



SOUTH AFRICAN HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY
111 HARRINGTON STREET, CAPE TOWN, 8001
PO BOX 4637, CAPE TOWN, 8000
TEL: 021 462 4502 FAX: 021 462 4509

FOR ATTENTION: **PHRA: Northern Cape**

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:

SAHRA File No: **9/2/025/0001**
Date Received: **7 July 2010**
Date of Comment: **24 August 2010**
Sent to Peer Review:
Date to Peer Review:
SAHRA Contact Person: **Mariagrazia Galimberti**
DME Ref No:

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

BY ARCHAEOLOGY/ PALAEOONTOLOGY UNIT OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY

South Africa has a unique and non-renewable archaeological and palaeontological heritage. Archaeological and palaeontological sites are protected in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999) and may not be disturbed without a permit. Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIAs) and Palaeontological Impact Assessments (PIAs) identify and assess the significance of the sites, assess the potential impact of developments upon such sites, and make recommendations concerning mitigation and management of these sites. On the basis of satisfactory specialist reports SAHRA or the relevant heritage resources agency can assess whether or not it has objection to a development and indicate the conditions upon which such development might proceed and assess whether or not to issue permission to destroy such sites.

AIAs and PIAs often form part of the heritage component of an Environmental Impact Assessment or Environmental Management Plan. They may also form part of a Heritage Impact Assessment called for in terms of section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act No. 25, 1999. They may have other origins. In any event they should comply with basic minimum standards of reporting as indicated in SAHRA Regulations and Guidelines.

This form provides review comment from the Archaeologist of the relevant heritage resources authority for use by Heritage Managers, for example, when informing authorities that have applied to SAHRA for comment and for inclusion in documentation sent to environmental authorities. It may be used in conjunction with Form B, which provides relevant peer review comment.

- A. PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY: **Northern Cape**
- B. AUTHOR(S) OF REPORT: **Mr Jonathan Kaplan**
- C. ARCHAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: **Agency for Cultural Resource Management**
- D. CONTACT DETAILS: **5 Stuart Rd, Rondebosch, Tel: 021 685 7589, Cel: 082 321 0172, acrm@waccess.co.za**
- E. DATE OF REPORT: **April 2010**
- F. TITLE OF REPORT: **Archaeological Impact Assessment Proposed Photovoltaic Power Generation Facility in De Aar, Northern Cape.**
- G. Please circle as relevant: Archaeological component of **EIA** / EMP / HIA / CMP
Other (Specify)
- H. REPORT COMMISSIONED BY (CONSULTANT OR DEVELOPER): **DJ Environmental Consultants**
- I. CONTACT DETAILS: **Mr Junaid Moosajee, Postnet Suite 66, Private Bag X15, Somerset West 7130, junaid@djec.co.za**
- J. COMMENTS:

Please see comment on next page

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**Mr Jonathan Kaplan on behalf of Agency for Cultural Resource Management
Dated: April 2010, received: July 2010**

Archaeological Impact Assessment Proposed Photovoltaic Power Generation Facility in De Aar, Northern Cape.

INTRODUCTION

A photovoltaic power generation facility is planned in the Northern Cape close to De Aar. Two alternative options, one North West of the city and one South East of it, have been identified.

The total energy production will be 20 MW and the footprint for the power plant will be 400 x 400 m (16 ha). The overhead powerline for the North West option is 1.6 km, whereas for the South East would be 7 km. Only the footprint of the North West powerline was surveyed.

The North West Option is the preferred one by the consultant, whereas the South East Option is the preferred one from an archaeological point of view.

The groundcover for both sites is quite thick with bush and scrubs hampering the visibility at times. After surveying the two footprints though, the specialist is confident that all archaeological resources were identified within good reason.

During the survey of the North West option (footprint of the PV power generation facility and existing powerline servitude) mostly scatter hornfels artefacts from the Later Stone Age were identified. In total, thirteen scatters were identified, two of which also contained some historical objects. According to the specialist, only two sites (DANW 10 and 11) require further investigation as they possibly represent settlement sites.

The survey of the second option, the South East one (footprint of the PV power generation facility), similarly revealed the presence of scattered tools, mostly from the Later Stone Age. No further investigation is required.

SAHRA RECOMMENDATIONS

SAHRA supports the recommendations of the author and requires that:

- Mitigation in the form of excavation and sampling must be undertaken before trenching and any other earth-moving activity resulting from this proposed project is carried out. A photographic record must be established before, during and after mitigation. The archaeologist will need to require a mitigation permit from SAHRA in terms of s. 35 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999). On receipt of a satisfactory mitigation (Phase 2) permit report from the archaeologist, SAHRA will make further

recommendations in terms of the report such as the final destruction or additional sampling of the sites.

From an archaeological perspective, the South East option would be the preferred one.

CONCLUSION

Once the final report from the mitigation process is received, the SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite Unit will further comment on this development (in terms of the component of the heritage resources). Meanwhile, if any new evidence of archaeological sites or artefacts, palaeontological fossils, graves or other heritage resources are found, SAHRA and a professional archaeologist must be alerted immediately.

Decisions on Built Environment (e.g. structures over 60 years) and Cultural Landscapes and associated Living Heritage (e.g. sacred sites) must be made by the Northern Cape Heritage Resources Authority of the Northern Cape (Mr. Joas Sinthumule jsinthumule@ncpg.gov.za) to whom this Archaeological Review Comment will be copied.

SAHRA is looking forward to receiving the palaeontological impact assessment for this project.

SIGNATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGIST PROCESSING REPORT: Mgalimberti
EMAIL: mgalimberti@sahra.org.za

SIGNATURE OF SAHRA HEAD ARCHAEOLOGIST: p.p. S.M. Jhumay
EMAIL: nndobochani@sahra.org.za

NAME OF HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY: SAHRA

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE COMMENT (ABOVE OR APPENDED) CONSTITUTES THE COMMENT OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGIST AND THAT ANY DEVELOPMENT THAT INVOLVES DESTRUCTION OF ANY ARCHAEOLOGICAL/PALAEONTOLOGICAL SITE IS STILL SUBJECT TO A PERMIT/PERMISSION FOR DESTRUCTION OF SUCH SITE GIVEN TO THE DEVELOPER BY THE RELEVANT HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEONTOLOGICAL PERMIT COMMITTEE (THIS WILL BE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE PHASE 2 OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL/ PALAEONTOLOGICAL MITIGATION AS NECESSARY). THIS REPORT MAY BE TAKEN ONLY AS APPROVAL IN TERMS OF SECTION 35 OF THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT. THE PROVINCIAL MANAGER OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY MUST ADVISE AS TO APPROVAL IN TERMS OF HERITAGE ISSUES ENCOMPASSED BY OTHER ASPECTS OF THE LEGISLATION, SUCH AS ISSUES OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (STRUCTURES (E.G. FARM HOUSES), OVER 60 YEARS), INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS OR OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES AS THIS IS NOT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGIST.

PLEASE NOTE THAT SAHRA IS NOW RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE I HERITAGE RESOURCES (AND EXPORT) AND THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE II AND GRADE III HERITAGE RESOURCES, EXCEPT WHERE THERE IS AN AGENCY ARRANGEMENT WITH THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY.