



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: Eastern Cape**

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:

SAHRA File No: **9/2/044/0001**
 Date Received: **10 August 2011**
 Date of Comment: **21 February 2012**
 Sent to Peer Review:
 Date to Peer Review:
 SAHRA Contact Person: **Dr Mariagrazia Galimberti**
 DMR Ref. no: **12/12/20/1861**

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOONTOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

BY ARCHAEOLOGY, PALAEOONTOLOGY 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: Eastern Cape**
- B. AUTHOR OF THE REPORT: Dr W. J. de Klerk**
- C. PALAEOONTOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: Albany Museum Earth Sciences**
- D. CONTACT DETAILS: Somerset Street, Grahamstown, 6139, tel: 0845826072, email: b.deklerk@ru.ac.za**
- E. DATE OF REPORT: January 2011**
- F. TITLE OF REPORT: Palaeontological Heritage Impact Assessment of the Proposed Happy Valley Wind Energy Facility on a site east of Humansdorp, Eastern Cape Province**
- B. AUTHOR OF THE REPORT: Dr Johan Binneman**
- C. ARCHAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: Eastern Cape Heritage Consultants**
- D. CONTACT DETAILS: P.O. Box 689, Jeffreys Bay, 6330, email: kobusreichert@yahoo.com**
- E. DATE OF REPORT: June 2011**
- F. TITLE OF REPORT: A Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment For The**

**Proposed Happy Valley Wind Energy Facility Near Humansdorp, Kouga
Local Municipality, District Of Humansdorp, Eastern Cape Province**

G. Please circle as relevant: Archaeological and Palaeontological components of **EIA /
EMP / HIA / CMP/ Other (Specify)**

REPORT COMMISSIONED BY (**CONSULTANT OR DEVELOPER**): **Savannah
Environmental, Mr John von Mayer**

H. CONTACT DETAILS: **P.O. Box 148, Sunninghill, 2157. Email:
john@savannahsa.com**

I. COMMENTS:

Please see comment on next page

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAENTOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

Dr W. De Klerk

Dated: January 2011, Received: August 2011

Palaeontological Heritage Impact Assessment of the Proposed Happy Valley Wind Energy Facility on a site east of Humansdorp, Eastern Cape Province

Dr J. Binneman,

Dated: June 2011, Received: August 2011

A Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment For The Proposed Happy Valley Wind Energy Facility Near Humansdorp, Kouga Local Municipality, District Of Humansdorp, Eastern Cape Province

INTRODUCTION

Renewable Energy Investments South Africa (Pty) Ltd is proposing the establishment of a wind energy facility with a maximum of 20 turbines 9 km north west of Humansdorp, along the N2. The entire area for the development will cover about 12km² and the energy facility will have a maximum output of 40MW.

So far only 13 turbines are proposed and they are going to be located on a high ridge, which is currently used for grazing and is covered by dense grass and fynbos vegetation.

A 132kV power line, which will connect the energy facility to the Melkhout substation, is also proposed, along with underground cabling between the turbines, internal access roads to each turbine and a small building (20x10m) for maintenance purposes. Each turbine will require a concrete foundation of 16x16x2.5m.

Both an archaeological and a palaeontological impact assessment were included in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report. A desktop study for the scoping phase had already been undertaken by Dr Binneman and commented upon by SAHRA in September 2011.

DISCUSSION

The palaeontologist identified that the Cape Supergroup with both the Bokkeveld and the Table Mountain Groups underlie the area earmarked for the development.

The Table Mountain Group is represented here by the Goudini and the Skurweberg Formations of the Nardouw Subgroup and by the Peninsula Formation, whereas the Bokkeveld Group is here located on the south-western section of the area and is composed of the Gydo Formation of the Ceres Subgroup.

After the field survey the palaeontologist concluded that the fossil significance of the area earmarked for the Happy Valley wind energy facility is very low since the fossils, which may have originally formed during the formation of these sedimentary rocks, have been most likely destroyed by the tectonic overprint of the Cape Folding Event (310 Ma) and by a long period of weathering and erosion.

Two archaeologists investigated the area and only identified one Earlier Stone Age hand axe. While previous studies in the surroundings recorded scatters of Earlier and Middle Stone Age, none of these have been considered of significance. Therefore, even if visibility was at time hampered by the thick vegetation, the archaeologist is confident that most likely, no archaeological sites of significance will be discovered during construction activities on the exposed rocky outcrops of the ridge.

SAHRA RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

If the recommendations included in this Review Comment are adhered to, SAHRA APM Unit has no objection to the development of the wind energy facility in terms of the archaeological and palaeontological components of the Heritage Impact Assessment.

If any new evidence of archaeological sites or artefacts (e.g., shell middens, dense

concentrations of stone artefacts and/or fossilized bone), unmarked human burials or palaeontological heritage resources (e.g., fossilized shell (dense concentrations), fossilized wood, large animal teeth, amber, corals) are encountered during construction activities in the absence of an archaeologist and/or palaeontologist, SAHRA APM Unit (Colette Scheermeyer/ Mariagrazia Galimberti, Tel: 021-4624502) must be alerted immediately, and an accredited professional archaeologist and/or palaeontologist may need to be contacted as soon as possible to inspect the findings.

SIGNATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGIST PROCESSING REPORT: *M Galimberti*.....
 EMAIL: mgalimberti@sahra.org.za
 SIGNATURE OF SAHRA HEAD ARCHAEOLOGIST: *pp Scheermeyer*.....
 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.