

1

HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE
Provincial Heritage Resources Authority of the Western Cape

Private Bag X9067
Cape Town
8000

Tel. (021) 483 9685
Fax: (021) 483 9842
Enquiries: Emmylou Rabe
e-mail: erabe@owrc.gov.za

2004-11-05
Ref: C13/3/6/2/21/1/A6

Ecosense
PO Box 12697
Die Boord
7613
Fax: (021) 887 2654

Dear Sir/ Madame

RE: Proposed development of Portion 10 Kompanjiesuin of the farm Kommetjie Estates No 946, Kommetjie.

Thank you for your correspondence and associated documentation regarding the above-mentioned proposed development that was received by Heritage Resource Management Services (HRMS) on 21 June 2004.

In terms of Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999):
Heritage Resource Management Services has no objection to the proposed development.

In terms of Section 36.5 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999):
Heritage Resources Management Services endorses the recommendations as set out in the Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment on the Proposed Development Kompanjiesuin Residential Estate, Kommetjie by Jonathan Kaplan in February 2004.

HRMS, therefore, supports the recommendation that states:

"With the regard to the burial/ grave site in the proposed 'stream buffer' alongside the Ocean View residential area, the following is required.

- The developer is requested to make a concerted effort to contact and consult with communities and individuals who, by tradition, may have an interest in the grave.
- This is a requirement in terms of Section 36.5 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)."

HRMS requests to be provided with information regarding the above before giving further comment on this proposed development.

We look forward to receiving the requested information so as to reach a decision-making point in this process.

Yours faithfully



Emmylou Rabe
for Accounting Officer: Heritage Western Cape

cc: Peter Kantor
021 686 1195 (f)

South Peninsula Administration
Private Bag X5
Plumstead
7801

9/2/08/175

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
KOMPANJIESTUIN RESIDENTIAL ESTATE
KOMMETJIE**

Prepared for

ECOSENSE

By

Jonathan Kaplan
Agency for Cultural Resource Management
PO Box 159
Riebeeck West
7306

Ph/Fax: 022 461 2755
Cellular: 082 321 0172
Email: acrm@wcaccess.co.za

**JANURAY
2004**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of the proposed Kompanjiesstun Residential Estate in Kommetjie has identified no significant impacts to pre-colonial archaeological material that will need to be mitigated prior to development activities.

A single, relatively recent burial/grave site was located in the proposed 'stream buffer' alongside the Ocean View residential area.

The developer is requested to make a concerted effort to contact and consult with communities and individuals who, by tradition, may have an interest in the grave.

This is a requirement in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999 Section 36.5).

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and brief

Ecosense requested that the Agency for Cultural Resource Management undertake a Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) of Portion 10 Kompanjiesuin of the farm Kommeijie Estates No. 948, Kommeijie, in the Cape Peninsula.

The proposed Kompanjiesuin Residential Estate development envisages a private residential housing estate consisting of approximately 350 erven.

The extent of the proposed development is about 57 ha.

The aim of the study is to locate and map archaeological remains that may be negatively impacted by the proposed development, and to propose measures to mitigate against the impact.

Margaret Neethling Heritage Consultant has been instructed by Ecosense to undertake a specialist Heritage Impact Assessment of the site.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference for the precolonial archaeological study were:

- to determine whether there are likely to be any archaeological sites of significance within the proposed site.
- to identify and map any sites of archaeological significance within the proposed site;
- to assess the sensitivity and significance of archaeological sites within the proposed site;
- to assess the status and significance of any impacts resulting from the proposed development, and
- to identify mitigatory measures to protect and maintain any valuable archaeological sites that may exist within the proposed site.

3. THE STUDY SITE

The location of the study site is illustrated in Figure 1.

A conceptual layout plan for the proposed development is illustrated in Figure 2.

An aerial photograph of the site is illustrated in Figure 3.

The property is located south of Kommetjie Main Road approximately 3 km east of Kommetjie. The site is bounded to the north by Kommetjie Main Road, with the light industrial area of Fish Eagle Park, and the Imhoffs Gift residential area on the opposite side of the road. A drainage course along the western boundary separates the site from the Ocean View residential area. The proposed development site stretches east as far as Sunhill.

Almost the entire site is infested with alien vegetation resulting in extremely low archaeological visibility. The site is also severely degraded. Mining for kaolin deposits alongside Kommetjie Road, large scale diggings, quarrying and dumping of rubble and refuse, have all resulted in substantial alteration and damage to the southern portion of the site alongside Kommetjie Road. Along the western boundary of the site, alongside the Ocean View residential area, dumping, diggings, and large-scale erosion have also resulted in considerable damage and alteration to the property.

4. LEGISLATION

Archaeological sites are protected under the National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999).

It is an offence to destroy, damage, excavate, alter, or remove from its original position, or collect, any archaeological material or object, without a permit issued by Heritage Western Cape, acting as the provincial heritage authority.

5. STUDY APPROACH AND DOCUMENTATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

The approach used in the archaeological study entailed a foot survey of Portion 10 Kompanjiesuin of the farm Kommetjie Estates No. 948.

A desktop study was also undertaken.

The earliest archaeological work in the Noordhoek Valley was done in the 1920's and 1950's, in certain areas along the lagoon and the Saltpan, where large collections of stone artefacts of considerable antiquity were collected by avid collectors and amateur archaeologists alike (Kaplan 1993).

By far the best known site in the Noordhoek Valley is the well-known public archaeology site known as Peers Cave (or Skidegat Cave), first excavated in the late 1920s (Goodwin 1929), and again during the late 1940's, and early 1960's (Anthony 1967; Jolly 1948).

Peers Cave is sometimes also referred to a 'the cave the world forgot' for it is one of those archaeological sites that were investigated too early to have had the benefit of the sophisticated techniques now in use (Deacon & Wilson 1992).

A number of smaller caves and shelters also occur in the sandstone mountains surrounding Sun Valley/Noordhoek (Kaplan 1990, 1993)

By the early 1990s, as a response to an increase in residential and coastal development in the Noordhoek Valley and Kommetjie, a number of archaeological surveys were commissioned, assessing the archaeological sensitivity of the region, and the impact of proposed development on archaeological sites (Parkington & Poggenpoel 1989; Parkington & Kaplan 1990; Kaplan 1991).

As a direct result of some of these surveys, archaeological excavations of Later Stone Age¹ (LSA) shell middens and campsites were carried out at Klein Slangkoppunt, not far from the proposed Kompanjiesuin development (Kaplan 1991). Calibrated radiocarbon dates for Klein Slangkoppunt show that the most probable age for the sites are between AD 1460 and 1648 (Kaplan 1990).

6. IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL RISKS

There are no potential precolonial archaeological risks associated with the proposed project.

7. CONSTRAINTS AND LIMITATIONS

The affected property is severely infested with alien vegetation (mainly Port Jackson and Bluegum), severely compromising archaeological visibility.

8. IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND DESCRIPTION

Early Stone Age² (ESA) tools were located on the site. These include a bifacially flaked handaxe, a large bifacially flaked cleaver, numerous chunks, large flakes, split/flaked cobbles and large cores. All the tools are in rough quartzite.

The majority of tools were located among the old earthworks and excavations related to historical kaolin mining alongside Kommetjie Main road, and among extensive gravels of quartzite and sandstone exposed as a result of quarrying, diggings and large scale dumping in the northern and eastern portions of the site.

A few ESA tools (flakes, a chunk and a large core) were also located on exposed gravels on the higher north-facing slopes in the south-eastern portion of the site, and along the cleared and disturbed fence-line on the south eastern boundary. Some of the tools located in this area are heavily patinated indicating tools of considerable antiquity.

¹ A term referring to the last 20 000 years of precolonial history in southern Africa.

² A term referring to the period between 2 million and 250 000 years ago.

All the tools were located in a severely disturbed and altered environment.

Several outcroppings of quartzites on the higher north-facing slopes of the property were also searched for evidence of prehistoric quarrying activities, but none was noted.

Importance of finds: **low**

Suggested mitigation: **none required**

8.1. Burial ground and graves

A single, probably relatively recent burial/grave site was located in the upper reaches of the proposed 'stream buffer' alongside the Ocean View residential area (**GPS reading S 34°08 586 E 18°21 628**).

The 'site' (Figure 4) is located alongside a large fallen Bluegum tree approximately 500 metres south of the Kommetjie Main Road. A yellow ribbon marks the site.

The burial comprises a single rectangular burial lined with small rocks/boulders and modern cement bricks and concrete paving. The headstone is a broken asbestos sheet, painted with pink water-based paint. Inscribed is the following: Here lies AULLYAA. LHHH SIETTIE. There is no visible date below, as the asbestos sheet is broken, but inscribed above is the date '1600/1700'. This date is inconsistent with the modern materials (bricks and asbestos used to 'mark' the site). There is some very faint 'Arabic' writing inscribed at the top of the asbestos sheet, which has been over painted in pink.

The low, dry packed sand mound is covered with a satin sheet.

9. IMPACT STATEMENT

The impact of the proposed project on precolonial archaeological remains is likely to be very low.

The probability of locating significant archaeological sites/remains during implementation (construction and operation) of the project is also likely to be very low.

10. CONCLUDING STATEMENT

Overall, the receiving environment is not considered to be archaeologically sensitive, vulnerable or threatened.

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

With regard to the proposed development of Portion 10 Kompanjiesstuijn of the farm Kommeijie Estates No. 948, Kommeijie in the Cape Peninsula, the following recommendations are made.

- No archaeological mitigation is required.
- No further detailed studies are required.

With regard to the burial/grave site in the proposed 'stream buffer' alongside the Ocean View residential area, the following is required.

- The developer is requested to make a concerted effort to contact and consult with communities and individuals who, by tradition, may have an interest in the grave.

This is a requirement in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999 Section 36.5).

12. REFERENCES

- Anthony, B. 1967. Excavations at Peers Cave, Fish Hoek, South Africa. *Palaeoecology of Africa* 2. 58-59.
- Deacon, J. & Wilson, M. 1992. Peers Cave, 'The Cave The World Forgot'. *The Digging Stick*. Volume 9, No. 2.
- Goodwin, A.J.H. 1929. The Middle Stone Age. In Goodwin, A.J.H. & Van Riet Lowe, C. *The Stone Age Cultures of South Africa*. 95-145. *Annals of the South African Museum* 27.
- Jolly, K. 1948. The development of The Cape Middle Stone Age in the Skildegat Cave, Fish Hoek. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 3:106-7.
- Kaplan, J. 1990. A report on the archaeological sensitivity of the Noordhoek Valley. Report prepared for Hill Kaplan Scott Consulting Engineers. Archaeology Contracts Office, Department of Archaeology, University of Cape Town
- Kaplan, J. 1991. The excavation of three archaeological sites at Klein Slangkoppunt Kommetjie. Report prepared for Hill Kaplan Scott Consulting Engineers. Archaeology Contracts Office, Department of Archaeology, University of Cape Town
- Kaplan, J. 1993. The state of Archaeological Information in the coastal zone from the Orange River to Ponto do Ouro. Report prepared for the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. Agency for Cultural Resource Management.
- Parkington, J.E. and Kaplan, J. 1990. Archaeological survey; Klein Slangkoppunt Development Kommetjie. Report prepared for Hill Kaplan Scott Consulting Engineers. Archaeology Contracts Office, Department of Archaeology, University of Cape Town
- Parkington, J.E. and Poggenpoel, C. 1989. A report on the likely archaeological implications of the proposed development at the site of the Noordhoek Saltpan. Archaeology Contracts Office, Department of Archaeology, University of Cape Town