



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: **9/2/025/0001**Date Received: **18 July 2011 (Cultural Heritage Survey)****30 August 2011 (Annexures 1 and 2)****16 September 2011 (revised Heritage Survey and AIA)****29 September 2011 (AIAs)**Date of Comment: **28 September 2011**

Sent to Peer Review:

Date to Peer Review:

SAHRA Contact Person: **Dr Mariagrazia Galimberti**DEA Ref. no: **12/12/20/2258**

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

BY THE 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(S) OF REPORT: **Mr David Morris**

C. ARCHAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: **McGregor Museum**

D. CONTACT DETAILS: **PO Box 316, Kimberley, 8300. Tel: 0822224777, email: dmorriskby@gmail.com**

E. DATE OF REPORT: **September 2011**

F. TITLE OF REPORT: **Archaeology specialist input on the site of the proposed Taaiboschfontein Photovoltaic construction site between De Aar and Hanover, Northern Cape**

B. AUTHOR(S) OF REPORT: **Mr David Morris**

C. ARCHAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: **McGregor Museum**

D. CONTACT DETAILS: **PO Box 316, Kimberley, 8300. Tel: 0822224777, email: dmorriskby@gmail.com**

E. DATE OF REPORT: **September 2011**

F. TITLE OF REPORT: **Archaeology specialist input on the site of the proposed**

Kalkbult Photovoltaic construction site north of De Aar, Northern Cape

- B. AUTHOR(S) OF REPORT: **Mr David Morris**
- C. ARCHAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: **McGregor Museum**
- D. CONTACT DETAILS: **PO Box 316, Kimberley, 8300. Tel: 0822224777, email: dmorriskby@gmail.com**
- E. DATE OF REPORT: **September 2011**
- F. TITLE OF REPORT: **Archaeology specialist input on the site of the proposed Vanderlindeskraal Photovoltaic construction site near Hanover, Northern Cape**
-
- B. AUTHOR(S) OF REPORT: **Ms Jean Beater**
- C. ARCHAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP:
- D. CONTACT DETAILS: **jean.beater@gmail.com**
- E. DATE OF REPORT: **February 2011 (revised September 2011)**
- F. TITLE OF REPORT: **Cultural Heritage Review Of Proposed Establishment Of Photo Voltaic (Solar Power) Panels On The Farm Taaiboschfontein, No 41, Hanover District, Northern Cape with Annexures 1 (Farm Vanderlindeskraal no. 79) and 2 (Farm New Kalkbult no 181)**
-
- G. Please circle as relevant: Archaeological and cultural components of **EIA** / EMP / HIA / CMP/ Other (Specify).....
- H. REPORT COMMISSIONED BY (CONSULTANT OR **DEVELOPER**): **Scatec Solar SA (Pty) Ltd**
- I. CONTACT DETAILS: **The farm Bloemhof, Bloemhof Road, Somerset East, Eastern Cape, South Africa, Mr Jed Borril, email: jed.borril@scatecsolar.com**
- J. COMMENTS:
- Please see comment on next page.....*

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

Mr D. Morris

Dated and Received: September 2011

Archaeology specialist input on the site of the proposed Taaiboschfontein Photovoltaic construction site between De Aar and Hanover, Northern Cape

Archaeology specialist input on the site of the proposed Kalkbult Photovoltaic construction site north of De Aar, Northern Cape

Archaeology specialist input on the site of the proposed Vanderlindeskraal Photovoltaic construction site near Hanover, Northern Cape

Ms J. Beater

Dated: February 2011 (revised September 2011), Received: September 2011

Cultural Heritage Review Of Proposed Establishment Of Photo Voltaic (Solar Power) Panels On The Farm Taaiboschfontein, No 41, Hanover District, Northern Cape with Annexures 1 and 2 on Farm New Kalkbult no. 181 and Farm Vanderlindeskraal no. 79.

INTRODUCTION

Scatec Solar is proposing the establishment of 4 to 9 solar energy facilities in the Northern Cape which will in total produce between 10 and 100MW.

Three different properties were identified for this development, along which the several energy facilities will be distributed. These are Farms Taaiboschfontein, New Kalkbult 181 and Vanderlindeskraal 79.

An archaeologist and an historian visited the area during a field assessment and identified a series of heritage resources which will require protection. Ngwao Boswa ya Kapa Bokone has already commented on the historical aspect of the project and agreed with the author's recommendations.

A palaeontological impact assessment was not included in the report.

DISCUSSION

All three properties have evidence of Stone Age and Colonial Archaeology. According to the authors ground visibility was good for most of the three properties,.

Taaiboschfontein 41 contains evidence of Middle Stone Age artefacts which may indicate off-site opportunistic knapping; these sites appear to be displaced through deflation. A Later Stone Age site was also identified within the debris of an Anglo-Boer War blockhouse.

Remains of the old railway line are located on a raised section along the new railway line, whereas redoubts, dated to the Anglo Boer War, are positioned on either sides of the old railway line. One possible grave was identified close to one of the redoubts but, since it is far from the proposed PV panels, it is not expected to be impacted by the development.

At **Vanderlindeskraal** weathered stone artefacts from the Middle Stone Age made of hornfels were recorded, some were heavily patinated. A possible hornfels quarry may also be located on this property.

At **Kalkbult**, a shallow soil overlain calcrete and dolerite outcrops were identified along with shale. No engravings were identified on the dolerite.

Stone Age scatters, mostly from the Middle but few also from the Later Stone Age, were recorded. Most of these are the results of eroded stratified sequences through both vertical and horizontal erosion.

A Y-shaped stone structure was recorded, but no age was proposed for it.

Geologically, the formations underlain the proposed area for the development are the Abrahamskraal formation of the Adelaide Subgroup of the Beaufort Group, Karoo Supergroup, which has been previously been identified of high fossil significance because of the identified material. However, the fossiliferous value of this formation is here decreased by the intrusion of Jurassic dolerite

SAHRA RECOMMENDATIONS

SAHRA supports the recommendations of the author and requires that:

- A destruction permit should be applied for the Later and Middle Stone Age occurrences in terms of s. 35 of the NHRA 25, 1999;
- A buffer zone of 15m on both sides be kept for the old railway line. During construction the area of the old railway line should be fenced off with white and red tape to minimise accidental damage to it.
- A 20m buffer zone be maintained around the possible grave.
- A buffer zone of 15m be kept around each redoubt and blockhouse fort. During construction the redoubts should be fenced off with white and red tape to minimise accidental damage to the structures.
- If disturbance to the redoubts is not avoidable, recording of the site by a heritage specialist will be necessary. After receiving a report from the recording, the developer or the archaeologist for on behalf of the applicant, will need to apply for a destruction permit from SAHRA before any development may impact on the redoubt.
- Existing access roads be used where possible;
- Where the development involves disturbance of an archaeological or palaeontological site of some significance and Phase 2 mitigation has been asked for, SAHRA will require that, in terms of s.38(4)(b&c) of the National Heritage Resources Act, the provisions of s 35 apply, as appropriate. The specialist will require a mitigation permit from the relevant Heritage Resources Authority. On receipt of a satisfactory mitigation (Phase 2) permit report from the archaeologist, the heritage authority will make further recommendations in terms of the site.

CONCLUSION

If the recommendations made in the specialist report and in this comment are adhered to, the SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite Unit has no objection to the development. If any new evidence of archaeological sites or artefacts, palaeontological fossils, graves or other heritage resources are found during development, construction or mining, SAHRA (Tel: 021 462 4502) and a professional archaeologist or palaeontologist according to the findings, must be alerted immediately.

SIGNATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGIST PROCESSING REPORT: 

EMAIL: mgalimberti@sahra.org.za

SIGNATURE OF SAHRA HEAD ARCHAEOLOGIST: 

EMAIL: nndobochani@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.

APPENDIX 1

Protection of Graves

In terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999) graves older than 60 years (not in a municipal graveyard) are protected. Human remains younger than 60 years should be handled only by a registered undertaker or an institution declared under the Human Tissues Act.

Anyone who wishes to develop an area where there are graves older than 60 years is required to follow the process described in the legislation (section 36 and associated regulations). The specialist will require a permit from the heritage resources authority:

1. Determine/ confirm the presence of the graves on the property. Normally the quickest way to proceed is to obtain the service of a professional archaeologist accredited to undertake burial relocations. The archaeologist will provide an estimate of the age of the graves. There may be a need for archival research and possibly test excavations (permit required).
2. The preferred decision is to move the development so that the graves may remain undisturbed. If this is done, the developer must satisfy SAHRA that adequate arrangements have been made to protect the graves on site from the impact of the development. This usually involves fencing the grave(yard) and setting up a small site management plan indicating who will be responsible for maintaining the graves and how this is legally tied into the development. It is recommended that a distance of at least 2 m is left undisturbed between the grave and the fence around the graves and another 15 m between the fence of the grave and the development.
3. If the developer wishes to relocate or disturb the graves:
 - a. A 60-day public participation (social consultation) process as required by section 36 (and regulations), must be undertaken to identify any direct descendants of those buried on the property. This allows for a period of consultation with any family members or community to ascertain what their wishes are for the burials. It involves notices to the public on site and through representative media. This may be done by the archaeologist, who can explain the process, but for large or sensitive sites a social consultant should be employed. Archaeologists often work with undertakers, who rebury the human remains.
 - b. If as a result of the public participation, the family (where descendants are identified) or the community agree to the relocation process then the graves may be relocated.
 - c. The archaeologist must submit a permit application to SAHRA for the disinterment of the burials. This must include written approval of the descendants or, if there has not been success in identifying direct descendants, written documentation of the social consultation process, which must indicate to SAHRA's satisfaction, the efforts that have been made to locate them. It must also include details of the exhumation process and the place to which the burials are to be relocated. (There are regulations regarding creating new cemeteries and so this usually means that relocation must be to an established communal rural or formal municipal cemetery.)
 - d. Permission must be obtained before exhumation takes place from the landowner where the graves are located, and from the owners/managers of the graveyard to which the remains will be relocated.

Other relevant legislation must be complied with, including the Human Tissues Act (National Department of Health) and any ordinances of the Provincial Department of Health). The archaeologist can usually advise about this.

