



Final Comment

In terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)

Attention: Mrs Gabriele Wood
Savannah Environmental
P.O. Box 148
Sunninghill
2157

Proposed Garob Wind Energy Facility Project, Northern Cape Province (DEA Ref No. 14/12/16/3/3/2/279)

van der Walt, J. September 2012. *Archaeological Impact Assessment Report for the proposed Garob Wind Energy Facility Project, located close to Copperton in the Northern Cape.*

Botha-Brink, J. August 2012. *Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the Proposed Garob Wind Energy Facility Project, Northern Cape Province*

Garob Wind Farms (Pty) Ltd has proposed the establishment of a wind farm on 5520 ha of Portion 5 of Farm Nelspoortjie 103, near Copperton in the Northern Cape. Project infrastructure will include up to 55 2-3 MW turbines built on concrete foundations, connected by cables laid underground where possible as well as on-site substations, an overhead power line, internal access roads to each turbine and maintenance and storage facilities. The site will either link to the existing on site Burchell-Cuprum power line or to the Eskom Caprum substation 8kms away, entailing power lines crossing the adjacent farm Vogelstruisbult. The receiving area is largely flat, with several drainage lines traversing the site, but no major landscape features. The vegetation is Karoo scrub and grass, with some thorn trees. A heritage scoping report for this project has already been compiled and reviewed by SAHRA. This study revealed that ESA, MSA and LSA sites are known from the area, with MSA and LSA sites more densely concentrated around sources of water. Stone kraals have also been identified. An archival history of the farm Nelspoortjie could not be established, although the property appears in documents between 1889 and 1890.

The archaeologist conducted a site survey of the proposed facility location and a desktop study of the proposed alignments of the power lines. The site survey found the property to contain no significant landscape features although several drainage lines were noted; the vegetation is predominantly Bushmanland Arid Grassland, with scrub, grass and some thorn trees. The area was surveyed on foot over four days, with potentially sensitive areas such as drainage lines, outcrops and elevated areas being focused on.

The site survey showed that the deep sands and thick vegetation of the northern part of the site obscured visibility of artefacts there, although isolated MSA and LSA artefacts were still encountered. In the south of the area, more artefacts were visible. Where these exceeded 5 per m², they were recorded as sites, while all others were recorded as occurrences. As such, seven Stone Age sites were recorded (Sites 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10). These sites included a possible MSA knapping site with associated quartzite flakes (Site 1), as well





as further sites of varying density (3-20 artefacts per m²) of MSA and LSA scrapers, blades, flakes and cores on quartz, quartzite, felsite and chert. One site consisted stone kraal (Site 2) with no associated artefacts. In addition, one historical artefact scatter (Site 6), consisting of late 19th/early 20th century glass, ceramics and metal artefacts, and one historical quarrying site (Site 9), related to exploration for copper in the 1930s, were identified. None of these sites will be directly impacted by development. A further 18 occurrences, mostly of MSA and LSA materials were recorded, with some heavily weathered ESA also noted. Of these, four find spots might be impacted during development.

The archaeologist does not address the impacts of the proposed development on the cultural landscape or the sense of place of the area, but does note that there are no buildings on the site and that there are no cultural landscape elements present. The author further notes that, although the development is close to the road, the visual impact will not be high.

The PIA, which was conducted as a desktop study, indicated that the area is largely underlain by Precambrian metamorphic rocks of the Uitdraai Formation (Brulpan Group), with a small area underlain by Permo-Carboniferous Dwyka deposits, probably of the Mbizane Formation. The metamorphic rocks are unfossiliferous, while the Dwyka rocks are of low palaeontological significance, as are the overlying Quaternary sediments. The development is, therefore, unlikely to have an impact on significant palaeontological resources.

Case Decision:

SAHRA supports the recommendations of the author and requires that:

- With regard to the power line alignment, the final route option and pylon positions must be subjected to a walk down, and those sites regarded as no go options on Vogelstruisbult, VGSTR4, NPRT4 and VGSTR12 (Wiltshire 2011) must be avoided. Further, any pans on that farm must be avoided with a 100m buffer zone. In light of the sensitive heritage resources located on the adjacent property, SAHRA recommends that the Garob facility be linked to the on site Eskom power line.
- With regard to the turbine placement, any deviation from the proposed layout must be assessed by an archaeologist.
- The presence of the kraal (Site 2) should be marked as a no go zone on all maps and a temporary fence should be erected around it prior to development.
- All sites identified in the report should be marked on development maps and these areas need to be avoided. Sites 1, 2 and 3 should be temporarily fenced prior to development proceeding; the fencing should be no less than 10m from the perimeter of the site and no development should occur within the fenced off area. If any of the sites are to be disturbed by development activities or turbine placement, SAHRA will require that mitigation is conducted, in terms of s.35 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999). 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. Very often permission is given for the destruction of the remainder of the archaeological or palaeontological sites.





Very rarely, if a site has high heritage significance the authority may request that it be conserved, that mini-site management plans, interpretive material and possibly protective infrastructure be established.

If the recommendations made in the specialist report and in this comment are adhered to, the SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites Unit has no objection to the development (in terms of the archaeological and palaeontological components of the heritage resources). If any new evidence of archaeological sites or artefacts, palaeontological fossils, graves or other heritage resources are found during development or construction, SAHRA and a professional archaeologist and/or palaeontologist, depending on the nature of the finds, must be alerted immediately.

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

Yours faithfully

Kathryn Smuts
Heritage Officer: Archaeology
South African Heritage Resources Agency

Colette Scheermeyer
SAHRA Head Archaeologist
South African Heritage Resources Agency

ADMIN:
(DEA, Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/279)

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.

