

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE  
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF A HOTEL AND RESORT ON ERF 6338,  
JEFFREYS BAY, KOUGA MUNICIPALITY, EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE**

**Prepared for:** Gertenbach Ecological Consultations  
P.O. Box 963  
Jeffreys Bay  
6330  
Tel.: 042 2961019  
Fax: 042 2961019  
Email: willem01@telkomsa.net

**Compiled by:** Dr Johan Binneman  
**On behalf of:** Eastern Cape Heritage Consultants  
P.O. Box 689  
Jeffreys Bay  
6330  
Tel: 042 962096  
Cell: 078006322

**Date:** October 2007

## CONTENTS

SUMMARY .....	1
PROJECT INFORMATION .....	2
BRIEF ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND .....	3
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY .....	5
ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION.....	5
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
GENERAL REMARKS AND CONDITIONS .....	10
APPENDIX A: IDENTIFICATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES AND MATERIAL FROM COASTAL AREAS.....	11
APPENDIX B: MAPS AND PHOTOGRAPHS	

# **PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF A HOTEL AND RESORT ON ERF 6338, JEFFREYS BAY, KOUGA MUNICIPALITY, EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE**

**Compiled by:** Dr Johan Binneman  
**On behalf of:** Eastern Cape Heritage Consultants  
P.O. Box 689  
Jeffreys Bay  
6330  
Tel: 042 962096  
Cell: 078006322

**Note:** This report follows the minimum standard guidelines required by the South African Heritage Resources Agency for compiling Archaeological Heritage Phase 1 Impact Assessment (AHIA) reports.

## **SUMMARY**

### **Purpose of the study**

To conduct a Phase 1 Archaeological Heritage Impact Assessment of Erf 6338, Jeffrey's Bay, Kouga Municipality, to evaluate the importance of the archaeological heritage sites, the potential impact of the development and to make recommendations to minimize possible damage to these sites.

### **The investigation**

The property on which the Caravan Park is currently situated has been transformed in the past and is covered by lawn, several large and small buildings and other structures. The only possible evidence of archaeological heritage sites was found in the area between the beach and the first row of chalets. Fragmented shell, usually associated with prehistoric shell middens was pushed to the surface by dune moles. There are no buildings older than 60 years or any graves on the property.

### **Cultural sensitivity**

Research and surveys in the wider region indicate that the area along the estuary and the nearby coastline is still rich in archaeological sites, despite the fact that a large number has been demolished during residential development in the past. The proposed property for development is situated close to the estuary and therefore falls within this archaeological sensitive zone. The fact that shell midden material was brought to the surface by dune moles, indicate that there are possible archaeological sites on that part of the property, covered by grass and soil. The development will have an indirect influence on heritage resources in the wider region and proper management of these resources is necessary.

### **Recommendations**

1. Test the area where the shell material is exposed for archaeological heritage sites.

2. Carefully 'scrape'/remove the top soil with a bull dozer, to identify possible sites before the existing buildings are demolished. An archaeologist must be on site to monitor the scraping. Recommendations will follow after the cleaning phase.
3. If archaeological sites are found, then a Phase 2 Mitigation process will be undertaken. The sites will be systematic excavated to establish the contextual status of the sites and remove the archaeological deposits before construction of the development starts.
4. A series of trenches and test pits could also be excavated where the foundations of buildings will be placed or other large scale developments will take place.
5. A person must be trained as a site monitor to report any archaeological sites found during development.
6. If sites are found during construction work, then work must be stopped for an archaeologist to investigate and if necessary conduct a Phase 3 Mitigation operation.
7. Visitors/tourists to the resort/hotel complex must be alerted to 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.

### **Community consultation**

Consultation with the Gamtkwa KhoiSan Council was conducted as required by the National Heritage Resources Act No. 25 of 1999, Section 38(3e). They will communicate their recommendations to Gertenbach Ecological Consultations

## **PROJECT INFORMATION**

### **Status**

The report is part of an Environmental Impact Assessment.

### **The type of development**

A high density residential, hotel and commercial component (see attached plans, supplied by the developer).

### **The Developer**

Anchors Rest (Pty) Ltd.  
Reg. No. 2006/032716/23

### **The Consultant**

Gertenbach Ecological Consultations  
P.O. Box 963  
Jeffreys Bay  
6330  
Tel.: 042 2961019  
Fax: 042 2961019  
Email: willem01@telkomsa.net

## **Terms of reference**

The original proposal was to conduct a Phase 1 Archaeological Heritage Impact Assessment of Erf 6338, Jeffrey's Bay, Kouga Municipality, to describe and evaluate the importance of the archaeological heritage sites, the potential impact of the development and to make recommendations to minimize possible damage to these sites.

## **BRIEF ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND**

### **Literature/research review**

The coastline between Kabeljous River Mouth and Cape St Francis once housed hundreds of archaeological sites, including the remains of the indigenous people (Rudner 1968). Unfortunately, in a few decades virtually all of these important archaeological features have been destroyed by the development of the coastal towns and many were covered with dune sand and vegetation (Binneman 1985, 2001, 2005).

Little is known of the very early prehistory of the region. The oldest evidence of the early inhabitants are large stone tools, called handaxes and cleavers, which can be found in the river gravels which capped the hill slopes in the region (Laidler 1947. These large stone tools are from a time period called the Earlier Stone Age and may date between 1 million and 250 000 years old). These large stone tools are often found associated with the gravels in the area, and were later replaced by smaller stone tools called the Middle Stone Age (MSA) flake and blades industries. Evidence of MSA sites occur throughout the region and date between 120 000 and 30 000 years old. Fossil bone may in rare cases be associated with MSA occurrences along the coast.

The most common archaeological sites found in the area are shell middens (Binneman 1996, 2001, 2005; Rudner 1968). They are relatively large piles of marine shell and are popularly referred to as 'strandloper middens'. In general these shell middens date from the past 6 000 years. 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. The Khoi people were the first food producers in South Africa and introduced domesticated animals (sheep, goat and cattle) and ceramic vessels to southern Africa as early as 2 000 years ago. The oldest sheep remains recovered from the middens near the Kabeljous River Mouth were radiocarbon dated to 1 560 years old - the oldest date for the presence of sheep in the Eastern Cape (Binneman 1996, 2001).

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 may consist of concentrations of stone artefact and/or bone remains. Some of the stone tools may date back to 100 000 years old, and the fossil bone occurrences along the coast may also date this old (See appendix for a list of possible archaeological sites that maybe found in the area).

### **Cultural sensitivity of the Kabeljous River estuary and adjacent coastal areas**

Archaeological research conducted and observations made in the region indicate that places like the Kabeljous River estuary were popular areas for the hunter-gatherer and pastoralists to live due to the wide variety of food resources within easy walking distance, i.e., shellfish along the beach, fish in the estuary and game in the nearby hills.

Research at a rock shelter some four kilometres upstream indicated that this part of the coast was well utilised by prehistoric people from 6 000 years ago (research report available on request). Two KhoiSan skeletons were found on the nearby New Papiessfontein farm during the past few years, indicating that such remains may also be buried on the property in question (Die Burger 27-09-2005). During 1983 several middens were badly damaged and eventually demolished by a bulldozer where houses were being built near the present day caravan park. These were found to be extremely rich in archaeological material (Binneman 1985, 1996, 2001, 2005). The following results were obtained from the limited research project.

1. Two of the shell middens were occupied by San hunter-gatherers ('Bushmen') and one was radiocarbon dated to 2 570 years old. Although the middens were situated along a sandy beach, the hunter-gatherers preferred to collect brown mussel from the rocky shore almost a kilometre away, rather than the white mussel which could be collected 50 metres away.
2. Two shell middens were of Khoi pastoralist origin. A similar shellfish collecting pattern was followed by the Khoi.
3. The Khoi were the first food producers in South Africa and the sheep remains recovered from the middens were radiocarbon dated to 1 560 years old - the oldest date for the presence of sheep in the Eastern Cape.
4. These middens yielded more fish remains than any other open-air shell midden along the Eastern Cape coast. The remains were mainly from mullet species and taken from the nearby estuary. The method of capture is unknown because it is known from historical records that the indigenous groups did not process nets of any kind.

## References

- Binneman, J.N.F. 1985. Research along the south eastern Cape coast. In: Hall, S.L. & Binneman, J.N.F. Guide to archaeological sites in the eastern and north eastern Cape. pp. 117-134. Grahamstown: Albany Museum.
- Binneman, J.N.F. 1996. The symbolic construction of communities during the Holocene Later Stone Age in the south-eastern Cape. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis: University of the Witwatersrand.
- Binneman, J.N.F. 1999. Mummified human remains from the Kouga Mountains, Eastern Cape. *The Digging Stick* 16:1-2.
- 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 part1: open-air shell middens *Southern African Field Archaeology* 13 & 14:49-77
- Die Burger. 27 September 2005.
- Laidler, P.W. 1947. The evolution of Middle Palaeolithic technique at Geelhoutboom, near Kareedouw, in the southern Cape. *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Africa*
- Rudner, J. 1968. Strandloper pottery from South and South West Africa. *Annals of the South African Museum* 49:441-663

## Museum/University databases and collections

The Albany Museum in Grahamstown houses collections and information from the region. Other institutions which may also have collections and information from the region include the University of Cape Town and Iziko Museums.

## **Relevant impact assessments:**

Phase 1 archaeological heritage impact assessment for the proposed development of erven 328/1, 328/2 and 779, Jeffreys Bay.

Prepared for: Integrated Environmental Management Unit, 36 River Road, Walmer, Port, Elizabeth, 6070.

Prepared by: Dr J. Binneman, Department of Archaeology, Albany Museum, Somerset Street, Grahamstown, 6139.

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY**

### **Area surveyed**

#### Location data

Erf 6338, Jeffreys Bay, Kouga Municipality, Cacadu District Municipality, Eastern Cape.

The property proposed for development (2.43 hectare) is currently a caravan park. It is situated approximately one kilometre from the Kabeljous River estuary next to the beach and the main road to Jeffreys Bay (Fig. 1 & 2). Originally, this part of the coast between the Kabeljous River estuary and the caravan park was relatively flat with small, low sand dunes, but has been completely transformed by residential development (Fig. 3). A brick wall and fences separate the caravan park from the surrounding properties. There are also tarred access roads and a large tarred parking area next to the property. It is clear that the property has been altered and disturbed on a large scale by levelling of the low coastal dunes and the construction of the caravan park. The entire property is covered by lawn. A large number of buildings and other structures, which include, a shop and offices, a tarred parking area, chalets, two large ablution facilities, smaller ablution buildings a tennis court, brick paved roads, brick braai facilities, lamp posts and other structures are situated on the property (Figs 4 - 7).

#### Map

1:50 000 - 3424BB Humansdorp

## **ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION**

### **Methodology**

The investigation was conducted by two people on foot. As discussed above, the entire property is covered by grass and a large number of modern building and other structures, which made it difficult to find archaeological sites/material. No visible *in situ* archaeological sites were found during the investigation, but dune mole activity has pushed fragmented marine shell and occasional stone artefacts and bone to the surface.

The narrow sandy fringe between the beach and caravan park was also investigated, but this area was disturbed and spills of building rubble were also present. The adjacent property west of the caravan park was investigated recently.

### **Description of possible sites**

GPS readings were taken with a Garmin Plus II

### Caravan Park

Fragmented marine shell were found over an area of some 10 metres between the beach and the first row of chalets (34.00.817S; 24.55,704E) (Figs 2, 8 - 10). The shell were pushed to the surface by dune moles and consisted mainly of *Donax serra* (white mussel). Usually these materials are associated with prehistoric shell middens and it may indicate that there are possibly larger accumulations of shells (possibly shell middens) buried under the lawn and surface soil. It is not known what the status of the material is, but given the fact that it is close to the row of chalets, it is probably disturbed. One Middle Stone Age stone tool (older than 30 000 years) was found on the surface in the same area. The presence of the isolated MSA stone tool is puzzling, because the age of the shell material appears to be of Late Holocene age (past 5000 years).

There are no buildings older than 60 years or graves on the property.

### Beach area

No visible archaeological sites were found in this area.

### Adjacent property (west)

No visible archaeological sites were found during the investigation because the entire area (three erven) is a well-manicured lawn. However, dune moles have pushed fragmented shell, occasional bone fragments and stone tools to the surface. Some were found near the boundary fence of the caravan park. The fragmented marine shell (but also whole shells) which included *Donax serra* (white mussel), *Perna perna* (brown mussel), *Oxysteles* spp. (winkles), *Turbo sarmaticus* (alikeukel), *Scuterllastra* spp. (limpets) and barnacles, are all marine species associated with prehistoric shell middens, as well as bone fragments and stone tools. The area investigated is well above high water mark and it must also be noted that all the species, except the white mussel, occur only at rocky coasts. The closest rocky coast is a few hundred metres to the west of the area.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that due to the possible archaeological sensitivity of the property, the following measures be taken:

1. The area between the beach and the first row of chalets (see Figs. 2, 3 & 4) where shell midden material is visible, must be investigated by a test pit or trench excavation before construction starts in that part of the proposed development. Further recommendations will follow from the investigation. This may include:
  - That further excavations/sampling must be conducted, or
  - That the Phase 1 development of that area may proceed.

**Note:** Phase 1 (below) may proceed independently of the above investigation in other areas, subject to the conditions recommended below.

### **Phase 1**

Against the background that all the existing buildings and structures will be demolished and that the entire property will be transformed by large scale levelling and earth moving activities before the development starts, it is recommended that:



- 1.1. The top soil be carefully removed (scraped) by an experienced bulldozer operator, preferably before any buildings or structures are demolished or removed. This will be a quick and easy way to expose the area and would make it easier to locate possible sites.
  - After the surface scraping exercise, the area will be investigated again. Should any archaeological sites or material be exposed, then further recommendations will follow for a Phase 2 (see below).
- 1.2. After the surface scraping exercise the buildings and other structures can be demolished.
  - However, foundations and concrete slabs/floors of demolished buildings and structures must be carefully removed because there may be possibly archaeological sites/material under these structures.

**Note:** An archaeologist must be on site when the scraping exercise and removal of the foundations and concrete slabs/floors take place to monitor the process and can stop the operations if archaeological sites/material are found.

**Phase 2:** Preliminary recommendations - to be finalised after Phase 1, may include:

- 2.1. A Phase 2 Mitigation process whereby systematic excavations/sampling will be conducted to establish the contextual status of the sites and possibly remove the archaeological deposits before construction of the development starts.
- 2.2. A series of test pits and test trenches be excavated where the foundations of buildings or other structures will be placed or where other general disturbances of the surface will take place.
  - A person be trained as a site monitor to report to the foreman when archaeological sites are found.
  - The site must be monitored during all construction work, and should any further archaeological remains be encountered, the work should be stopped to contact the nearest archaeologist to investigate the finds. Recommendations will follow after the investigation and may include:
  - A Phase 3 Mitigation process to systematically excavate and remove the archaeological deposits before construction of the development continues.

**Note:** Important site(s) may be declared national and/or provincial heritage site(s) by SAHRA and may not be demolished, but must be protected and preserved.

3. Although there are few visible archaeological sites in close proximity of the property, the proposed development will have an impact on cultural resources in the surrounding areas. Important archaeological and historical sites and material are in walking distance and visitors/tourists will no doubt visit or 'discover' these through their recreational activities. Against this background the following suggestions are proposed:
  - The developers should consider a small display/information centre at a central place in the resort/hotel complex where relevant information can be displayed regarding the archaeological heritage resources of the area. This should include a 'management strategy' which inform the visitors/tourists about the protection, conservation and protocol of visiting these heritage resources. Such a facility will be a constructive contribution towards the potential protection and conservation of the heritage resources of the region and may prove to be a valuable 'investment' to the development.

### **Motivation for 3.**

There is no doubt that a development of this size will have an impact/ripple effect on the archaeological heritage resources of the region. The impact will be indirect, but will increase over time. It is therefore the responsibility of the developers to inform potential visitors/tourists to the resort/hotel complex of the importance of the archaeological heritage of the area.

The immediate and adjacent areas to the proposed development are rich in archaeological heritage sites, i.e. caves and shelters with extremely valuable and important and unique archaeological deposits. There are sites within walking distance from the development and many others within a short driving distance. These sites and others will be ‘discovered’ by visitors during their stay/visit.

The development will also provide private business opportunities such as eco-tourism and other recreational activities which may include visits to archaeological heritage sites. Archaeological heritage resources are non-renewable and also protected by the South African National Heritage Resources (NHRA) Act 1999, and therefore there are rules and regulations which regulate visits to these sites. The main concern is to protect and conserve the sites and their contents.

It is suggested that information regarding the importance and protection of archaeological heritage in the area be displayed at a strategic place within the resort/hotel complex. Minimum standards and regulations regarding archaeological sites can be obtained from the South African National Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA). Visitors/tourists can contribute to the protection and conservation of heritage sites if they first establish the following before they visit or participate in an archaeological tour, for example:

1. Only archaeological sites registered to SAHRA, with an approved management plan may be opened to public visiting.
2. Only registered and accredited archaeological and/or rock art tour guides may conduct archaeological tours.
3. Only registered tour guides (registered to the Eastern Cape Tourism Board) may conduct tours.

**Note:** Detailed Terms of Conditions/management strategy can be compiled once the development is established in cooperation of all the interest groups.

### **Conclusions**

The proposed property for development is a caravan park and situated in a potentially rich archaeological environment. Several important archaeological heritage sites were located nearby in the early 1980s. However, the area has been severely transformed in the past and probably also damaged and/or demolished a number of archaeological heritage site/material. Apart from a small scatter of possible shell midden material which was pushed to the surface by dune moles, no other sites were found. It is possible that there are still sites buried under the grass top soil. Several recommendations were proposed to recover material from archaeological sites, should these be exposed during development.

There are also many archaeological sites along the immediate coastline and there are many other important sites in the surrounding region. Development will indirectly impact on these resources via recreational and tourism activities. It is the responsibility of the developers to inform landowners and visitors to the development that these resources are sensitive and non-

renewable and that there are regulations protecting and conserving them. A positive contribution the developers must/can make towards the possible protection and conservation of these resources is to inform landowners and visitors to the estate what the correct legal procedures are regarding visiting and viewing heritage sites in the region. This information must be displayed on sign boards placed at public places in the development. Hopefully this 'educational approach' will make a positive contribution towards the protection and conservation of important archaeological heritage resources.

## GENERAL REMARKS AND CONDITION

**Note:** This report is a phase 1 archaeological heritage impact assessment/investigation 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/features and may not therefore, reflect the true state of affairs. Many sites/features 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, (such as 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 Act No. 25 of 1999.

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

## **APPENDIX A: IDENTIFICATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES AND MATERIAL FROM COASTAL AREAS: 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, bone and occasionally also human remains. Shell middens may be of various sizes and depths, but an accumulation which exceeds 1 m<sup>2</sup> 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

These occur in different forms and sizes, but easily identifiable. 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 platforms for shell fish. Others may resemble circular single row cobble stone markers. These occur in different sizes and may be the remains of wind breaks or cooking shelters.

### 6. Historical artefacts or features

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

1:50 000 SOUTH AFRICA  
SUID-AFRIKA



**Proposed development**

**3424 BB HUMANSDORP**

Fig. 1. Location of the proposed development.





Fig. 2. Locations of the caravan park and the area where archaeological remains were found in 1983 as mentioned in the text.





**Fig. 3.** View towards the estuary. The Houses mark the area where the sites were found in 1983.



**Fig. 7.** Tennis court and buildings in the background.



**Fig.4.** Entrance to the Caravan Park.



**Fig. 8.** View of the area between the beach and chalets.



**Fig. 5.** An example of the buildings and other structures.



**Fig. 9.** Shell fragments near the chalets.



**Fig. 6.** Brick paved roads and grass covered top soil.



**Fig. 10.** Shell fragments pushed to the surface by dune moles, near the chalets.





Plan of the groundfloor.



**GAMTKWA  
KHOISAN COUNCIL**

P.O BOX 196  
HANKEY  
6350

Cell. : 083 504 6769  
Fax : 042 – 2931 909

**We, the Indigenous Peoples, walk**

**towards the future in the footprints  
our ancestors”** ( Kari-Ocha Declaration)

**of**

19 Oktober 2007

Gertenbach Ecological Consultations  
P.O Box 963  
Jeffreys Bay  
6330

Dear Dr. Gertenbach,

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT : ERF 6338 (KABELJOUS CARAVAN  
PARK), KOUGA MUNICIPAL AREA**

We refer to our registration as an affected party for the purposes of the above process.

We have studied the report submitted by Dr. Binneman and we agree with his recommendations and findings.

Please note that we need to be consulted if any further archaeological investigation of the property is commissioned, and we will appreciate it if we can be provided with copies of any reports relevant to such an investigation.

We will also appreciate it if you can indicate when the Basic Assessment Report will be available for inspection at the local library.

Regards

**PASTOR J.J MAARMAN  
CHAIRPERSON :  
GAMTKWA TRIBE**