological sites or artefacts, palaeontological fossils, graves or other heritage resources are found during development, construction or mining, SAHRA or an archaeologist must be alerted immediately.

Decisions on Built Environment (e.g. structures over 60 years) and Cultural Landscapes and associated Living Heritage (e.g. sacred sites) must be made by the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority of the Northern Cape (**Mr. Andrew Timothy, ratha.timothy@gmail.com**) to whom this Archaeological Review Comment will be copied.

SIGNATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGIST PROCESSING REPORT:
 EMAIL: ksmuts@sahra.org.za.....
 SIGNATURE OF SAHRA HEAD ARCHAEOLOGIST:
 EMAIL: cscheermeyer@sahra.org.za
 NAME OF HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY: SAHRA.....

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE COMMENT (ABOVE OR APPENDED) CONSTITUTES THE COMMENT OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGIST AND THAT ANY DEVELOPMENT THAT INVOLVES DESTRUCTION OF ANY ARCHAEOLOGICAL/PALAEONTOLOGICAL SITE IS STILL SUBJECT TO A PERMIT/PERMISSION FOR DESTRUCTION OF SUCH SITE GIVEN TO THE DEVELOPER BY THE RELEVANT HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEONTOLOGICAL PERMIT COMMITTEE (THIS WILL BE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE PHASE 2 OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL/ PALAEONTOLOGICAL MITIGATION AS NECESSARY). THIS REPORT MAY BE TAKEN ONLY AS APPROVAL IN TERMS OF SECTION 35 OF THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT. THE PROVINCIAL MANAGER OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY MUST ADVISE AS TO APPROVAL IN TERMS OF HERITAGE ISSUES ENCOMPASSED BY OTHER ASPECTS OF THE LEGISLATION, SUCH AS ISSUES OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (STRUCTURES (E.G. FARM HOUSES), OVER 60 YEARS), INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS OR OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES AS THIS IS NOT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGIST.

PLEASE NOTE THAT SAHRA IS NOW RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE I HERITAGE RESOURCES (AND EXPORT) AND THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE II AND GRADE III HERITAGE RESOURCES, EXCEPT WHERE THERE IS AN AGENCY ARRANGEMENT WITH THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY.