



**DANAX ENERGY (PTY) LTD: PHOTOVOLTAIC POWER PLANT
DEVELOPMENT ON PORTION 1 OF THE FARM SHIRLEY 367,
GAMAGARA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, JOHN TAOLO GAETSEWE
DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE**

Archaeological Impact Assessment

Prepared for: Danax Energy (Pty) Ltd
Document version 6.0 (Final)
Compiled by N. Kruger

August 2015



Proudly Supporting
TOUCHING AFRICA

Prepared by



ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (AIA) OF A DEMARCATED SURFACE PORTION ON THE FARM SHIRLEY 367 FOR THE PROPOSED SHIRLEY PHOTOVOLTAIC POWER PLANT AND POWER LINE DEVELOPMENT, GAMAGARA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, JOHN TAOLO GAETSEWE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

August 2015

Document Version 6 (Final)

Conducted on behalf of:

Danax Energy (Pty) Ltd
AGES Gauteng

Compiled by:

Nelius Kruger (BA, BA Hons. Archaeology Pret.)

Reviewed by:

Engela Grobler

GAUTENG PROVINCE: The Village Office Park (Block E), 309 Glenwood Road, Pretoria 0081, Postnet no 74, Private Bag X07, Arcadia, 0007 Tel: +27-12 751 2160 Fax: +27 (0) 86 607 2406 www.ages-group.com

*Offices: Eastern Cape Gauteng Limpopo Province Namibia North-West Province Western Cape Zimbabwe
AGES Board of Directors: SJ Pretorius JA Myburgh JJP Vivier JH Botha H Pretorius THG Ngoepe SM Haasbroek R Crosby
JC Vivier FN de Jager CJH Smit AS Potgieter AGES Gauteng Directors: JJP Vivier JC Vivier E van Zyl M Grobler*

Although Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd exercises due care and diligence in rendering services and preparing documents, Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd accepts no liability, and the client, by receiving this document, indemnifies Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd and its directors, managers, agents and employees against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, directly or indirectly by Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd and by the use of the information contained in this document.

This document contains confidential and proprietary information equally shared between Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd. and Danax Energy (Pty) Ltd, and is protected by copyright in favour of these companies and may not be reproduced, or used without the written consent of these companies, which has been obtained beforehand. This document is prepared exclusively for Danax Energy (Pty) Ltd and is subject to all confidentiality, copyright and trade secrets, rules, intellectual property law and practices of South Africa.

Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd promotes the conservation of sensitive archaeological and heritage resources and therefore uncompromisingly adheres to relevant Heritage Legislation (National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999, Human Tissue Act 65 of 1983 as amended, Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance no. 7 of 1925, Excavations Ordinance no. 12 of 1980). In order to ensure best practices and ethics in the examination, conservation and mitigation of archaeological and heritage resources, Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd follows the Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment as set out by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and the CRM section of the Association for South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA).

DECLARATION

I, Nelius Le Roux Kruger, declare that –

- I act as the independent specialist;
- I am conducting any work and activity relating to the proposed Shirley Solar Park and power line Project in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the client;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have the required expertise in conducting the specialist report and I will comply with legislation, including the relevant Heritage Legislation (National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999, Human Tissue Act 65 of 1983 as amended, Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance no. 7 of 1925, Excavations Ordinance no. 12 of 1980), the Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment (SAHRA and the CRM section of ASAPA), regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I have not, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- All the particulars furnished by me in this declaration are true and correct.



SIGNATURE OF SPECIALIST

Company: Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd.

Date: 25 August 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the results of an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study on Portion 1 of the farm Shirley 367, subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed Shirley Solar Park and power line Project, Gamagara Local Municipality, John Taolo Gaetsewe District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. The report includes background information on the area's archaeology, its representation in southern Africa, and the history of the larger area under investigation, survey methodology and results as well as heritage legislation and conservation policies. A copy of the report will be supplied to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and recommendations contained in this document will be reviewed.

A number of archaeological and historical studies have been conducted in the Kathu and Hotazel areas and many of these studies infer a varied and rich heritage landscape. However, the landscape directly surrounding the Shirley property seems to have been sparsely populated by humans in the past, possibly as a result of the general scarcity of sustainable water sources as well as the absence of hills or outcrops for shelter. Similarly, no areas of archaeological or heritage potential were located during the AIA survey of the two solar park project footprint areas and areas proposed for the Mamatwane-Wincantan and Ferrum-Umtu 132 KV power line sections, covering approximately **440ha** in total.

Stone Age:

No Stone Age occurrences were observed in the survey area.

Iron Age (Farmer Period):

No Iron Age (Farmer Period) occurrences were observed in the survey area.

Historical/ Colonial Period:

No Historical/Colonial Period occurrences were observed in the survey area.

Graves:

No grave or burials were observed in the survey area

Since no heritage resources have been documented on either of the proposed Shirley Solar Park Project footprint areas or in areas proposed for the two 132 KV power line sections, no impact on such resources is anticipated. No site-specific actions or any further heritage mitigation measures are recommended but the construction process should be monitored in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains. In the opinion of the author of this Archaeological Impact Assessment Report, the proposed Danax Energy Shirley Solar Park Project on Portion 1 of the farm Shirley 367 may proceed from a culture resources management perspective.

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment should be considered where bedrock is to be impacted on and, should fossil remains such as fossil fish, reptiles or vitrified wood be exposed during construction, these objects should be carefully safeguarded and the relevant heritage resources authority (SAHRA) should be notified immediately so that the appropriate action can be taken by a professional palaeontologist. It is essential that cognisance be taken of the larger archaeological landscape of the area in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage sites. Here, care should be taken around rock faces and outcrops in the larger landscape, as rock art is known to occur on these outcrops. Water sources such as salt pans, drainage lines and rivers should also be regarded as potentially sensitive in terms of possible Stone Age deposits. The possible existence

of Historical Period resources deriving from the area's more recent history should also be considered. Ultimately, it is essential that the archaeological and cultural heritage of the Northern Cape Province be respected.

NOTATIONS AND TERMS

Absolute dating:

Absolute dating provides specific dates or range of dates expressed in years.

Archaeology:

The study of the human past through its material remains.

Archaeological record:

The archaeological record minimally includes all the material remains documented by archaeologists. More comprehensive definitions also include the record of culture history and everything written about the past by archaeologists.

Artefact:

Entities whose characteristics result or partially result from human activity. The shape and other characteristics of the artefact are not altered by removal of the surroundings in which they are discovered. In the southern African context examples of artefacts include potsherds, iron objects, stone tools, beads and hut remains.

Assemblage:

A group of artefacts recurring together at a particular time and place, and representing the sum of human activities.

¹⁴C or radiocarbon dating:

The ¹⁴C method determines the absolute age of organic material by studying the radioactivity of carbon. It is reliable for objects not older 70 000 years by means of isotopic enrichment. The method becomes increasingly inaccurate for samples younger than ±250 years.

Ceramic Facies:

In terms of the cultural representation of ceramics, a facies is denoted by a specific branch of a larger ceramic tradition. A number of ceramic facies thus constitute a ceramic tradition.

Ceramic Tradition:

In terms of the cultural representation of ceramics, a series of ceramic units constitutes as ceramic tradition.

Context:

An artefact's context usually consists of its immediate *matrix*, its *provenience* and its *association* with other artefacts. When found in *primary context*, the original artefact or structure was undisturbed by natural or human factors until excavation and if in *secondary context*, disturbance or displacement by later ecological action or human activities occurred.

Culture:

A contested term, "culture" could minimally be defined as the learned and shared things that people have, do and think.

Cultural Heritage Resource:

The broad generic term *Cultural Heritage Resources* refers to any physical and spiritual property associated with past and present human use or occupation of the environment, cultural activities and history. The term includes sites, structures, places, natural features and material of palaeontological, archaeological, historical, aesthetic, scientific, architectural, religious, symbolic or traditional importance to specific individuals or groups, traditional systems of cultural practice, belief or social interaction.

Cultural landscape:

A cultural landscape refers to a distinctive geographic area with cultural significance.

Cultural Resource Management (CRM):

A system of measures for safeguarding the archaeological heritage of a given area, generally applied within the framework of legislation designed to safeguard the past.

Ecofact:

Non artefactual material remains that has cultural relevance which provides information about past human activities. Examples would include remains or evidence of domesticated animals or plant species.

Excavation:

The principal method of data acquisition in archaeology, involving the systematic uncovering of archaeological remains through the removal of the deposits of soil and the other material covering and accompanying it.

Feature:

Non-portable artefacts, in other words artefacts that cannot be removed from their surroundings without destroying or altering their original form. Hearths, roads, and storage pits are examples of archaeological features

GIS:

Geographic Information Systems are computer software that allows layering of various types of data to produce complex maps; useful for predicting site location and for representing the analysis of collected data within sites and across regions.

Historical archaeology:

Primarily that aspect of archaeology which is complementary to history based on the study of written sources. In the South African context it concerns the recovery and interpretation of relics left in the ground in the course of Europe's discovery of South Africa, as well as the movements of the indigenous groups during, and after the "Great Scattering" of Bantu-speaking groups – known as the *mfecane* or *difaqane*.

Impact: A description of the effect of an aspect of the development on a specified component of the biophysical, social or economic environment within a defined time and space.

Iron Age:

Also known as "Farmer Period", the "Iron Age" is an archaeological term used to define a period associated with domesticated livestock and grains, metal working and ceramic manufacture.

Lithic:

Stone tools or waste from stone tool manufacturing found on archaeological sites.

Management / Management Actions:

Actions – including planning and design changes - that enhance benefits associated with a proposed development, or that avoid, mitigate, restore, rehabilitate or compensate for the negative impacts.

Matrix:

The material in which an artefact is situated (sediments such as sand, ashy soil, mud, water, etcetera). The matrix may be of natural origin or human-made.

Megalith:

A large stone, often found in association with others and forming an alignment or monument, such as large stone statues.

Midden:

Refuse that accumulates in a concentrated heap.

Microlith:

A small stone tool, typically knapped of flint or chert, usually about three centimetres long or less.

Monolith:

A geological feature such as a large rock, consisting of a single massive stone or rock, or a single piece of rock placed as, or within, a monument or site.

Oral Histories:

The historical narratives, stories and traditions passed from generation to generation by word of mouth.

Phase 1 CRM Assessment:

An Impact Assessment which identifies archaeological and heritage sites, assesses their significance and comments on the impact of a given development on the sites. Recommendations for site mitigation or conservation are also made during this phase.

Phase 2 CRM Study:

In-depth studies which could include major archaeological excavations, detailed site surveys and mapping / plans of sites, including historical / architectural structures and features. Alternatively, the sampling of sites by collecting material, small test pit excavations or auger sampling is required. Mitigation / Rescue involves planning the protection of significant sites or sampling through excavation or

collection (in terms of a permit) at sites that may be lost as a result of a given development.

Phase 3 CRM Measure:

A Heritage Site Management Plan (for heritage conservation), is required in rare cases where the site is so important that development will not be allowed and sometimes developers are encouraged to enhance the value of the sites retained on their properties with appropriate interpretive material or displays.

Prehistoric archaeology:

That aspect of archaeology which concerns itself with the development of humans and their culture before the invention of writing. In South Africa, prehistoric archaeology comprises the study of the Early Stone Age, the Middle Stone Age and the greater part of the Later Stone Age and the Iron Age.

Probabilistic Sampling:

A sampling strategy that is not biased by any person's judgment or opinion. Also known as statistical sampling, it includes systematic, random and stratified sampling strategies.

Provenience

Provenience is the three-dimensional (horizontal and vertical) position in which artefacts are found. Fundamental to ascertaining the provenience of an artefact is *association*, the co-occurrence of an artefact with other archaeological remains; and *superposition*, the principle whereby artefacts in lower levels of a matrix were deposited before the artefacts found in the layers above them, and are therefore older.

Random Sampling:

A probabilistic sampling strategy whereby randomly selected sample blocks in an area are surveyed. These are fixed by drawing coordinates of the sample blocks from a table of random numbers.

Relative dating:

The process whereby the relative antiquity of sites and objects are determined by putting them in sequential order but not assigning specific dates.

Remote Sensing:

The small or large-scale acquisition of information of an object or phenomenon, by the use of either recording or real-time sensing device(s) that is not in physical or intimate contact with the object (such as by way of aircraft, spacecraft or satellite). Here, ground-based geophysical methods such as Ground Penetrating Radar and Magnetometry are often used for archaeological imaging.

Rock Art Research:

Rock art can be "decoded" in order to inform about cultural attributes of prehistoric societies, such as dress-code, hunting and food gathering, social behaviour, religious practice, gender issues and political issues.

Scoping Assessment:

The process of determining the spatial and temporal boundaries (i.e. extent) and key issues to be addressed in an impact assessment. The main purpose is to focus the impact assessment on a manageable number of important questions on which decision making is expected to focus and to ensure that only key issues and reasonable alternatives are examined. The outcome of the scoping process is a Scoping Report that includes issues raised during the scoping process, appropriate responses and, where required, terms of reference for specialist involvement.

Sensitive:

Often refers to graves and burial sites although not necessarily a heritage place, as well as ideologically significant sites such as ritual / religious places. *Sensitive* may also refer to an entire landscape / area known for its significant heritage remains.

Site (Archaeological):

A distinct spatial clustering of artefacts, features, structures, and organic and environmental remains, as the residue of human activity. These include surface sites, caves and rock shelters, larger open-air sites, sealed sites (deposits) and river deposits. Common functions of archaeological sites include living or habitation sites, kill sites, ceremonial sites, burial sites, trading, quarry, and art sites,

Slag:

The material residue of smelting processes from metalworking.

Stone Age:

An archaeological term used to define a period of stone tool use and manufacture.

Stratigraphy:

This principle examines and describes the observable layers of sediments and the arrangement of strata in deposits

Stratified Sampling:

A probabilistic sampling strategy whereby a study area is divided into appropriate zones – often based on the probable location of archaeological areas, after which each zone is sampled at random.

Systematic Sampling:

A probabilistic sampling strategy whereby a grid of sample blocks is set up over the survey area and each of these blocks is equally spaced and searched.

Tradition:

Artefact types, assemblages of tools, architectural styles, economic practices or art styles that last longer than a phase and even a horizon are describe by the term *tradition*. A common example of this is the early Iron Age tradition of Southern Africa that originated \pm 200 AD and came to an end at about 900 AD.

Trigger: A particular characteristic of either the receiving environment or the proposed project which indicates that there is likely to be an *issue* and/or potentially significant *impact* associated with that proposed development that may require specialist input. Legal requirements of existing and future legislation may also trigger the need for specialist involvement.

Tuyère:

A ceramic blow-tube used in the process of iron smelting / reduction.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
AGES	Africa Geo Environmental Services Gauteng Pty Ltd
ASAPA	Association for South African Professional Archaeologists
AIA	Archaeological Impact Assessment
BP	Before Present
BCE	Before Common Era
CRM	Culture Resources Management
EIA	Early Iron Age (also Early Farmer Period)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EFP	Early Farmer Period (also Early Iron Age)
ESA	Earlier Stone Age
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
K2/Map	K2/Mapungubwe Period
LFP	Later Farmer Period (also Later Iron Age)
LIA	Later Iron Age (also Later Farmer Period)
LSA	Later Stone Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age (also Early later Farmer Period)
MRA	Mining Right Area
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act No.25 of 1999, Section 35
PFS	Pre-Feasibility Study
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Authorities
SAFA	Society for Africanist Archaeologists
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Association
YCE	Years before Common Era (Present)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	II
1 BACKGROUND.....	12
1.1 SCOPE AND MOTIVATION.....	12
1.2 PROJECT DIRECTION	12
1.3 PROJECT BRIEF.....	12
1.4 TERMS OF REFERENCE	15
1.5 CRM: LEGISLATION, CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE MANAGEMENT	16
1.5.1 <i>Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites</i>	16
1.5.2 <i>Background to HIA and AIA Studies</i>	18
2 REGIONAL CONTEXT	19
2.1 AREA LOCATION	19
2.2 AREA DESCRIPTION: RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	21
2.3 SITE DESCRIPTION.....	22
3 METHOD OF ENQUIRY	23
3.1 SOURCES OF INFORMATION.....	23
3.1.1 <i>Desktop Study</i>	23
3.1.2 <i>Aerial Representations and Survey</i>	23
3.1.3 <i>Field Survey</i>	23
3.1.4 <i>General Public Liaison</i>	25
3.2 LIMITATIONS.....	25
3.2.1 <i>Access</i>	25
3.2.2 <i>Visibility</i>	25
3.2.3 <i>Limitations and Constraints</i>	28
4 RESULTS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY	29
4.1 THE STONE AGE.....	29
4.2 THE IRON AGE FARMER PERIOD	29
4.3 HISTORICAL / COLONIAL PERIOD AND RECENT TIMES.....	29
4.4 GRAVES.....	29
5 ARCHAEO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT.....	29
5.1 THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF SOUTHERN AFRICA	29
5.1.1 <i>The Stone Ages</i>	30
5.1.2 <i>The Iron Age Farmer Period</i>	30
5.1.3 <i>Historical and Colonial Times and Recent History</i>	31
5.2 THE HOTAZEL, KURUMAN, KATHU AREA: SPECIFIC THEMES.....	32
5.2.1 <i>Palaeontology & Early History</i>	32
5.2.2 <i>The Early and Middle stone Ages in the Northern Cape</i>	32
5.2.3 <i>Rock Markings</i>	32
5.2.4 <i>Iron Age / Farmer Period Sites</i>	33
5.2.5 <i>Later History: Historical archaeology and living heritage</i>	33
5.2.6 <i>Other: Mining and Metallurgy</i>	34
5.2.7 <i>Significant Heritage Sites in this section of the Northern Cape Province</i>	35
6 RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING	39
6.1 HERITAGE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION	39

6.2	CATEGORIES OF SIGNIFICANCE	39
6.3	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE RATINGS	41
6.3.1	<i>General assessment of impacts on resources</i>	41
6.3.2	<i>Direct impact rating</i>	42
6.3.3	<i>Management actions</i>	43
6.4	DISCUSSION: EVALUATION OF RESULTS	44
7	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	45
8	GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS	45
9	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	47

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Map representation of the Shirley Solar Park EIA study area. Footprint locations for infrastructure were selected from within this area.....	14
Figure 1-2: Map representation of the proposed footprint areas for the Shirley Solar Park Development. The area shaded in blue indicates the preferred Alternative Location.....	15
Figure 2-1: 1:50 000 Map representation of the location of the Shirley Solar Park Development location (2722BD). The farm Shirley is indicated in black outline and the proposed project footprints are shaded in red.....	20
Figure 2-2: Aerial imagery providing a regional context for the respective footprint areas proposed for the Shirley Solar Park project.....	21
Figure 2-3: General surroundings on a western portion of the farm Shirley at the preferred footprint area for in the Shirley Solar Park, at the time of the field survey (March 2014).....	22
Figure 2-4: General surroundings on an eastern portion of the farm Shirley at the alternative footprint area for in the Shirley Solar Park, at the time of the field survey (March 2014).....	22
Figure 3-1: Captured screen contents of real time mobile aerial orientation representations employed during the field survey, current field location indicated by blue marker.....	24
Figure 3-2: Garmin GPS Track log for the site survey of the two proposed site alternatives for the Shirley Solar Park (indicated in blue and yellow) and the location of proposed new power line sections (black box).....	24
Figure 3-3: View of the study area on the western portion of Shirley, looking north towards the Matatatwan Mine.....	25
Figure 3-4: View of the study area on the western portion of Shirley, looking east.....	26
Figure 3-5: View of the study area on the western portion of Shirley, looking east towards the Transnet railway line.....	26
Figure 3-6: View of general surroundings in the eastern portion of the farm Shirley.....	27
Figure 3-7: Animal burrowing and digging visible in the eastern portion of Shirley.....	27
Figure 3-8: View of small cattle tracks in the eastern portion of Shirley.....	28
Figure 5-1: The original title deed for the farm Shirley c. 1910.....	34
Figure 5-2: Early Stone Age (Acheul) handaxe from the Kathu Pan site (http://www.museumsnc.co.za).....	36
Figure 5-3: Middle Stone Age hafted points, similar to those documented at the Kathu Pan site (http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn22508-first-stonetipped-spear-thrown-earlier-than-thought.html).....	36
Figure 5-4: Interior of the Wonderwerk Cave.....	37
Figure 5-5: Flaked MSA lithics on jasper from the farm Lylyveld, documented by Beaumont (2009).....	38

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Chronological Periods across southern Africa.....	29
Table 2: Heritage Site Significance Ratings.....	40
Table 3: Impact Assessment Criteria.....	41
Table 4: Direct Impact Assessment Criteria.....	43
Table 5: Management and Mitigation Actions.....	43

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Scope and Motivation

AGES Gauteng was commissioned by Danax Energy (Pty) Ltd for an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study of Portion 1 of the farm Shirley 367, subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed Shirley Solar Park Project, Gamagara Local Municipality, John Taolo Gaetsewe District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. The rationale of this AIA is to determine the presence of heritage resources such as archaeological and historical sites and features, graves and places of religious and cultural significance in previously unstudied areas; to consider the impact of the proposed project on such heritage resources, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the cultural resources management measures that may be required at affected sites / features.

1.2 Project Direction

AGES's expertise ensures that all projects be conducted to the highest international ethical and professional standards. As archaeological specialist for AGES, Mr Neels Kruger acted as field director for the project; responsible for the assimilation of all information, the compilation of the final consolidated AIA report and recommendations in terms of heritage resources on the demarcated project areas. Mr Kruger is an accredited archaeologist and Culture Resources Management (CRM) practitioner with the Association of South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA), a member of the Society for Africanist Archaeologists (SAFA) and the Pan African Archaeological Association (PAA) as well as a Master's Degree candidate in archaeology at the University of Pretoria.

1.3 Project Brief

A Photovoltaic (PV) Power Plant, known as the Shirley Solar Park is proposed on the farm Shirley where two areas, 210ha each, have been identified as alternatives for the plant. The solar facility will have a maximum generating capacity up to 75 MW. As noted above, the PV power plant will cover a footprint (fenced area) up to 210 ha within the study area, 1430 ha in extent. In addition, two sections of 132 KV power lines will connect to the 132kv busbar that is located on the project site. The facility will comprise several arrays (strings) of PV modules mounted on frames; the associated infrastructure and structures will consist of:

- internal and external access roads and a small parking area;
- fencing of the plant and video security control systems;
- foundations / mini piles for the mounted Photovoltaic arrays;
- electricity access point for the construction phase, operation phase (if necessary) and UPS (Uninterruptible Power Supply) devices;
- water access point and/or water extraction on-site from borehole(s), water supply pipelines, water treatment;
- sewage system and storm water collection system;
- workshop & warehouse,
- offices & administrative area;
- cabling linking Photovoltaic strings and other internal cabling;
- medium voltage stations designed to host DC/AC inverters and medium voltage power transformers;
- one medium voltage receiving station, linking in parallel all the medium voltage stations; (xii) one small on-site high-voltage substation with high-voltage power transformer(s),
- stepping up the voltage to the voltage of the Eskom's grid, control building(s) and one busbar with metering and protection devices (also called "switching station");
- two new small sections of high-voltage power line allowing either the Eskom "Mamatwane-

Wincantan" 132 kV power line or the Eskom "Ferrum-Umtu" 132kV power line (currently under construction) - crossing the project site - to loop in and out of the 132 kV busbar of the new on-site loop-in loop-out substation.

As alternative connection solution, the **Shirley Solar Park** may be connected to the Eskom Mamatwane substation, within the project site. The connection may also entail interventions on the Eskom grid, according to Eskom's connection requirements/solution

The PV plant will mainly consist of the following components:

- **Photovoltaic cells and photovoltaic modules:** PV cells are made in silicone and act as a semiconductor used to produce the photovoltaic effect. Individual PV cells are linked and placed behind a protective glass sheet to form a photovoltaic module. The facility will use photovoltaic modules with high efficiency.
- **Support structures:** PV modules will be assembled on steel or aluminium frames. At this stage, the preferred technology for the mounting system is **the horizontal single-axis trackers**, depicted in Figure 1. Each tracker is composed by several PV arrays North-South oriented and linked by a horizontal axis, driven by a motor. The horizontal axis allows the rotation of the PV arrays toward the West and East direction, in order to follow the daily sun path.
- **Strings and string boxes:** the PV modules are connected in series in order to form PV strings, so that the string voltage fits into the voltage range of the DC/AC inverters. PV strings are devised in order to be connected to DC-connection boxes (string boxes) with a parallel connection solution (PV sub-field). String Boxes monitor the currents in photovoltaic modules and can promptly diagnose faults. String boxes are also designed with a general circuit breaker in order to disconnect the photovoltaic sub-fields from the DC/AC inverters.
- **Medium voltage stations:** Each medium-voltage station is designed to host one or more DC/AC inverters, and one or more medium-voltage power transformers. The DC/AC inverters are deemed to convert the direct current (DC) to alternating current (AC) at low voltage; subsequently the AC will pass through a medium-voltage power transformer in order to step-up the voltage up to 20/22 kV.
- **Medium-voltage receiving station:** The energy from the medium voltage stations will be collected into one medium voltage receiving station, linking in parallel all the PV fields of the PV generator.
- **High-voltage loop-in loop-out substation:** from the medium-voltage receiving station, the electrical energy will be delivered to one small on-site high-voltage substation with two or more high-voltage power transformers (one as spare), stepping up the voltage to the voltage of the Eskom grid. Furthermore, the on-site high-voltage substation will be equipped with a control building and one busbar with metering and protection devices (also called "switching station"). New sections of 132 kV line for the connection to the Eskom grid: from the busbar of the high voltage substation, two overhead power lines - 100 m long - will deliver the energy to either the Eskom "Mamatwane-Wincantan" 132 kV power line or the Eskom "Ferrum- Umtu" 132 kV power line, both crossing the project site.
- **Interventions on the Eskom's network:** the connection may also entail interventions on either the Eskom "Mamatwane-Wincantan" 132 kV power line or the Eskom "Ferrum-Umtu" 132 kV power line and/or on the Eskom network.

Other key features of the project are to ensure a high level of reliability, operational and maintenance safety, low water consumption. The expected operational life of the plant is deemed of approximately 25-30 years.




Figure 1-1: Map representation of the Shirley Solar Park EIA study area. Footprint locations for infrastructure were selected from within this area.




Figure 1-2: Map representation of the proposed footprint areas for the Shirley Solar Park Development. The area shaded in blue indicates the preferred Alternative Location.

1.4 Terms of Reference

Heritage specialist input into the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is essential to ensure that through the management of change, developments still conserve our heritage resources. Heritage specialist input in EIA processes can play a positive role in the development process by enriching an understanding of the past and its contribution to the present. It is also a legal requirement for certain development categories which may have an impact on heritage resources (Refer to Section 1.5.2.).

Thus, EIAs should always include an assessment of Heritage Resources. The heritage component of the EIA is provided for in the **National Environmental Management Act, (Act 107 of 1998)** and endorsed by section 38 of

the **National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA - Act 25 of 1999)**. In addition, the NHRA protects all structures and features older than 60 years (see Section 34 of the Act), archaeological sites and material (see Section 35 of the Act) and graves as well as burial sites (see Section 36 of the Act). The objective of this legislation is to enable and to facilitate developers to employ measures to limit the potentially negative effects that the development could have on heritage resources.

Based hereon, this project functioned according to the following **terms of reference** for heritage specialist input:

- *Provide a detailed description of all archaeological artefacts, structures (including graves) and settlements which may be affected, if any.*
- *Assess the nature and degree of significance of such resources within the area.*
- *Establish heritage informants/constraints to guide the development process through establishing thresholds of impact significance.*
- *Assess any possible impact on the archaeological and historical remains within the area emanating from the proposed development activities.*
- *Propose possible heritage management measures provided that such action is necessitated by the development.*
- *Liaise and consult with the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).*

1.5 CRM: Legislation, Conservation and Heritage Management

The broad generic term *Cultural Heritage Resources* refers to any physical and spiritual property associated with past and present human use or occupation of the environment, cultural activities and history. The term includes sites, structures, places, natural features and material of palaeontological, archaeological, historical, aesthetic, scientific, architectural, religious, symbolic or traditional importance to specific individuals or groups, traditional systems of cultural practice, belief or social interaction.

1.5.1 Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and their provincial offices aim to conserve and control the management, research, alteration and destruction of cultural resources of South Africa. It is therefore vitally important to adhere to heritage resource legislation at all times.

a. National Heritage Resources Act No 25 of 1999, section 35

According to the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 a historical site is any identifiable building or part thereof, marker, milestone, gravestone, landmark or tell older than 60 years. This clause is commonly known as the "60-years clause". Buildings are amongst the most enduring features of human occupation, and this definition therefore includes all buildings older than 60 years, modern architecture as well as ruins, fortifications and Iron Age settlements. "Tell" refers to the evidence of human existence which is no longer above ground level, such as building foundations and buried remains of settlements (including artefacts).

The Act identifies heritage objects as:

- objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa including archaeological and palaeontological objects, meteorites and rare geological specimens
- visual art objects
- military objects

- numismatic objects
- objects of cultural and historical significance
- objects to which oral traditions are attached and which are associated with living heritage
- objects of scientific or technological interest
- any other prescribed category

With regards to activities and work on archaeological and heritage sites this Act states that:

“No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years without a permit by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.” (34. [1] 1999:58)

and

“No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority-

- (a) destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;*
- (b) destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological material or object or any meteorite;*
- (c) trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or palaeontological material or object, or any meteorite; or*
- (d) bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites. (35. [4] 1999:58).”*

and

“No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources agency-

- (a) destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;*
- (b) destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority;*
- (c) bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals (36. [3] 1999:60).”*

b. Human Tissue Act of 1983 and Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies of 1925

Graves 60 years or older are heritage resources and fall under the jurisdiction of both the National Heritage Resources Act and the Human Tissues Act of 1983. However, graves younger than 60 years are specifically protected by the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and the Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies (Ordinance 7 of 1925) as well as any local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws. Such burial places

also fall under the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the Provincial Health Departments. Approval for the exhumation and re-burial must be obtained from the relevant Provincial MEC as well as the relevant Local Authorities.

1.5.2 Background to HIA and AIA Studies

South Africa's unique and non-renewable archaeological and palaeontological heritage sites are 'generally' protected in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999, section 35) and may not be disturbed at all without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority. Heritage sites are frequently threatened by development projects and both the environmental and heritage legislation require impact assessments (HIAs & AIAs) that identify all heritage resources in areas to be developed. Particularly, these assessments are required to make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact of the sites. HIAs and AIAs should be done by qualified professionals with adequate knowledge to (a) identify all heritage resources including archaeological and palaeontological sites that might occur in areas to be developed and (b) make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact on the sites.

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999, section 38) provides guidelines for Cultural Resources Management and prospective developments:

“38. (1) Subject to the provisions of subsections (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development categorised as:

(a) the construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;

(b) the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length;

(c) any development or other activity which will change the character of a site:

(i) exceeding 5 000 m² in extent; or

(ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or

(iii) involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or

(iv) the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;

(d) the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m² in extent; or

(e) any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority,

must at the very earliest stages of initiating such a development, notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.”

And:

“The responsible heritage resources authority must specify the information to be provided in a report required in terms of subsection (2)(a): Provided that the following must be included:

(a) The identification and mapping of all heritage resources in the area affected;

- (b) *an assessment of the significance of such resources in terms of the heritage assessment criteria set out in section 6(2) or prescribed under section 7;*
- (c) *an assessment of the impact of the development on such heritage resources;*
- (d) *an evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the sustainable social and economic benefits to be derived from the development;*
- (e) *the results of consultation with communities affected by the proposed development and other interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources;*
- (f) *if heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the consideration of alternatives; and*
- (g) *plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after the completion of the proposed development (38. [3] 1999:64)."*

Consequently, section 35 of the Act requires Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) or Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIAs) to be done for such developments in order for all heritage resources, that is, all places or objects of aesthetic, architectural, historic, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance to be protected. Thus any assessment should make provision for the protection of all these heritage components, including archaeology, shipwrecks, battlefields, graves, and structures older than 60 years, living heritage, historical settlements, landscapes, geological sites, palaeontological sites and objects.

2 REGIONAL CONTEXT

2.1 Area Location

The study area is located between the small towns of Deben and Hotazel on Portion 1 of the Farm Shirley 367, generally at **S27°25'1.59" E22°58'52.60" (1:50 000 Map Reference 2722BD)**. The farm is situated in the Gamagara Local Municipality, John Taolo Gaetsewe District Municipality, Northern Cape Province.

The site is situated more or less 40km north-west of the town of Kuruman and the Sishen Mining Complex occurs approximately 30km southeast of the farm. The property is bordered to the east by the R380 provincial road and the Mamathwane Manganese Mine is situated directly north of the study area. The region lies approximately 180km north-east of the Northern Cape town of Upington (see Figure 2-1).




Figure 2-1: 1:50 000 Map representation of the location of the Shirley Solar Park Development location (2722BD). The farm Shirley is indicated in black outline and the proposed project footprints are shaded in red.




Figure 2-2: Aerial imagery providing a regional context for the respective footprint areas proposed for the Shirley Solar Park project.

2.2 Area Description: Receiving Environment

The Northern Cape area around Kuruman, Kathu and Hotazel receives around 200-400 mm of rain in the summer months. The local vegetation is classified as Karroid Bushveld where a transition occurs between trees in a mixed grassveld, typical to the Bushveld complex, to a Karoo landscape with more open grasslands and succulents (Acocks 1988). The geology of the region is underlain by rocks older than 1000 million years and the

overburden consists mainly of geologically recent Kalahari sand, which in turn is un-fossiliferous. Some quartzites also occur on area on the landscape. Previous studies in the area indicated that the area is underlain more specifically by Proterozoic-aged rocks belonging to the Asbestos Hills Subgroup of the Transvaal Supergroup (Beaumont 2009). The Gamagara River, a major non-perennial waterway transects the landscape west of the study area, and the Kuruman hills are located north and east of the farm Shirley.



Figure 2-3: General surroundings on a western portion of the farm Shirley at the preferred footprint area for in the Shirley Solar Park, at the time of the field survey (March 2014).



Figure 2-4: General surroundings on an eastern portion of the farm Shirley at the alternative footprint area for in the Shirley Solar Park, at the time of the field survey (March 2014).

2.3 Site Description

The farm Shirley occurs on fairly flat terrain. The western portion of the property, where the preferred site for the solar facility has been demarcated, is relatively heavily vegetated. The eastern portion, containing an alternative development area for the solar facility is less vegetated, and covered in mostly soft red sands with little visible surface stone. Existing infrastructure comprises several dams/water holes, concrete drinking troughs, feeding bins, and dry pans. A Transnet railway line intersects the farm and a gravel farm road, following the servitude of the railway crosses the property. A number of small cattle tracks intersect the site. There are no significant

landscape features in the footprint area but a dry drainage line, the Vlermuisleegte occurs along the western periphery of the property (see Figure 2-3). The chosen site is suitable for the installation of a photovoltaic (PV) power plant. It is appropriate morphologically (flat terrain) and regarding the favourable radiation conditions. The available radiation allows a high rate of electric energy production, as a combination of latitude-longitude and climatic conditions.

3 METHOD OF ENQUIRY

3.1 Sources of Information

Data from detailed desktop, aerial and field studies were employed in order to sample surface areas systematically and to ensure a high probability of heritage site recording.

3.1.1 Desktop Study

A desktop study was prepared in order to contextualize the proposed project within a larger historical milieu. The study focused on relevant previous studies, archaeological and archival sources, aerial photographs, historical maps and local histories, all pertaining to the Hotazel area and the larger landscape of this section of the Northern Cape Province.

3.1.2 Aerial Representations and Survey

Aerial photography is often employed to locate and study archaeological sites, particularly where larger scale area surveys are performed. This method was applied to great success in the pedestrian survey for the project where contour lines of elevations, depressions, variation in vegetation, soil marks and landmarks were examined. Specific attention was given to shadow sites (shadows of walls or earthworks which are visible early or late in the day), crop mark sites (crop mark sites are visible because disturbances beneath crops cause variations in their height, vigour and type) and soil marks (e.g. differently coloured or textured soil (soil marks) might indicate ploughed-out burial mounds). Attention was also given to moisture differences, as prolonged dampening of soil as a result of precipitation frequently occurs over walls or embankments (see Figure 2-3). By superimposing high frequency aerial photographs with images generated with Google Earth, potential sensitive areas were subsequently identified, geo-referenced and transferred to a handheld GPS device. In addition, based on existing knowledge of the local heritage landscape, the corridor was divided into smaller survey zones centred around areas of higher site catchment probability (where human activity was likely to occur in prehistoric and historic times e.g. around water sources, near soils fit for agriculture, on ridges). These survey zones were then transferred to a handheld GPS device. These areas served as referenced points from where further vehicular and pedestrian surveys were carried out.

3.1.3 Field Survey

Archaeological survey implies the systematic procedure of the identification of archaeological sites. An archaeological survey of the footprint areas proposed for the Shirley Solar Park, as well as corridors for the proposed Mamatwane-Wincantan and Ferrum-Umtu 132 KV power lines, was conducted in March 2014. The process encompassed a systematic field survey in accordance with standard archaeological practice by which heritage resources are observed and documented. In order to sample surface areas systematically and to ensure a high probability of site recording, the two site alternatives were systematically surveyed on foot by means of a transect survey. The short corridors demarcated for the high-voltage power lines allowing intervention into the existing Eskom grid were also investigated by means of a pedestrian survey along these routes (see GPS Track log in Figure 3-2). GPS reference points identified during the aerial survey were also visited and random spot checks were made (see detail in previous section). Using a Garmin E-trex Legend GPS objects and structures of

archaeological / heritage value were recorded and photographed with a Canon 450D Digital camera. Real time aerial orientation, by means of a mobile Google Earth application was also employed to investigate possible disturbed areas during the survey.




Figure 3-1: Captured screen contents of real time mobile aerial orientation representations employed during the field survey, current field location indicated by blue marker.




Figure 3-2: Garmin GPS Track log for the site survey of the two proposed site alternatives for the Shirley Solar Park (indicated in blue and yellow) and the location of proposed new power line sections (black box).

As most archaeological material occur in single or multiple stratified layers beneath the soil surface, special attention was given to disturbances, both man-made such as roads and clearings, as well as those made by natural agents such as burrowing animals and erosion.

3.1.4 General Public Liaison

Correspondence with the owner of Shirley provided information on the general history of the area, possible locations of heritage resources and brief commentaries on the recent history of the farm. He pointed to the fact that, according to his knowledge, no heritage resources was present on the farm portion subject to this AIA Study.

3.2 Limitations

3.2.1 Access

Portion 1 of the farm Shirley is accessed directly via the R380 regional road which connects to the towns of Deben, Hotazel and Kathu. Access control is applied to the farm portions relevant to this assessment but no restrictions were encountered during the site visit as the author of this report was granted access by the owner of the farm. A railway service road provided vehicular access to most areas within the demarcated footprint area.

3.2.2 Visibility

The surrounding vegetation in the study area is mostly comprised out of mixed grasslands and scattered trees with the occurrence of semi-arid succulents in places. The eastern portion of Shirley is covered in more dense Thornveld vegetation and visibility proved to be a constraint when approaching the study. The western portion of the property is covered in less dense vegetation and archaeological visibility was consequently better in these areas. The general visibility at the time of the initial AIA survey (March 2012) therefore ranged between moderate to high visibility in areas to the west, and moderate visibility in the central and western portions of the study area (see Figures 3-3 to 3-8). In single cases during the survey sub-surface inspection was possible. Where applied, this revealed no archaeological deposits.



Figure 3-3: View of the study area on the western portion of Shirley, looking north towards the Matatatwan Mine.



Figure 3-4: View of the study area on the western portion of Shirley, looking east.



Figure 3-5: View of the study area on the western portion of Shirley, looking east towards the Transnet railway line.



Figure 3-6: View of general surroundings in the eastern portion of the farm Shirley.



Figure 3-7: Animal burrowing and digging visible in the eastern portion of Shirley.



Figure 3-8: View of small cattle tracks in the eastern portion of Shirley.

3.2.3 Limitations and Constraints

The pedestrian site survey for the Shirley Solar Park Project AIA primarily focused around areas tentatively identified as sensitive and of high heritage probability (i.e. those noted during the aerial survey) as well as areas of high human settlement catchment. The following constraints were encountered:

- **Survey Time and Extent:** Survey time proved to be somewhat of a constraint due to the relatively large surface extent of the tow footprint area. Therefore, pedestrian site surveys focused around areas tentatively identified as sensitive (i.e. along drainage lines and those noted during the aerial survey) during aerial surveys.
- **Visibility:** Visibility constrained site identification in areas with denser surface cover, as well as portions where vegetation is more pristine.

Thus, even though it might be assumed that survey findings are representative of the heritage landscape of the project area for the Shirley Solar Park, it should be stated that the possibility exists that individual sites could be missed due to the localised nature of some heritage remains as well as the possible presence of sub-surface archaeology. Therefore, maintaining due cognisance of the integrity and accuracy of the archaeological survey, it should be stated that the heritage resources identified during the study do not necessarily represent all the heritage resources present in the project area. The subterranean nature of some archaeological sites, dense vegetation cover and visibility constraints sometimes distort heritage representations and any additional heritage resources located during consequent development phases must be reported to the Heritage Resources Authority or an archaeological specialist.

4 RESULTS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

4.1 The Stone Age

No Stone Age occurrences were observed in the survey area.

4.2 The Iron Age Farmer Period

No Iron Age (Farmer Period) occurrences were observed in the survey area.

4.3 Historical / Colonial Period and recent times

No Historical / Colonial Period occurrences were observed in the survey area.

4.4 Graves

No graves or burial sites were observed in the survey area.

5 ARCHAEO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT

5.1 The archaeology of Southern Africa

Archaeology in southern Africa is typically divided into two main fields of study, the **Stone Age** and the **Iron Age** or **Farmer Period**. The following table provides a concise outline of the chronological sequence of periods, events, cultural groups and material expressions in Southern African pre-history and history.

Table 1 Chronological Periods across southern Africa

Period	Epoch	Associated cultural groups	Typical Material Expressions
Early Stone Age 2.5m – 250 000 YCE	Pleistocene	Early Hominins: <i>Australopithecines</i> <i>Homo habilis</i> <i>Homo erectus</i>	Typically large stone tools such as hand axes, choppers and cleavers.
Middle Stone Age 250 000 – 25 000 YCE	Pleistocene	First <i>Homo sapiens</i> species	Typically smaller stone tools such as scrapers, blades and points.
Late Stone Age 20 000 BC – present	Pleistocene / Holocene	<i>Homo sapiens sapiens</i> including San people	Typically small to minute stone tools such as arrow heads, points and bladelets.
Early Iron Age / Early Farmer Period 300 – 900 AD	Holocene	First Bantu-speaking groups	Typically distinct ceramics, bead ware, iron objects, grinding stones.
Middle Iron Age (Mapungubwe / K2) / early Later Farmer Period 900 – 1350 AD	Holocene	Bantu-speaking groups, ancestors of present-day groups	Typically distinct ceramics, bead ware and iron / gold / copper objects, trade goods and grinding stones.
Late Iron Age / Later Farmer Period 1400 AD -1850 AD	Holocene	Various Bantu-speaking groups including Venda, Thonga, Sotho-Tswana and Zulu	Distinct ceramics, grinding stones, iron objects, trade objects, remains of iron smelting activities including iron smelting furnace, iron slag and residue as well as iron ore.
Historical / Colonial Period ±1850 AD – present	Holocene	Various Bantu-speaking groups as well as European farmers, settlers and explorers	Remains of historical structures e.g. homesteads, missionary schools etc. as well as, glass, porcelain, metal and ceramics.

5.1.1 The Stone Ages

- The Earlier Stone Age (ESA)

Earlier Stone Age deposits typically occur on the flood-plains of perennial rivers and may date to between 2 million and 250 000 years ago. These ESA open sites sometimes contain stone tool scatters and manufacturing debris ranging from pebble tool choppers to core tools such as handaxes and cleavers. These stone tools were made by the earliest hominins. These groups seldom actively hunted and relied heavily on the opportunistic scavenging of meat from carnivore kill sites.

- The Middle Stone Age (MSA)

The majority of Middle Stone Age (MSA) sites occur on flood plains and sometimes in caves and rock shelters. Sites usually consist of large concentrations of knapped stone flakes such as scrapers, points and blades and associated manufacturing debris. Tools may have been hafted but organic materials, such as those used in hafting, seldom remain preserved in the archaeological record. Limited drive-hunting activities are also associated with the MSA.

- The Later Stone Age (LSA)

Sites dating to the Later Stone Age (LSA) are better preserved in rock shelters, although open sites with scatters of mainly stone tools can occur. Well-protected deposits in shelters allow for stable conditions that result in the preservation of organic materials such as wood, bone, hearths, ostrich eggshell beads and even bedding material. By using San (Bushman) ethnographic data a better understanding of this period is possible. South African rock art is also associated with the LSA.

5.1.2 The Iron Age Farmer Period

- Early Iron Age (Early Farming Communities)

The Early Iron Age (also Early Farmer Period) marks the movement of Bantu speaking farming communities into South Africa at around 200 A.D. These groups were agro-pastoralists that settled in the vicinity of water in order to provide subsistence for their cattle and crops. Artefact evidence from Early Farmer Period sites is mostly found in the form of ceramic assemblages and the origins and archaeological identities of this period are largely based upon ceramic typologies and sequences, where diagnostic pottery assemblages can be used to infer group identities and to trace movements across the landscape. Early Farmer Period ceramic traditions are classified by some scholars into different "streams" or trends in pot types and decoration that, over time emerged in southern Africa. These "streams" are identified as the Kwale Branch (east), the Nkope Branch (central) and the Kalundu Branch (west). More specifically, in the northern regions of South Africa at least three settlement phases have been distinguished for prehistoric Bantu-speaking agropastoralists. The first phase of the Early Iron Age, known as Happy Rest (named after the site where the ceramics were first identified), is representative of the Western Stream of migrations, and dates to AD 400 - AD 600. The second phase of Diamant is dated to AD 600 - AD 900 and was first recognized at the eponymous site of Diamant in the western Waterberg. The third phase, characterised by herringbone-decorated pottery of the Eiland tradition, is regarded as the final expression of the Early Iron Age (EIA) and occurs over large parts of the North West Province, Northern Province, Gauteng and Mpumalanga. This phase has been dated to about AD 900 - AD 1200. Early Farmer Period ceramics typically display features such as large and prominent inverted rims, large neck areas and fine elaborate decorations. The Early Iron Age continued up to the end of the first millennium AD.

- Middle Iron Age / K2 Mapungubwe Period (early Later Farming Communities)

The onset of the middle Iron Age dates back to ±900 AD, a period more commonly known as the Mapungubwe /

K2 phase. These names refer to the well known archaeological sites that are today the pinnacle of South Africa's Iron Age heritage. The inhabitants of K2 and Mapungubwe, situated on the banks of the Limpopo, were agriculturalists and pastoralists and were engaged in extensive trade activities with local and foreign traders. Although the identity of this Bantu-speaking group remains a point of contestation, the Mapungubwe people were the first state-organized society southern Africa has known. A considerable amount of golden objects, ivory, beads (glass and gold), trade goods and clay figurines as well as large amounts of potsherds were found at these sites and also appear in sites dating back to this phase of the Iron Age. Ceramics of this tradition take the form of beakers with upright sides and decorations around the base (K2) and shallow-shouldered bowls with decorations as well as globular pots with long necks. (Mapungubwe). The site of Mapungubwe was deserted at around 1250 AD and this also marks the relative conclusion of this phase of the Iron Age.

- **Later Iron Age (Later Farming Communities)**

The late Iron Age of southern Africa marks the grouping of Bantu speaking groups into different cultural units. It also signals one of the most influential events of the second millennium AD in southern Africa, the difaqane. The difaqane (also known as "the scattering") brought about a dramatic and sudden ending to centuries of stable society in southern Africa. Reasons for this change was essentially the first penetration of the southern African interior by Portuguese traders, military conquests by various Bantu speaking groups primarily the ambitious Zulu King Shaka and the beginning of industrial developments in South Africa. Different cultural groups were scattered over large areas of the interior. These groups conveyed with them their customs that in the archaeological record manifest in ceramics, beads and other artefacts. This means that distinct pottery typologies can be found in the different late Iron Age groups of South Africa.

- **Bantu Speaking Groups in the South African interior**

It should be noted that terms such as "Nguni", "Sotho", "Venda" and others refer to broad and comprehensive language groups that demonstrated similarities in their origins and language. It does not imply that these Nguni / Sotho groups were homogeneous and static; they rather moved through the landscape and influenced each other in continuous processes marked by cultural fluidity.

Ethnographers generally divide major Bantu-speaking groups of southern Africa into two broad linguistic groups, the Nguni and the Sotho with smaller subdivisions under these two main groups. Nguni groups were found in the eastern parts of the interior of South Africa and can be divided into the northern Nguni and the southern Nguni. The various Zulu and Swazi groups were generally associated with the northern Nguni whereas the southern Nguni comprised the Xhosa, Mpondo, Thembu and Mpondomise groups. The same geographically based divisions exist among Sotho groups where, under the western Sotho (or Tswana), groups such as the Rolong, Hurutshe, Kwena, Fokeng and Kgatla are found. The northern Sotho included the Pedi and amalgamation of smaller groups united to become the southern Sotho group or the Basutho. Other smaller language groups such as the Venda, Lemba and Tshonga Shangana transpired outside these major entities but as time progressed they were, however to lesser or greater extent influenced and absorbed by neighbouring groups.

5.1.3 Historical and Colonial Times and Recent History

The Historical period in southern Africa encompass the course of Europe's discovery of South Africa and the spreading of European settlements along the East Coast and subsequently into the interior. In addition, the formation stages of this period are marked by the large scale movements of various Bantu-speaking groups in the interior of South Africa, which profoundly influenced the course of European settlement. Finally, the final retreat of the San and Khoekhoen groups into their present-day living areas also occurred in the Historical period in southern Africa.

5.2 The Hotazel, Kuruman, Kathu Area: Specific Themes

The history of the Northern Cape Province is reflected in a rich archaeological landscape, mostly dominated by Stone Age occurrences. However, Webley & Halkett (2008) have noted that there has been very little archaeological work undertaken north of Kuruman, but there are reports of rock engravings to the north of the town. Most of our knowledge of the archaeology of the region is largely dependent on the work undertaken by Humphreys & Thackeray (1983) to the south of Kuruman, and on the Ghaap escarpment, as well as that of Beaumont (1990). A number of Archaeological Impact Assessments (e.g. Beaumont, Morris, Kaplan, Becker & Kruger) have been done in the Kuruman area. Generally, numerous sites documenting Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age habitation occur across the province, mostly in open air locales or in sediments alongside rivers or pans. In addition, a wealth of Later Stone Age rock art sites, most of which are in the form of rock engravings are to be found in the larger landscape. These sites occur on hilltops, slopes, rock outcrops and occasionally in river beds. Sites dating to the Iron Age occur in the north eastern part of the Province and environmental factors delegated that the spread of Iron Age farming westwards from the 17th century was constrained mainly to these areas. However, evidence of an Iron Age presence as far as the Upington area in the eighteenth century occurs in this area. Moving into recent times, the archaeological record reflects the development of a rich colonial frontier, characterised by, amongst others, a complex industrial archaeological landscape such as mining developments at Kimberley, which herald the modern era in South African history.

5.2.1 Palaeontology & Early History

Palaeontological assessments on areas around Kuruman note that the area is underlain by rocks older than 1000 million years, which makes them too old to contain hard-bodied fossils (e.g. Beaumont 2009). This overburden consists mainly of un-fossiliferous Kalahari sand, which is relatively recent in geological age. An indurated calcareous layer frequently occurs at the interface of the sandy overburden and the rock beneath. This layer may contain fossil remains in more suitable localities, although none have been reported from such contexts in this area.

5.2.2 The Early and Middle stone Ages in the Northern Cape

The landscape around the town of Kuruman is rich in archaeological material dating to Earlier and Middle Stone Ages. Sites such as Wonderwerk Cave, Kathu Pan and Kathu Townlands (see below) have yielded significant Stone Age assemblages that all inform on our general understanding of the technological sequences of the Stone Age in the Northern Cape (e.g. see Beaumont 2008; Morris 2006; Morris 2007; Dreyer 2007). In addition, a large amount of Middle and Later Stone Age sites have been documented across the landscape on calcrete lined pans and road cuttings.

5.2.3 Rock Markings

Rock engravings are mostly situated in the semi-arid plateau with most of these engravings situated at the Orange – Vaal basin, Karoo and Namibia. The upper Vaal, Limpopo basin and eastern Free State regions have a small quantity of rock engravings as well. Generally, rock paintings exist at cave areas and rock engravings at open surface areas. The Cape interior consists of a technical, formal and thematic variation between and within sites (Morris 1988). Two major techniques existed namely the incised and pecked engravings. Morris (1988) indicated technical and formal characteristics through space and a sharp contrast exists between engravings positioned north of the Orange River that are mostly pecked and those in the Karoo where scraping was mostly used. According to Morris (1988) hairline engravings occur at the North and the South, but they are rare at the Vryburg region. Finger painting techniques mostly occur at the Kuruman Hills, Asbestos Mountains, Ghaap Escarpment, Langeberg, Koranaberg ranges, scattered sites at the Karoo and the Kareeberge (Morris 1988).

The development petroglyphs (i.e. carving or line drawing on rock) were associated with three different types of techniques, namely incised fine lines, pecked engravings and scraped engravings. According to Peter Beaumont the pecked and scraped engravings at the Upper Karoo are coeval (i.e. having the same age or date of origin) (Beaumont P B et al. 1989). Dating of rock art includes the use of carbonate fraction dating of ostrich eggshell pieces, dating of charcoal and ostrich eggshell at various rock art shelters. Unifacial points, double segments and thin – walled sherds may indicate the presence of the Khoikhoi at the Northern Cape during 2500 BP (years Before the Present) (Beaumont 1989).

5.2.4 Iron Age / Farmer Period Sites

The beginnings of the Iron Age (Farmer Period) in southern Africa are associated with the arrival of a new Bantu speaking population group at around the third century AD. These newcomers introduced a new way of life into areas that were occupied by Later Stone Age hunter-gatherers and Khoekhoe herders. Distinctive features of the Iron Age are a settled village life, food production (agriculture and animal husbandry), metallurgy (the mining, smelting and working of iron, copper and gold) and the manufacture of pottery. Stone ruins indicate the occurrence of Iron Age settlements in the Northern Cape specifically at sites such as Dithakong where evidence exists that the Thlaping used to be settled in the Kuruman – Dithakong areas prior to 1800 (Humphreys 1976). Here, the assessment of the contact between the Stone Age, Iron Age and Colonial societies are significant in order to understand situations of contact and assimilation between societies. As an example, Trade occurred between local Thlaping Tswana people and the Khoikhoi communities. It means that the Tswana traded as far south as the Orange River at least the same time as the Europeans at the Cape (Humphreys 1976).

5.2.5 Later History: Historical archaeology and living heritage

Areas south of Kuruman played a strategic role during the Anglo-Boer and towns such as Postmasburg, situated about 100km south of Kuruman, acted as an important link between the Boer forces from Transvaal to the Cape Colony south of the Orange River, providing ammunition and horses (Snyman 1985). The oral and written history of the Northern Cape pertaining to the last centuries is relatively abundant resulting from an assimilation of local folklore and Historical sources such as missionary accounts. The Historical period commenced when pioneers (in most cases, missionaries) arrived between the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, depending on the region. Later, larger populations established villages in the area, some of which are often still occupied today. During the 1930's some of the Tswana communities consisted of a wealth of cattle that could be used to gain capital and purchase additional land. The Khoisan and Khoikhoi communities were not so lucky, because they were mostly used as labourers at various Tswana and European households (Wylie 1989).

The Northern Cape was subjected to a resettlement program during the apartheid years. Tswana families were divided into the men who had to live in a compound and the women who were sent to a relocation centre (Hallett 1984). Between 1960 and 1962 it was estimated that an average of 834,000 people were affected by the Group Areas Act (Hallett 1984). The farm Shirley was established in 1910.




Figure 5-1: The original title deed for the farm Shirley c. 1910.

5.2.6 Other: Mining and Metallurgy

Surface occurrence of specularite (i.e. a variety of hematite) and prehistoric specularite workings are known to occur in the Northern Cape. One of these historic mines occurs at Doornfontein near Postmasburg, which dates

to 1200 BP (Thackeray 1983). Specularite used to be transported in ostrich eggshells and pottery containers (Thackeray 1983). Various oral accounts indicate that Skeyfontein was visited by Khoi Herding people, Iron Age Tswana and San hunter – gatherers. More recently, asbestos mines were operated north-west of Kuruman on the farms Riries and Mt Vera during the 20th century.

5.2.7 Significant Heritage Sites in this section of the Northern Cape Province

The Northern Cape has a wealth of pre-colonial archaeological sites (Beaumont & Morris 1990; Morris & Beaumont 2004). Archaeological sites in the vicinity of the Sishen Iron Ore Mine are not randomly scattered within the landscape and they occur either near water or close to local source of two highly-prized raw materials, specularite and jaspilite. Besides the Gamagara River where numerous low density artefact scatters occur, another regional water source occurs below superficial sands on the bedrock plains around Kathu, where water was contained at times that gradually filled up with stratified sediments often containing massive calcretes of Tertiary age. Large tracts are far more widespread, where archaeological traces are almost non-existent with very occasional specimens of the Later Stone Age on the sand surface and thin scatters of specimens from the Early Stone Age on calcrete below. Rock engravings previously occurred on the farms Bruce and Sishen, but as these were located in land that was to be mined, personnel of the McGregor Museum removed them prior to mining developments. At least two archaeological sites of note occur in the general landscape around the town of Kathu.

As noted earlier, significant Stone Age sites occur in and around Kathu and on adjacent farms. These are subject to on-going archaeological research, primarily by Jayne Wilkins from the University of Toronto in Ontario, who has suggested the earliest stone-tipped spears yet found occur in the Kathu area.

Archaeological sites of note occur in the general landscape around the town of Kuruman and include:

- *Kathu Pan*

This site, situated near the town of Kathu, is a shallow water pan about 30ha in extent. The site was extensively studied from 1974 to 1990 by Humpreys and Beaumont, amongst others. Kathu Pan is an extremely significant site as it represents the major industries of the Stone Age, more specifically two phases of the Earlier Stone Age, two phases of the Middle Stone Age, and more or less the entire Later Stone Age (Beaumont 1990). The site yielded large amounts of hand axes and faunal remains, including the concentrated remains of large mammal remains. More recently, research by Jayne Wilkins revealed a hoard of stone points, each between 4 and 9 centimeters long, that they think belonged to the earliest stone-tipped spears yet found. The stone points are the right shape and size for the job, and some have fractured tips that suggest they were used as weapons. Since stone points used on spears had been found only at sites that date back no more than 300 000 years, these discoveries in the 500 000-year-old deposits at Kathu is greatly significant. The abundance of Stone Age material at Kathu Pan can probably be attributed to the presence of a permanent water source at the pan.



Figure 5-2: Early Stone Age (Acheul) handaxe from the Kathu Pan site (<http://www.museumsnc.co.za>).



Figure 5-3: Middle Stone Age hafted points, similar to those documented at the Kathu Pan site (<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn22508-first-stonetipped-spear-thrown-earlier-than-thought.html>).

- *Wonderwerk Cave*

One of the most important archaeological sites in the region is the world renowned long-sequence Wonderwerk Cave, formed originally as an ancient solution cavity in Dolomite rocks of the Kuruman Hills. The cave, situated between Danielskuil and Kuruman, contains up to 6 m depth of archaeological deposits reflecting human and environmental history through the Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Ages to the present. Rock art occurs in the

form of parietal paintings within the first 40 metres from the entrance, possibly all less than 1000 years old, and small engraved stones found within the deposit, mainly from the Later Stone Age sequence where they date back some 10 500 years. The associations of older engraved or striated pieces have yet to be substantiated.



Figure 5-4: Interior of the Wonderwerk Cave

- *Dithakong*

Important farmer period Iron Age remnants occur at the major Tswana town and pre-colonial stone-walled settlements of Dithakong. Local BaTlhaping communities claimed not to have known who had made or lived in this earlier town but archaeological investigations have established Tswana affinities in the earlier settlement which includes features indicative of frontier complexity at this south-western edge of Tswana expansion. Early traveller accounts refer to an impressively large town consisting of mud houses, traces of which have yet to be located archaeologically.

- *Gamohana Shelters*

Two rock shelters on the northern and southern faces of GaMohaana (Gamohana), situated in the Kuruman Hills north west of the town, contain Later Stone Age remains and rock paintings.

- *Moffat Mission Station and the Kuruman Mission*

Historically, Kuruman boasts one of the longest trajectories of African-colonial interaction centred on the nearly two-century old Moffat Mission. The Kuruman Mission was established by the London Missionary Society (LMS) in 1816 at Maruping near Kuruman where a town of about 10 000 Batswana were resident. Robert Moffat (1795-1887) arrived in Kuruman from Scotland in 1820, and soon organised permission from Chief Mothibi to relocate it to the present position at Seodin in the valley of the Kuruman River. From here he preached Christianity to the local people. Moffat laboured at the mission for 50 years, and his period is considered the “golden age” of missionary work amongst the Batswana. He was a man of considerable talents and oversaw the building of staff

houses, a school house, store rooms, and the “cathedral of the Kalahari”, the great Moffat Church (1838) which can seat 800 people. The mission is also well-known as the first African home of Dr. David Livingstone. He arrived as an LMS missionary in 1841, and remained in contact with the mission due to his marriage to Moffat’s eldest daughter Mary.

- *“Die Oog”*

Locally, “Die Oog” (“The Eye”) and the water course springing from it have been a focus of utilization and settlement and it was in its immediate vicinity that Kuruman, as town, evolved from the late nineteenth century.

- *Kathu Townlands*

This Provincial Heritage Site, covering an estimated area of 250 000 m² is located away from the Kathu pan on the outskirts of the town of Kathu. The site, excavated in 1982 and 1990, primarily displays a large Earlier Stone Age horizon in deposits up to a metre below surface. This deposit dates to the Acheul phase of the Earlier Stone Age. It is estimated that in total, the site holds more than 2 billion artefacts. This abundance of lithic debris could be ascribed to the protracted use of the high-grade banded ironstone outcrop in the area, as a raw material source (Beaumont 1990).

- *Other sites around the Sishen area*



Figure 5-5: Flaked MSA lithics on jasper from the farm Lylyveld, documented by Beaumont (2009).

Small McGregor Museum collections from the farm Lylyveld 545 comprise an Earlier Stone Age sample from along the Gamagara River and Earlier Stone Age plus Iron Age material from around specularite pits on the hillside, all collected by G & S Collins in 1967. The latter sites were destroyed by subsequent Iscor prospecting,

as was another small Iron Age specularite working on a hill flanking the Gamagara River, on Demaneng 546, that they found in the same year. Another small Later Stone Age collection was documented in 1987 on southern Lylyveld 545, from the slopes around a shallow overhang, now mined away, directly south of the N14. Still intact is a low rise with many specularite pits on Mashwening 557, some 6 km to the south-east, where a test trench in 1989 yielded Ceramic Later Stone Age overlying sparse Acheulean, which included a cleaver. These studies also mention pecked engravings on off – white Gamagara Shale located on the farms Sishen 543 and Bruce 544. In addition, another Acheul quarry of similar extent to the Kathu Townlands Site occurs on the crest of Kathu Hill close to the town of Kathu.

6 RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING

6.1 Heritage resources management and conservation

Archaeological sites, as previously defined in the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) are places in the landscape where people have lived in the past – generally more than 60 years ago – and have left traces of their presence behind. In South Africa, archaeological sites include hominid fossil sites, places where people of the Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age lived in open sites, river gravels, rock shelters and caves, Iron Age sites, graves, and a variety of historical sites and structures in rural areas, towns and cities. Palaeontological sites are those with fossil remains of plants and animals where people were not involved in the accumulation of the deposits. The basic principle of cultural heritage conservation is that archaeological and other heritage sites are valuable, scarce and *non-renewable*. Many such sites are unfortunately lost on a daily basis through development for housing, roads and infrastructure and once archaeological sites are damaged, they cannot be re-created as site integrity and authenticity is permanently lost. Archaeological sites have the potential to contribute to our understanding of the history of the region and of our country and continent. By preserving links with our past, we may not be able to revive lost cultural traditions, but it enables us to appreciate the role they have played in the history of our country.

6.2 Categories of significance

Rating the significance of archaeological sites, and consequently grading the potential impact on the resources is linked to the significance of the site itself. The significance of an archaeological site is based on the amount of deposit, the integrity of the context, the kind of deposit and the potential to help answer present research questions. Historical structures are defined by Section 34 of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999, while other historical and cultural significant sites, places and features, are generally determined by community preferences. The guidelines as provided by the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999) in Section 3, with special reference to subsection 3 are used when determining the cultural significance or other special value of archaeological or historical sites. In addition, ICOMOS (the Australian Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites) highlights four cultural attributes, which are valuable to any given culture:

- *Aesthetic value:*

Aesthetic value includes aspects of sensory perception for which criteria can and should be stated. Such criteria include consideration of the form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric, the general atmosphere associated with the place and its uses and also the aesthetic values commonly assessed in the analysis of landscapes and townscape.

- *Historic value:*

Historic value encompasses the history of aesthetics, science and society and therefore to a large extent underlies all of the attributes discussed here. Usually a place has historical value because of some kind of influence by an event, person, phase or activity.

- *Scientific value:*

The scientific or research value of a place will depend upon the importance of the data involved, on its rarity, quality and on the degree to which the place may contribute further substantial information.

- *Social value:*

Social value includes the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a certain group.

It is important for heritage specialist input in the EIA process to take into account the heritage management structure set up by the NHR Act. It makes provision for a 3-tier system of management including the South Africa Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) at a national level, Provincial Heritage Resources Authorities (PHRAs) at a provincial and the local authority. The Act makes provision for two types or forms of protection of heritage resources; i.e. formally protected and generally protected sites:

Formally protected sites:

- Grade 1 or national heritage sites, which are managed by SAHRA
- Grade 2 or provincial heritage sites, which are managed by the provincial HRA.
- Grade 3 or local heritage sites.

Generally protected sites:

- Human burials older than 60 years.
- Archaeological and palaeontological sites.
- Shipwrecks and associated remains older than 70 years.
- Structures older than 60 years.

With reference to the evaluation of sites, the certainty of prediction is definite, unless stated otherwise and if the significance of the site is rated high, the significance of the impact will also result in a high rating. The same rule applies if the significance rating of the site is low. The significance of archaeological sites is generally ranked into the following categories.

Table 2: Heritage Site Significance Ratings

Significance	Rating Action
No significance: sites that do not require mitigation.	None
Low significance: sites, which may require mitigation.	2a. Recording and documentation (Phase 1) of site; no further action required 2b. Controlled sampling (shovel test pits, augering), mapping and documentation (Phase 2 investigation); permit required for sampling and destruction
Medium significance: sites, which require mitigation.	3. Excavation of representative sample, C14 dating, mapping and documentation (Phase 2 investigation); permit required for sampling and destruction [including 2a & 2b]
High significance: sites, where disturbance should be avoided.	4a. Nomination for listing on Heritage Register (National, Provincial or Local) (Phase 2 & 3 investigation); site management plan; permit required if utilised for education or tourism
High significance: Graves and burial places	4b. Locate demonstrable descendants through social consulting; obtain permits from applicable legislation, ordinances and regional by-laws; exhumation and reinterment [including 2a, 2b & 3]

Furthermore, the significance of archaeological sites was based on six main criteria:

- Site integrity (i.e. primary vs. secondary context),
- Amount of deposit, range of features (e.g., stonewalling, stone tools and enclosures),
- Density of scatter (dispersed scatter),
- Social value,
- Uniqueness, and
- Potential to answer current and future research questions.

A fundamental aspect in assessing the significance and protection status of a heritage resource is often whether or not the sustainable social and economic benefits of a proposed development outweigh the conservation issues at stake. When, for whatever reason the protection of a heritage site is not deemed necessary or practical, its research potential must be assessed and mitigated in order to gain data / information, which would otherwise be lost.

6.3 Potential Impacts and Significance Ratings²

The following section provides a background to the identification and assessment of possible impacts and alternatives, as well as a range of risk situations and scenarios commonly associated with heritage resources management. The section ultimately provides a guideline (Section 6.3.1, Section 6.3.2 & Section 6.3.3) for the rating of impacts and recommendation of management actions for the Shirley Solar Park Development Area.

6.3.1 General assessment of impacts on resources

Generally, the value and significance of archaeological and other heritage sites might be impacted on by any activity that would result immediately or in the future in the destruction, damage, excavation, alteration, removal or collection from its original position, any archaeological material or object (as indicated in the National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999)). Thus, the destructive impacts that are possible in terms of heritage resources would tend to be direct, once-off events occurring during the initial construction period. However, in the long run, the proximity of operations in any given area could result in secondary indirect impacts. The EIA process therefore specifies impact assessment criteria which can be utilised from the perspective of a heritage specialist study which elucidates the overall extent of impacts.

Table 3: Impact Assessment Criteria

Significance of the heritage resource

This is a statement of the nature and degree of significance of the heritage resource being affected by the activity. From a heritage management perspective it is useful to distinguish between whether the significance is embedded in the physical fabric or in associations with events or persons or in the experience of a place; i.e. its visual and non-visual qualities. This statement is a primary informant to the nature and degree of significance of an impact and thus needs to be thoroughly considered. Consideration needs to be given to the significance of a heritage resource at different scales (i.e. site specific, local, regional, national or international) and the relationship between the heritage resource, its setting and its associations.

Nature of the impact

This is an assessment of the nature of the impact of the activity on a heritage resource, with some indication of its positive and/or negative effect/s. It is strongly informed by the statement of resource significance. In other words, the nature of the impact may be historical, aesthetic, social, scientific, linguistic or architectural, intrinsic, associational or contextual (visual or non-visual). In many cases, the nature of the impact will include more than one value.

Extent

Here it should be indicated whether the impact will be experienced:

- On a site scale, i.e. extend only as far as the activity;
- Within the immediate context of a heritage resource;
- On a local scale, e.g. town or suburb
- On a metropolitan or regional scale; or

² Based on: Winter, S. & Baumann, N. 2005. *Guideline for involving heritage specialists in EIA processes: Edition 1.*

- On a national/international scale.

Duration

Here it should be indicated whether the lifespan of the impact will be:

- Short term, (needs to be defined in context)
- Medium term, (needs to be defined in context)
- Long term where the impact will persist indefinitely, possibly beyond the operational life of the activity, either because of natural processes or by human intervention; or
- Permanent where mitigation either by natural process or by human intervention will not occur in such a way or in such a time span that the impact can be considered transient.

Of relevance to the duration of an impact are the following considerations:

- Reversibility of the impact; and
- Renewability of the heritage resource.

Intensity

Here it should be established whether the impact should be indicated as:

- Low, where the impact affects the resource in such a way that its heritage value is not affected;
- Medium, where the affected resource is altered but its heritage value continues to exist albeit in a modified way; and
- High, where heritage value is altered to the extent that it will temporarily or permanently be damaged or destroyed.

Probability

This should describe the likelihood of the impact actually occurring indicated as:

- Improbable, where the possibility of the impact to materialize is very low either because of design or historic experience;
- Probable, where there is a distinct possibility that the impact will occur;
- Highly probable, where it is most likely that the impact will occur; or
- Definite, where the impact will definitely occur regardless of any mitigation measures

Confidence

This should relate to the level of confidence that the specialist has in establishing the nature and degree of impacts. It relates to the level and reliability of information, the nature and degree of consultation with I&AP's and the dynamic of the broader socio-political context.

- High, where the information is comprehensive and accurate, where there has been a high degree of consultation and the socio-political context is relatively stable.
- Medium, where the information is sufficient but is based mainly on secondary sources, where there has been a limited targeted consultation and socio-political context is fluid.
- Low, where the information is poor, a high degree of contestation is evident and there is a state of socio-political flux.

Impact Significance

The significance of impacts can be determined through a synthesis of the aspects produced in terms of the nature and degree of heritage significance and the nature, duration, intensity, extent, probability and confidence of impacts and can be described as:

- Low; where it would have a negligible effect on heritage and on the decision
- Medium, where it would have a moderate effect on heritage and should influence the decision.
- High, where it would have, or there would be a high risk of, a big effect on heritage. Impacts of high significance should have a major influence on the decision;
- Very high, where it would have, or there would be high risk of, an irreversible and possibly irreplaceable negative impact on heritage. Impacts of very high significance should be a central factor in decision-making.

6.3.2 Direct impact rating

Direct or primary effects on heritage resources occur at the same time and in the same space as the activity, e.g. loss of historical fabric through demolition work. **Indirect effects or secondary effects** on heritage resources occur later in time or at a different place from the causal activity, or as a result of a complex pathway, e.g. restriction of access to a heritage resource resulting in the gradual erosion of its significance, which is dependent on ritual patterns of access. The following table provides an outline as to the relationship between the significance of a heritage context, the intensity of development and the significance of heritage impacts to be expected.

Table 4: Direct Impact Assessment Criteria

HERITAGE CONTEXT	TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT			
	CATEGORY A	CATEGORY B	CATEGORY C	CATEGORY D
CONTEXT 1 High heritage Value	Moderate heritage impact expected	High heritage impact expected	Very high heritage impact expected	Very high heritage impact expected
CONTEXT 2 Medium to high heritage value	Minimal heritage impact expected	Moderate heritage impact expected	High heritage impact expected	Very high heritage impact expected
CONTEXT 3 Medium to low heritage value	Little or no heritage impact expected	Minimal heritage impact expected	Moderate heritage impact expected	High heritage impact expected
CONTEXT 4 Low to no heritage value	Little or no heritage impact expected	Little or no heritage impact expected	Minimal heritage value expected	Moderate heritage impact expected
NOTE: A DEFAULT "LITTLE OR NO HERITAGE IMPACT EXPECTED" VALUE APPLIES WHERE A HERITAGE RESOURCE OCCURS OUTSIDE THE IMPACT ZONE OF THE DEVELOPMENT.				
HERITAGE CONTEXTS		CATEGORIES OF DEVELOPMENT		
<p>Context 1: Of high intrinsic, associational and contextual heritage value within a national, provincial and local context, i.e. formally declared or potential Grade 1, 2 or 3A heritage resources</p> <p>Context 2: Of moderate to high intrinsic, associational and contextual value within a local context, i.e. potential Grade 3B heritage resources.</p> <p>Context 3: Of medium to low intrinsic, associational or contextual heritage value within a national, provincial and local context, i.e. potential Grade 3C heritage resources</p> <p>Context 4: Of little or no intrinsic, associational or contextual heritage value due to disturbed, degraded conditions or extent of irreversible damage.</p>		<p>Category A: Minimal intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No rezoning involved; within existing use rights. - No subdivision involved. - Upgrading of existing infrastructure within existing envelopes - Minor internal changes to existing structures - New building footprints limited to less than 1000m2. <p>Category B: Low-key intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spot rezoning with no change to overall zoning of a site. - Linear development less than 100m - Building footprints between 1000m2-2000m2 - Minor changes to external envelop of existing structures (less than 25%) - Minor changes in relation to bulk and height of immediately adjacent structures (less than 25%). <p>Category C: Moderate intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rezoning of a site between 5000m2-10 000m2. - Linear development between 100m and 300m. - Building footprints between 2000m2 and 5000m2 - Substantial changes to external envelop of existing structures (more than 50%) - Substantial increase in bulk and height in relation to immediately adjacent buildings (more than 50%) <p>Category D: High intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rezoning of a site in excess of 10 000m2 - Linear development in excess of 300m. - Any development changing the character of a site exceeding 5000m2 or involving the subdivision of a site into three or more erven. - Substantial increase in bulk and height in relation to immediately adjacent buildings (more than 100%) 		

6.3.3 Management actions

Recommendations for relevant heritage resources management actions are vital to the conservation of heritage resources. Recommended management actions may include the following:

Table 5: Management and Mitigation Actions

<p>No further action / Monitoring</p> <p>Where no heritage resources have been documented, heritage resources occur well outside the impact zone of any development or the primary context of the surroundings at a development footprint has been largely destroyed or altered, no further immediate action is required. Site monitoring during</p>

development, by an ECO or the heritage specialist are often added to this recommendation in order to ensure that no undetected heritage remains are destroyed.

Avoidance

This is appropriate where any type of development occurs within a formally protected or significant or sensitive heritage context and is likely to have a high negative impact. Mitigation is not acceptable or not possible. This measure often includes the change / alteration of development planning and therefore impact zones in order not to impact on resources.

Mitigation

This is appropriate where development occurs in a context of heritage significance and where the impact is such that it can be mitigated to a degree of medium to low significance, e.g. the high to medium impact of a development on an archaeological site could be mitigated through sampling/excavation of the remains. Not all negative impacts can be mitigated.

Compensation

Compensation is generally not an appropriate heritage management action. The main function of management actions should be to conserve the resource for the benefit of future generations. Once lost it cannot be renewed. The circumstances around the potential public or heritage benefits would need to be exceptional to warrant this type of action, especially in the case of where the impact was high.

Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation is considered in heritage management terms as a intervention typically involving the adding of a new heritage layer to enable a new sustainable use. It is not appropriate when the process necessitates the removal of previous historical layers, i.e. restoration of a building or place to the previous state/period. It is an appropriate heritage management action in the following cases:

- The heritage resource is degraded or in the process of degradation and would benefit from rehabilitation.
- Where rehabilitation implies appropriate conservation interventions, i.e. adaptive reuse, repair and maintenance, consolidation and minimal loss of historical fabric.
- Where the rehabilitation process will not result in a negative impact on the intrinsic value of the resource.

Enhancement

Enhancement is appropriate where the overall heritage significance and its public appreciation value are improved. It does not imply creation of a condition that might never have occurred during the evolution of a place, e.g. the tendency to sanitize the past. This management action might result from the removal of previous layers where these layers are culturally of low significance and detract from the significance of the resource. It would be appropriate in a range of heritage contexts and applicable to a range of resources. In the case of formally protected or significant resources, appropriate enhancement action should be encouraged. Care should, however, be taken to ensure that the process does not have a negative impact on the character and context of the resource. It would thus have to be carefully monitored.

6.4 Discussion: Evaluation of Results

Previous studies conducted in the larger Hotazel, Kathu and Kuruman areas suggest a rich and diverse archaeological landscape. However, areas directly adjacent to the farm Shirley seem to have seen ephemeral human occupation but cognisance should nonetheless be taken of archaeological material that might be present in surface and sub-surface deposits along drainage lines and at water pans.

Since no heritage resources have been documented on either of the proposed Shirley Solar Park Project footprint areas or in areas proposed for the two 132 KV power line sections, no impact on such resources is anticipated. In the opinion of the author of this Archaeological Impact Assessment Report, the proposed Danax Energy Shirley Solar Park Project on Portion 1 of the farm Shirley 367 may proceed from a culture resources management perspective.

No site-specific actions or any further heritage mitigation measures are recommended but the construction process should be monitored in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

The larger landscape around Hotazel, Kathu and Kuruman is rich in pre-historical and historical remnants but areas directly adjacent to the farm Shirley seem to have been less densely occupied during prehistoric and historic times. Cognisant of this landscape and the need for the conservation of its heritage resources, the following recommendations are made based on general observations in the proposed Shirley Solar Park Development Area:

- A Palaeontological Impact Assessment is recommended where bedrock is to be impacted and, should fossil remains such as fossil fish, reptiles or petrified wood be exposed during construction, these objects should be carefully safeguarded and the relevant heritage resources authority (SAHRA) should be notified immediately so that the appropriate action can be taken by a professional palaeontologist.
- Considering the localised nature of heritage remains, the general monitoring of the development progress is recommended for all stages of the project. Should any subsurface palaeontological, archaeological or historical material, or burials be exposed during construction activities, all activities should be suspended and the archaeological specialist should be notified immediately.
- It is essential that cognisance be taken of the larger archaeological landscape of the area in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage sites. It should be stated that it is likely that further undetected archaeological remains might occur elsewhere in the Study Area along water sources and drainage lines, fountains and pans would often have attracted human activity in the past. Also, since Stone Age material seems to originate from below present soil surfaces in eroded areas, the larger landscape should be regarded as potentially sensitive in terms of possible subsurface deposits. Burials and historically significant structures dating to the Colonial Period occur on farms in the area and these resources should be avoided during all phases of construction and development, including the operational phases of the Solar Park.

In addition to these site-specific recommendations, careful cognisance should be taken of the following:

- Water sources such as drainage lines, fountains and pans would often have attracted human activity in the past.
- As Palaeontological remains occur where bedrock has been exposed, such geological features should be regarded as sensitive in terms of impacts on fossilized resources.

8 GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS

This AIA report serves to confirm the extent and significance of the heritage landscape of the proposed Shirley Solar Park Development area. The larger heritage horizon encompasses rich and diverse archaeological landscapes and cognisance should be taken of heritage resources and archaeological material that might be present in surface and sub-surface deposits. If, during construction, any possible archaeological material culture discoveries are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist be contacted for an assessment of the find. Such material culture might include:

- Formal Earlier Stone Age stone tools such as handaxes, choppers and cleavers.
- Formal Middle Stone Age stone tools such as points, blades and scrapers.
- Formal Later Stone Age stone tools such as microlithic blades, points and scrapers.
- Lithic residues and debris such as stone cores and flakes.

- Decorated and undecorated potsherds.
- Iron objects.
- Beads made from ostrich eggshell and glass.
- Ash middens and cattle dung deposits and accumulations.
- Animal bones and faunal remains.
- Human remains/graves.
- Stone walling or any sub-surface structures.
- Historical glass, tin or ceramics.
- Fossils.

If such site were to be encountered or impacted by any proposed developments, recommendations contained in this report, as well as endorsement of mitigation measures as set out by SAHRA, the National Resources Act and the CRM section of ASAPA will be required. Please note that this report is an archaeological scoping study only and does not include or exempt other required heritage impact assessments.

It must be emphasised that the conclusions and recommendations expressed in this archaeological heritage sensitivity investigation are based on the visibility of archaeological sites/features and may not therefore, represent the area's complete archaeological legacy. Many sites/features may be covered by soil and vegetation and might only be located during sub-surface investigations. If subsurface archaeological deposits, artefacts or skeletal material were to be recovered in the area during construction activities, all activities should be suspended and the archaeological specialist should be notified immediately (**cf. NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 36 (6)**).

It must also be clear that Archaeological Specialist Reports will be assessed by the relevant heritage resources authority. The final decision rests with the heritage resources authority, which should give a permit or a formal letter of permission for the destruction of any cultural sites.

9 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beaumont P B et al., 1989, Patterns in the Age and Context of Rock Art in the Northern Cape, *The South African Archaeological Bulletin*, Vol. 44, No. 150, pp. 73-81

Beaumont, P & Morris, D. 1990. Guide to archaeological sites in the Northern Cape. *McGregor Museum, Kimberley*

Beaumont, P.B., 2004. Kathu Pan and Kathu Townlands/Uitkoms. In: Morris, D. & Beaumont, P.B. (Eds.), *Archaeology in the Northern Cape: Some Key Sites*. Southern African Association for Archaeologists Postconference Excursion, Kimberley, McGregor Museum: pp. 50–53;

Bergh, J.S. 1999. *Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika: die vier noordelike provinsies*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik

Deacon, J. 1996. *Archaeology for Planners, Developers and Local Authorities*. National Monuments Council. Publication no. P021E.

Deacon, J. 1997. Report: Workshop on Standards for the Assessment of Significance and Research Priorities for Contract Archaeology. In: Newsletter No 49, Sept 1998. Association for Southern African Archaeologists.

Guelke L and Shell Robert, 1992, Landscape of Conquest: Frontier Water Alienation and Khoikhoi Strategies of Survival, 1652 – 1780, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 803 – 824.

Hall, M. 1987. *The Changing Past :Farmers, Kings & Traders in Southern Africa 200 – 1860 Cape Town*, Johannesburg: David Philip

Hall, M. 1996. *Archaeology Africa*. Cape Town, Johannesburg: David Philip

Hallett R, 1984, Desolation on the Veld: Forced Removals in South Africa, *African Affairs*, Vol. 83, No. 332, pp. 301-320.

Humphreys, A.J.B. & Thackeray, A. 1. 1983. *Ghaap and Gariiep: Later Stone Age studies in the Northern Cape*. The South African Archaeological Society Monograph Series No 2. Cape Town.

Kaplan, J. 2012. *Archaeological Impact Assessment, the proposed Whitebank Keren Energy Solar Plant on Farm 77 near Kuruman, Northern Cape*. Report prepared for EnviroAfrica. Agency for Cultural Resource Management.

Kruger, N. 2012. *Sishen Western Waste Rock Dumps: Sishen Iron Ore Mine, Kgalagadi District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment Report*. Pretoria: AGES Gauteng (Pty)Ltd.

Phillipson, D.W. 1985. *African Archaeology (second edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Renfrew, C & Bahn, P. 1991. *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice USA*: Thames & Hudson

Sharer, A.J & Ashmore, W 1979. *The Nature of Archaeological Data California*: Benjamin/Cummings Publishing

Snyman P H R, 1985, Postmasburg en die tweede Vryheidsoorlog, *The South African Military Society*, Vol. 6 No. 6, pp 1-8.

Swanepoel, N. et al (Eds.) 2008. *Five hundred years rediscovered*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press

Soriano, S, Villa, P & Wadley, L. 2007. Blade technology and tool forms in the Middle Stone Age of South Africa: the Howiesons Poort and post-Howiesons Poort at Rose Cottage Cave. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 34:681-703.

Webley, L & Halkett, D. 2008. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment: proposed prospecting on the Farm Adams 328 and Erin 316 Kuruman. Ga-segonyana Municipality. in the Northern Cape. Report prepared for Zama Mining Resources (Pty) Ltd. Archaeology Contracts Office, Department of Archaeology, University of Cape Town.

Wilkins, J. & Chazan, M. 2012. Blade production ~500 thousand years ago at Kathu Pan 1, South Africa: support for a multiple origins hypothesis for early Middle Pleistocene blade technology. *Journal of Archaeological Science*

Human Tissue Act and Ordinance 7 of 1925, Government Gazette, Cape Town

National Resource Act No.25 of 1999, Government Gazette, Cape Town

<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn22508-first-stonetipped-spear-thrown-earlier-than-thought.html>

Accessed 2014-03-10

<http://southafricanpalaecaves.files.wordpress.com/>

Accessed 2013-03-10

<http://csg.dla.gov.za/index.html>

Accessed 2014-03-15

