

FOR ATTENTION: SAHRA: Northern Cape



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 OFFICIAL USE ONLY:
 SAHRA File No: 9/2/025/0002
 Date Received: 01 June 2006
 Date of Comment: 14 December 2006
 Sent to Peer Review:
 Date to Peer Review:
 SAHRA Contact Persons: Mrs Portia Ramalamula
 Dr Sarah Wurz

**REVIEW COMMENT ON
 ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT / SECOND COMMENT
 ON THIS SITE**

BY ARCHAEOLOGIST OF HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY

South Africa has a unique and non-renewable archaeological heritage. Archaeological 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) 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 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 PROVINCE: Mr Joas Sinthumule**.....
- B. SAHRA PROVINCIAL MANAGER : **NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE : Ms Molebiemang Manong**..
- C. AUTHOR(S) OF REPORT: **Mr Cobus Dreyer**
- D. ARCHAEOLOGY CONTRACT GROUP: **Pr. Archaeologist/Heritage Resource Specialist**
- E. CONTACT DETAILS: **P.O. Box 12910, Brandhof, 9324, Bloemfontein, Tel: 051 444 1187, Fax:051 444 4395, Cell: 083 357 7982, drezej@telkomsa.net**.....
- F. DATE OF REPORT: **May 2006**
- G. TITLE OF REPORT: **Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Investigation of the Proposed Eskom Hydra-Perseus & Beta-Perseus Transmissions line at the farm Jackalskuil 21, Petrusville, Northern Cape**
- H. Please circle as relevant: Archaeological component of EIA / EMP / HIA / CMP Other (Specify).....
- I. REPORT COMMISSIONED BY (CONSULTANT OR DEVELOPER):
- J. CONTACT DETAILS: **Acer Africa, PO Box 503, Mtunzini, 3867, Tel: 086 010 4958**
Fax:0353402232, E-mail:eskomHP@acerafrica.co.za
 COMMENTS:

Please see comment on next page.....

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

C Dreyer

May 2006, Received 01 June 2006

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE INVESTIGATION OF THE PROPOSED ESKOM HYDRA-PERSEUS & BETA-PERSEUS TRANSMISSION LINE AT THE FARM JACKALSKUIL 21, PETRUSVILLE, NORTHERN CAPE

The report assesses and evaluates the impact of the installation of the power line on the cultural and archaeological heritage and historical remnants on the farm. This report complements another archaeological impact assessment undertaken by Mr A van Jaarsveld, March 2006 "Archaeological and cultural heritage investigation of the proposed ESKOM Hydra-Perseus & Beta-Perseus transmission line at the farm Jackalskuil 21, Petrusville, Northern Cape". Mr van Jaarsveld did not undertake a full Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment and consulted existing published information and a low altitude helicopter tour of the area (1 200 000 km²). Our original comment cannot therefore be considered complete. The recommendations from this report by Mr Dreyer should be incorporated into the final Environmental Impact Assessment.

The following cultural heritage resources were recorded on Jackalskuil:

- Single and multi-grooved lower grindstones are scattered over a large areas. The stones are associated with single and multi faceted upper grindstones, stone flakes and pieces of broken bored stones.
- Single facet and multi faceted upper grindstones are associated with scatters of lower grindstones, Later Stone Age flakes and scrapers and broken bored stones.
- A great number of broken bored stones are found associated with upper and lower grindstones and LSA flakes and scrapers. The occurrence of so many bored stones may be a unique feature and should be preserved for further documentation and study. Bored stones are also found in different stages of manufacture.
- Long stones with damage on either one and or both ends could have been used as punches or a hammer stones. These stones are found in association with LSA flakes and scrapers and broken bored stones.
- Stone flakes and scrapers which date to the Later Stone Age are found in abundance at the site. These artefacts occur in association with hammer stones, cores and broken bored stones.
- A large number of stone engravings occur on boulders on a low hill. According to the heavy patination on some of the items the individual pictures clearly date from different times and were produced by different techniques, which vary from engraving, rubbing or scouring and line pecking. The author mentioned that not all the rock engravings were recorded and indicated that the Rock Art Department at the National Museum Department in Bloemfontein must be invited to track and document these.
- A rectangular stone-walled stock enclosure measuring about 20m x 34m is located on the hill among the archaeological material and rock engravings. The walls are well built and well preserved. The land-owner related that his ancestors had been sheep farmers for more than a century.
- A circular structure of about 2m diameter of unknown origin and purpose occurs on the hill between the engraved boulders. A collection of stone artefacts, which consist of broken bored stones and small multi-faceted upper grindstones, is found inside the

stone circle.

- A stone-wall, more than 5km long was made by the great-grandfather of the present owner. The wall was built by special stonemasons during the years between 1870 and 1880. The purpose of the wall was to control the movement of free roaming wild ostriches. The half circle of the wall was completed by a wooden fence made out of branches of thorn bushes brought up from the river.
- The present owner's father, who took great interest in his environment, made small and undocumented collections of Stone Age material on the farm. As a keen collector, he kept the material on display in a glass paned cabinet. The collections include stone artefacts as well as ostrich eggshell beads, clay pottery, an LSA Wilton arrow head and a variety of bored stone.
- There are two farm houses on the property. The first house was built shortly after 1920. The building is in a very good condition, and is still occupied by the landowner and his family. The structure is older than 60 years and is therefore protected.

These archaeological remains are significant and are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999).

The report recommends that in terms of the heritage:

1. Corridor 4 seems to be the only alternative of the four routes to be investigated for the installation of the proposed power line on Jackalskuil 21, Petrusville.
2. The planning should be adapted to take the proposed developments away from the archaeological and historical sites. The necessary arrangements to preserve and protect the stone tool and rock art sites as heritage resources should also be made.
3. An archaeologist should be involved to assess the exact positions where the pylons will be placed and to assess which site may be affected.
4. Planners and developers must note that construction work must avoid the archaeological material and that the identified Stone Age artefacts and engravings should not be damaged, either during the planning or during the construction stages.
5. The random collecting of stones at the site for construction or any other purpose is prohibited.
6. If the pylon, line or access roads impact on the rock engravings or lie within 100 m of them all the engravings must be recorded by the National Museum.
7. If corridors 1 or 2 or 3 are chosen then all the stone tool, rock engravings and historical sites on the farm that will be in the zone of impact must be mitigated.

Where the development involves disturbance of an archaeological or palaeontological site of some significance and Phase 2 mitigation (sampling through excavation and dating) is been asked for, SAHRA will require that, in terms of s.38(4)(b&c) of the National Heritage Resources Act, the provisions of ss 35 & 36 apply, as appropriate. The specialist will require a mitigation permit from the relevant Heritage Resources Authority. On receipt of a satisfactory mitigation (Phase 2) permit report from the archaeologist, the heritage authority may make further recommendations in terms of these provisions. Very rarely if a site is of high heritage significance the authority may request that it be conserved, that mini-site management plans, interpretive material and possibly protective infrastructure be established. More generally permission is given for the destruction of the remainder of archaeological or palaeontological sites, after full recording.

Decisions on Built Environment (e.g. structures over 60 years) and Cultural Landscapes must be made by the Northern Cape Provincial Heritage Authority (Mr Joas Sinthumule jsinthumule@bp.ncape.gov.za) to whom we will send the Impact Assessment Report and this

Comment before it is sent to you.

NAME OF ARCHAEOLOGIST PROCESSING REPORT: Portia Ramalamula.....

SIGNATURE OF SAHRA HEAD ARCHAEOLOGIST: 

EMAIL: *mf* mleslie@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 SITE IS STILL SUBJECT TO A PERMIT/PERMISSION FOR DESTRUCTION OF SUCH SITE GIVEN TO THE DEVELOPER BY THE RELEVANT HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERMIT COMMITTEE (THIS WILL BE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE PHASE 2 OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION AS NECESSARY). THIS REPORT MAY BE TAKEN ONLY AS APPROVAL, IN PRINCIPLE, 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.