

Final Comment

In terms of Section 35(4) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)

Attention: Dr Jayson Orton
ASHA
6A Scarborough Road
Muizenberg
7945

PROPOSED PHOTOVOLTAIC ENERGY PLANT ON FARM KLIPGATS PAN NEAR COPPERTON, NORTHERN CAPE. The present application is for a permit to mitigate seven LSA archaeological sites in the development area. They lie near Copperton in the Northern cape.

Orton, J., April 2014. ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION OF LATER STONE AGE SITES ON THE REMAINDER OF PORTION 4 OF KLIPGATS PAN 117, PRIESKA MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT, NORTHERN CAPE

Dr Orton undertook the mitigation on seven archaeological sites on Farm Klipgats which will be impacted by the establishment of a photovoltaic energy plant.

The five sites that were mitigated under Permits ID 1524, 1525, 1526, 1527, 1528, 1529, 1530 were all Later Stone Age sites. From the information compiled in the report, it appears that the mitigation of the site mostly included collection of surface material with sieving of the surface sand. This surface sand was underlain by very hard silt which after excavation has proven to be sterile in most sections.

Site KGP2014/004 (permit ID 1524) was not excavated but a surface collection of the material, inclusive of sand sieving, was undertaken. Mostly potsherds were recovered from the site, some of which can be refitted. The potsherds are consistent with LSA pottery from the area, tempered with both minerals and fibres.

Site KGP2014/006 (permit ID 1525) is a quite extensive site with a dense scatter of mostly stone artefacts, but also 16,8g of ostrich eggshell, very small fragments of animal bone and only two fragments of freshwater mussels (*Unio caffer*). The archaeologist mitigated a total of 103m², mostly collecting surface material. The artefacts are mostly quartz with quartzite flakes.

Site KGP2014/008 (Permit ID 1526) was similar in composition to site KGP2014/006. The area mitigated was 60m² in two separate sections, with an average of 3-4 artefacts per m². Once again, most of the identified



material was quartz with a greater representation of quartzite than in the previous site. One upper and two lower grindstones were also identified at this site, along with 196 fragments of ostrich eggshell, two of which engraved, and mostly unidentifiable animal bone fragments. Many of the artefacts from this site were reused from older material.

The mitigation of site KGP2014/009 (Permit ID 1527) covers 29m², with an average of about 4 stone artefacts per m² with fragments of ostrich eggshell (5.7g), one of which is engraved, and one small fragment of animal bone. Compared to the previous two sites, the raw material here is mostly quartzite with a significantly lower percentage of quartz artefacts.

The mitigation of site KGP2014/011 (Permit ID 1528) covered an extent of 28m² with a density of about 10 artefacts per m² which is a higher density than the other sites. 81 Fragments of ostrich eggshell were identified, one of which engraved, along with a few small fragments of animal bone.

Site KGP2014/013 (Permit ID 1529) was mitigated over 39m². About 10 artefacts per m² were recovered on this site, with quartz being once again the predominant raw material (60%) but CCS and quartzite being present in equal amounts (about 20% each). Three potsherds and approximately 300 ostrich eggshell fragments, two of which engraved, were also recovered along with a few animal bone fragments.

The portion of site KGP2014/016 (Permit ID 1530) which was mitigated covered 42m². Since the vegetation was too thick in specific sections of this site, the mitigation was undertaken selectively around the bush. By analysing the material the specialist suggested that this site may be older than the previous ones. While it may appear from the analyses undertaken that most sites belong a Swartkop industry and therefore are most likely the result of hunter-gatherer activity than herder activity, a clear division between this industry and the contemporaneous herder industry (Doornfontein) is not very clear.

SAHRA is generally satisfied with the mitigation undertaken and the reporting of the mitigation. However, the report is not clear in describing the exact methodology used for this "excavation". Was the material sieved from the material to a depth which is never specific in the report.

Mitigation of site KGP2014/013 seems to be insufficient. Further information is required regarding the context of the site. This is the only site where the hard silt was broken and included artefacts. Since earlier in the report the author states that no artefacts are present below the surface, an explanation is necessary on why this site differs from the others and on how the material identified below the broken hard silt relates to the surface material. Moreover, since the vegetation was too thick to undertake mitigation of the northern section





of the site where the material is the densest leaves the doubt whether the material obtained from the site is sufficient to understand the significance of the site and its composition.

SAHRA will further comment on site KGP2014/013 when this information is provided. Details on the methodology, as requested above, should also be provided for the other sites.

Should you have any further queries, please contact the designated official using the case number quoted above in the case header.

Yours faithfully

Mariagrazia Galimberti
Heritage Officer: Archaeology
South African Heritage Resources Agency

Colette Scheermeyer
SAHRA Head Archaeologist
South African Heritage Resources Agency

ADMIN:

Direct URL to case: <http://www.sahra.org.za/node/49512>
(DEA, Ref: 12/12/20/2501)

Terms & Conditions:

1. This approval does not exonerate the applicant from obtaining local authority approval or any other necessary approval for proposed work.
2. If any heritage resources, including graves or human remains, are encountered they must be reported to SAHRA immediately.
3. SAHRA reserves the right to request additional information as required.

