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$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Site visit to inspect cultural material } \\
\text { on mine debris dumps adjacent to the } \\
\text { Kimberley Mine } \\
\text { at the site of a proposed hotel }
\end{gathered}
$$


,
provide extracts from the National Heritage Resources Act). destruction, or adequately mitigated and/or managed. (Appendices
give criteria for evaluating heritage value for archaeological sites; and while ensuring that what should be conserved is saved from Heritage impact assessments are a means to facilitate development aspects of Kimberley's past. the Act, and could be highly instructive in an archaeological sense on (q pejoepoid An! preservation of nearby dumps. Certain features, such as ash/bottle themselves a heritage feature, recognition of which is given in the The principal importance of the area examined is in relation to the
history of Kimberley over the past 135 years. The debris dumps are

## puno.6yoeg

 Recommendations are given that include the need for sampling ofmidden content. edges of the property). clusters of earlier artefacts and in fact become more common near the smashed glass, bottle tops, etc, which also extend beyond the main
 (perhaps a century old), with possibly some objects being a little older possibly nearby. The material is mainly of early twentieth century date of this material results from secondary dumping from another site,
 Notably the dumps are capped in places by, a scatter of probably
mainly twentieth century cultural material. It is not clear whether this period of active mining here pre-1915 No precolonial traces were noted during the present survey: the entire
area is mantled by debris dumps which are presumed to date from the
period of active mining here pre -1915 . were not included in the terms for that report). (Morris 2005) will be of relevance (the dumps around Kimberley Mine
 unesnu eulu eut 10 Guidueser fueuno eut to ped se fing eq pinom
 This report presents findings based on a brief visit to the dumps at the

## 

## Kimberley: September 2005

Site visit to inspect cultural material on mine debris dumps
adjacent to Kimberley Mine at the site of a proposed hotel.

A cutting through the dump and an adjacent slope to the west of a point
at $28^{\circ} 44.488^{\prime} \mathrm{S} 24^{\circ} 45.385^{\prime}$ E revealed relatively rich densities of circa
century-old porcelain, glass (codds, etc), metal and bone (well
Observations

> These possible resources/features include:
> that such resources or features are found during development they
should be reported immediately to an archaeologist. Only surface traces were inspected. It is possible that important

## suolfeyu! pue spouton

The Provincial Heritage Resources Agency (PHRA) in the Northern
Cape has, for the time being, requested SAHRA at national level to act
on an agency basis where archaeological sites are concerned. Permit
applications must be made to the SAHRA office in Cape Town.
may take place without heritage assessment and approval.
 to assess whether approval may be given for any form of disturbance, protects human remains older than 60 years. In order for the authority sites and requires that anyone wishing to disturb a site must have a Section 35 of the Act protects all archaeological and palaeontological
sites and requires that anyone wishing to disturb a site must have a Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) (defined in the Act), without a permit issued by the South African It is an offence to destroy, damage, excavate, alter, or remove from its

The National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999) (NHRA) provides

## Legislation

 on the surface of the area of proposed hotel development and to make The purpose for the visit was merely to inspect cultural material noted
 Morris, D. 2005. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment for De
soวนขมอృอy
I should like to thank Professional Management Consultants who
arranged the visit.
Acknowledgements or dump clearance is recommended.
Heritage resources may well come to light in other dump clearance
operations on the properties in question. In the event of any being
found, an archaeologist should be consulted. Monitoring during drilling
Representative samples of the midden should be recovered before it is
disturbed further. disturbed during preparation of the site for hotel development. Phase 2 mitigation work is recommended where middens may be those described above, even if they are not in primary context. mining era heritage resources, which include rubbish middens such as SAHRA permits will be required in the case of disturbance of any Recommendations
Only part of this area would be impacted by the hotel structure itself but
all of it might be impacted by leveling of the site.

ordinates:
The principal distribution of material is defined by the following co-
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| 8 | $\geq$ | $\frac{\frac{2}{8}}{8}$ | $\infty$ | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | $\omega$ | N' | $\pm$ | $\frac{\square}{9}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 $\stackrel{0}{0}$ 0 - 0 $\frac{0}{7}$ 0 0 |  |  | $\frac{2}{8}$ $\frac{8}{7}$ $\frac{6}{7}$ $\frac{9}{9}$ $\frac{\sigma}{9}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} 5 \\ \hline \frac{9}{3} \\ \frac{0}{9} \\ \frac{8}{8} \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\frac{0}{8}$ <br> $\frac{8}{7}$ <br> $\frac{8}{2}$ <br> 2 |  | $\frac{5}{\frac{5}{8}}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{6} \\ & \frac{9}{6} \\ & 8 \\ & \frac{3}{6} \\ & \frac{7}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95 \\ & 5 \\ & 5 \\ & 5 \\ & 0 \\ & 08 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & \frac{5}{8} \\ & -1 \end{aligned}$ | 7 0 $\frac{2}{3}$ $\frac{1}{8}$ $\frac{2}{4}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{y}{d} \\ \frac{3}{6} \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{v}{x} \\ & \frac{\overline{3}}{3} \\ & \frac{7}{3} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{7}{9} \\ & \frac{3}{3} \\ & \frac{3}{3} \\ & \frac{9}{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\pi$ $\frac{9}{9}$ $\frac{3}{3}$ $\frac{2}{9}$ $\frac{0}{9}$ |  | $\sum_{-1}^{8}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 8 \\ & \frac{8}{7} \\ & 8 \\ & 6 \\ & 3 \\ & \frac{5}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \overrightarrow{8} \\ \% \\ N \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{cc} 9 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{8}{3} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 9 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 8 \\ & \frac{9}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  | 20 $\frac{5}{3}$ $\frac{3}{6}$ $\frac{5}{9}$ $\frac{9}{9}$ |  |  | 5 $\frac{7}{8}$ $\frac{8}{2}$ $\frac{9}{3}$ |  | $\frac{-7}{8}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{8}{8} \\ & \frac{8}{8} \\ & \frac{8}{8} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{3}{7} \\ & \frac{5}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 8 \\ \omega \end{gathered}$ | 7 <br> $\frac{7}{9}$ <br> $\frac{7}{8}$ <br>  <br>  <br> $\frac{7}{7}$ <br> 8 <br> 8 <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | 0 $\frac{0}{3}$ 9 9 8 9 9 9 8 $\vdots$ 4 9 3 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ \frac{2}{3} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{9}{2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & z \\ & \frac{2}{7} \\ & \frac{2}{7} \\ & \frac{8}{6} \\ & \frac{6}{6} \\ & \frac{\square}{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & \frac{9}{2} \\ & \frac{3}{8} \\ & \frac{9}{9} \\ & \frac{3}{8} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\frac{3}{8}$ | Table 1. Classification of landforms and visible archaeological traces for

estimating the potential for archaeological sites (after J. Deacon, Type 3 attributes being those of highest significance. good indicator of the general archaeological significance of a site, with aspects of this matrix remain qualitative, attribute assessment is a
 developed an approach for selecting sites meriting heritage recognition The second matrix (Table 2) is adapted from Whitelaw (1997), who Assessing site value by attribute
light of such variables, thus requires some interpretation. older a site the poorer the preservation. Estimation of potential, in the Kimberley, which is on landform L1 Type 1. Generally, moreover, the exceptions, such as the renowned rock art site Driekopseiland, near those with higher archaeological potential. There are notable traces for estimating the potential Dear National Monuments Council). Type 3 sites tend to be Table 1 is a classification of landforms and visible archaeological (Morris 2000c). been developed and found to be suitable in Northern Cape settings use in assessing relative significance of archaeological resources have In addition to guidelines provided by the Act, archaeological criteria fo

## i xipueddy <br> Criteria to be used for archaeological significance

| Class | Landform | Type 1 |  | Type 2 |  | Type 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | visible |  |  |  |  | shell a | and bone dense |
| A3 | Stone artefacts or stone walling or other feature visible | Dispersed scatter |  | Deposit $<0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ thick |  | Deposit $>0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ thick |  |
| Table 2. Site attributes and value assessment (adapted from Whitelaw 1997) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Attribute |  | Type 1 |  | Type 2 |  | Type 3 |
| 1 | Length of sequence/context |  | No sequence Poor context Dispersed distribution |  | Limited sequence |  | Long sequence Favourable context High density of artelecofacts |
| 2 | Presence of exceptional items (incl regional rarity) |  | Absent |  | Present |  | Major element |
| 3 | Organic preservation |  | Absent |  | Present |  | Major element |
| 4 | Potential for future archaeological investigation |  | Low |  | Medium |  | High |
| 5 | Potential for public display |  | Low |  | Medium |  | High |
| 6 | Aesthetic appeal |  | Low |  | Medium |  | High |
| 7 | Potential for implementation of a long-term management plan |  | Low |  | Medium |  | High |
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BURIAL GROUNDS AND GRAVES
Section 36
No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources
authority -
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;
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; or
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.
4)
SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for the
destruction of any burial ground or grave referred to in subsection 3a) unless it is
satisfied that the applicant has made satisfactory arrangements for the exhumation
and re-interment of the contents of such graves, at the cost of the applicant and in
accordance with any regulations made by the responsible heritage resources
authority.
SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for any
activity under stabsection 3b) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has, in accordance
with regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority -
a) made a concerted effort to contact and consult communities and individuals
who by tradition have an interest in such grave or burial ground; and
b) reached agreements with such communities and individuals regarding the
future of such grave or burial ground.
5ubison who in the course of
6)
Subject to the provision of any other law, any person when
development or any other activity discovers the location of a grave, the existence of
which was previously unknown, must immediately cease such activity and report the
discovery to the responsible heritage resources authority which must, in co-operation
with the South African Police Service and in accordance with regulations of the
responsible heritage resources authority -
a) cary out an investigation for the purpose of obtaining information on
whether or not such grave is protected in terms of this Act or is of
significance to any community; and
b) if such grave is protecled or is of significance, assist any person who or
community which is a direct descendant to make arrangements for the
exhumation and re-internmenit of the contents of such grave or, in the
absence of such person or community, make any such arrangements as it
deems fit.
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 destruction of any burial ground or grave referred to in subsection 3a) unless it is
satisfied that the applicant has made satisfactory arrangements for the exhumation

 hereof which contains such graves; No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources
authority -
a) destroy, damage, alfer, exhume or remove from its original position or BURIAL GROUNDS AND GRAVES

[^2]

 carry out an investigation for the purpose of or or alogical site exists and whether
whether or not an ol palaeontol
mitigation is necessary:
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "P४ sily to suia, ul avono ue } \\
& \text { jeuosea, si se uonpe yons exe }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

E terms of this Act has been, is being, or is about to be commifted, the heritage






APPOINTMENT AND POWERS OF HERITAGE INSPECTORS
Section 50 $\square$
$\square$
$\frac{2}{8}$
$\frac{5}{6}$
$\frac{5}{3}$
1
$\triangleq$
N цuenajal पi, A Fi, The responsible heritage resources authority must, within 14 days of receipt of a
notification in terms of subsection 1) 0.8
The responsible heritage resources authority must specify the information to be responsible heritage resources authority must specify the information to be
 if there is reason to believe that heritage resources will be affected by such
development, notify the person who intends to undertake the development to
submit an impact assessment report. Such report must be complied at the
cost of the person proposing the development, by a person or persons heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature



> exceeding $5000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ in extent; or
involving three of more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or
pment or other activity which will change the character of a site-
exceeding $5000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ in extent; or

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { E } \\
& \text { e) whether the proposal }
\end{aligned}
$$


[^0]:    debris dumps and on the higher surfaces only. preserved, showing butcher cuts etc). It was found that this cultural
    material occurred mainly as, or within, a capping on top of old mine
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