

CHAPTER 9:

ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE SURVEY

PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT ON THE FARM ROSEHILL ERF NO. 20 PORT ALFRED, NDLAMBE MUNICIPALITY, DISTRICT, EASTERN CAPE

Compiled by: Dr Johan Binneman
Department of Archaeology
Albany Museum
Grahamstown
6139
Tel: 046 6222312
Fax: 046 6222398

On behalf of: Coastal & Environmental Services
P.O. Box 8145
Quigney
5210
Tel: 043 742 3302
Fax: 041 742 3306

December 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

9	PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT ON THE FARM ROSEHILL ERF NO. 20, PORT ALFRED, NDLAMBE MUNICIPALITY, DISTRICT, EASTERN CAPE	9-5
9.1	SUMMARY	9-5
9.2	PROJECT INFORMATION	9-5
9.3	TERMS OF REFERENCE	9-5
9.4	BRIEF ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.....	9-6
9.4.1	LITERATURE REVIEW	9-6
9.5	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY	9-6
9.5.1	AREA SURVEYED	9-6
9.5.2	METHODOLOGY	9-6
9.5.3	SURVEY/DESCRIPTION OF SITES	9-7
9.5.4	DISCUSSION	9-7
9.6	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	9-7
9.7	GENERAL REMARKS AND CONDITIONS	9-7
9.8	REFERENCES	9-8

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 9.1: IDENTIFICATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES AND MATERIAL: GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPERS

9 PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT ON THE FARM ROSEHILL ERF NO. 20, PORT ALFRED, NDLAMBE MUNICIPALITY, DISTRICT, EASTERN CAPE

The chapter has been formatted to follow the structure required by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).

9.1 SUMMARY

Proposal

The original proposal was to do a survey of possible archaeological heritage sites on the farm Rosehill Erf No. 20, Port Alfred, Ndlambe Municipality; to establish the range and importance of the heritage sites, the potential impact of the development and to make recommendations to minimize possible damage to these sites.

The investigation

No visible archaeological sites were found during the investigation. Most of the area is covered by dense high grass and patches of woody thicket and shrubs in areas. Sites and/or material may be exposed during development.

Cultural sensitivity

Although no visible sites were located during the investigation, sites may be covered by soil and vegetation and will only be located once this has been removed. The area investigated is situated within 5 km from the coast and falls within the maximum distance shell middens are expected to be found from the beach (Binneman 1996, 2001).

Recommendations

If any concentrations of archaeological material are uncovered during development it should be reported immediately to the Albany Museum and/or the South African Heritage Resources Agency.

9.2 PROJECT INFORMATION

Status

The report is part of an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The type of development

Residential and business development (mixed use development).

The Developer

Mr TJ Coombs
DYU Trading CC
6 Cromwell Street
Grahamstown, 6139
Fax: 046 622 9299
t.coombs@iafrica.com

The Environmental Consultant

Ms Deborah Vromans
Coastal & Environmental Services
Tel: 043 742 3302
Fax: 043 742 3306
P.O. Box 8145
Quigney, 5210
East London

9.3 TERMS OF REFERENCE

Conduct a survey of possible archaeological heritage sites on the farm Rosehill Erf No. 20 Port Alfred, to establish the range and importance of the heritage sites, the potential impact of the development and to make recommendations to minimize possible damage to these sites.

9.4 BRIEF ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

9.4.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

Although the visible archaeological sensitivity of the area investigated is low, the Port Alfred coast (between the Great Fish River Mouth and Bushman's River Mouth in general is rich in archaeological sites and material. The Albany Museum houses many collections of archaeological material and human remains from the Port Alfred area. Hewitt (1921) and Rudner (1968) were the first amateur archaeologists to report on the KhoiSan sites and pottery found in the region. Rudner mentioned that remains of 28 Khoi pots were found in the vicinity of the present day Port Alfred alone. Unfortunately, in a few decades many of these important archaeological features have been destroyed by the developments along the coastal.

The most common archaeological sites found in the area are shell middens (people refer to these as 'strandloper middens'). In general these shell middens date from the past 6 000 years (called the Later Stone Age) and consist of two types. Shell middens are relatively large piles of marine shell and they are in generally referred to as 'strandloper middens'. They are found mainly opposite rocky coasts, but also occur along sandy beaches if there was a large enough source of white mussel. These concentrations of shell represent the campsites of San hunter-gatherers (dating from as old as 6 000 years ago), Khoi pastoralists and KhoiSan (dating from the past 1 800 in the region) peoples who lived along the immediate coast and collected marine foods on a daily basis. A few pot shards associated with Early Iron Age mixed farmers were also found near Port Alfred. This suggests that this part of the coast was also sporadically visited by these people between 1 600 and 1 000 years ago.

Shell middens are usually within 300 of the high water mark, but can be found up to 5 km inland. Mixed with the shell and other marine food waste are other terrestrial food remains, cultural material and often human remains are found buried in the middens. Also associated with middens are large stone floors which were probably used as cooking platforms.

Other archaeological sites reported from the area include tools which date from the Middle Stone Age (MSA) and date between 120 000 and 30 000 years old. Fossil bone may in rare cases be associated with MSA occurrences along the coast. In areas where there are beach and/or river gravels large stone tools, called handaxes and cleavers may be found. These stone tools are from a time period called the Earlier Stone Age and may date between 1 million and 250 000 years old. (See appendix for a list of possible archaeological sites that maybe found in the area).

Relevant impact assessments: - none nearby; nearest is some 25 km away.

Archaeological heritage impact assessment for the proposed Carpe Diem coastal eco-estate development, Great Fish Point: coastal foreland survey (palmiet annex 239).

Prepared by: Dr J. Binneman
Department of archaeology
Albany Museum
Grahamstown
6139

For: Chand Environment Consultants
P.O. Box 238
Plumstead
7801

9.5 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY

9.5.1 AREA SURVEYED

Location data

The proposed Rosehill farm development is approximately 70 hectares in extent and situated west of Port Alfred within the urban boundary next to the R72 (road between Port Alfred and Alexandria).

Map

1:50 000 3426DB Port Alfred

9.5.2 METHODOLOGY

Large areas of the property were investigated on foot. Spot checks were also conducted from a vehicle while driving

through the property. A recently disturbed area i.e. road construction, was also investigated. The survey took four hours. No sampling was conducted.

The proposed property for development is located on gently undulating hills with a scenic view of the surrounding Kowie River estuary and coastal region. Most of the property was previously used for agricultural activities and was extensively ploughed. The old fields are now covered by dense high grass with patches of woody thicket and shrubs in areas. It was impossible to find any archaeological sites/material under these circumstances.

9.5.3 SURVEY/DESCRIPTION OF SITES

No archaeological sites were found. It is unlikely that any archaeological heritage remains of any value will be found *in situ* or of any contextual value in this area due to the extensive agricultural activities in the past. Notwithstanding, there is always a possibility that human remains and/or other archaeological and historical material may be uncovered during the development. Such material must be reported to the nearest museum, archaeologist or to the South African Heritage Resources Agency if exposed (see general remarks and conditions below).

9.5.4 DISCUSSION

The surrounding coastline is clearly visible from the property. There are large numbers of archaeological sites and remains of the KhoiSan people (see brief archaeological background) along the coast. No doubt the coastal areas will experience the ripple effect of this development and this may impact on the archaeological resources. The future landowners and visitors should be informed about the archaeology of the area, the people who lived in the region and the legislation which protects archaeological heritage. This could be accommodated in a small display at the main entrance to the complex (or elsewhere).

9.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed area for development is of very low cultural sensitivity, but is three kilometres from the coast and therefore falls within the maximum distance of five kilometres shell middens are expected to be found from the beach. (Binneman 2001, 2005). It is highly unlikely that any archaeological or historical material would be located during development, but sites (possibly shell middens) and material may be exposed after the top soil is removed. See appendix for a list of possible archaeological sites that maybe found in the area.

1. In the unlikely event that any concentrations of archaeological material are uncovered during further development of the site, it should be reported to the Albany Museum and/or the South African Heritage Resources Agency immediately so that systematic and professional investigation/excavations can be undertaken. Sufficient time should be allowed to remove/collect such material.
2. Construction managers/foremen should be informed before construction starts on the possible types of heritage sites and cultural material they may encounter and the procedures to follow when they find sites.
3. Each landowner in the proposed development should be made aware of the importance, sensitivity, conservation and protection of the cultural heritage of the region to avoid possible damage to heritage features or removal of material from heritage sites anywhere in the region. A small information display on the cultural heritage of the region can be created at a public place on the development.

9.7 GENERAL REMARKS AND CONDITIONS

Note: This report is for a Phase 1 archaeological heritage impact assessment **only** and does **not** include or exempt other required heritage impact assessments (see below).

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999, section 35) requires a full Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in order that all heritage resources, that is, all places or objects of aesthetics, architectural, historic, scientific, social, spiritual linguistic or technological value or significance are 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

It must be emphasised that the conclusions and recommendations expressed in this archaeological heritage sensitivity investigation are based on the visibility of archaeological sites/material and may not therefore, reflect the

true state of affairs. Many sites may be covered by soil and vegetation and will only be located once this has been removed. In the event of such finds being uncovered, (during any phase of construction work), archaeologists must be informed immediately so that they can investigate the importance of the sites and excavate or collect material before it is destroyed. The onus is on the developer to ensure that this agreement is honoured in accordance with the National Heritage Resources Act No. 25 of 1999.

It must also be clear that Phase1 Specialist Reports (AIA's) 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.

9.8 REFERENCES

- Binneman, J.N.F. 2001. An introduction to a Later Stone Age coastal research project along the south-eastern Cape coast. *Southern African Field Archaeology* 10:75-87.
- Binneman, J.N.F. 2005. Archaeological research along the south-eastern Cape coast Part 1: open-air shell middens. *Southern African Field Archaeology* 13&14:49-77.
- Hewitt, J. 1921 On several implements and ornaments from strandloper sites in the Eastern Province. *South African Journal of Science* 18:454-467.
- Rudner, J. 1968. Strandloper pottery from South and South West Africa. *Annals of the South African Museum* 49:441-663.

APPENDIX 9.1: IDENTIFICATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES AND MATERIAL: guidelines and procedures for developers**1. Shell middens**

Shell middens can be defined as an accumulation of marine shell deposited by human agents rather than the result of marine activity. The shells are concentrated in a specific locality above the high-water mark and frequently contain stone tools, pottery and bone remains. Shell middens may be of various sizes and depths, but an accumulation which exceeds 1 m² in extent, should be reported to an archaeologist.

2. Human Skeletal material

Human remains, whether the complete remains of an individual buried during the past, or scattered human remains resulting from disturbance of the grave, should be reported. In general the remains are buried in a flexed position on their sides, but are also found buried in a sitting position with a flat stone capping and developers are requested to be on the alert for this.

3. Fossil bone

Fossil bones may be found embedded in calcrete deposits at the site. Any concentrations of bones, whether fossilized or not, should be reported.

4. Stone artefacts

These are difficult for the layman to identify. However, large accumulations of flaked stones which do not appear to have been distributed naturally should be reported. If the stone tools are associated with bone remains, development should be halted immediately and archaeologists notified.

5. Stone features and platforms

They come in different forms and sizes, but are easy to identify. The most common are an accumulation of roughly circular fire cracked stones tightly spaced and filled in with charcoal and marine shell. They are usually 1-2 metres in diameter and may represent cooking platform for shell fish. Others may resemble circular single row cobble stone markers. These are different sizes and may be the remains of wind breaks or cooking shelters.

6. Historical artefacts or features

These are easy to identified and include foundations of buildings or other construction features and items from domestic and military activities.