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\section*{Executive summary}

No significant archaeological remains were located during an archaeological sensitivity assessment of Erf 2 in Gordons Bay.

The results of the assessment will be used to guide proposed development of the property, which envisages tourist accommodation, including chalets, a guest lodge, and tourist related activities.

The 13.4 ha site is currently undeveloped and is located on steep slopes overlooking the harbour at Gordons Bay. The site is largely in a natural state, although some areas are infested with alien vegelation.

Some Early Stone Age tools were located in the firebreak, which cuts across the site. A few stone tools were also located on the sleep gravel slopes in the northem partion of the property.

The tools are not considered to be significant.
No ether heritage remains were located.
The overall impact of development on archaeological and heritage remains on Erf 2 Gordon's Bav is considered to be low to negligible.

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

With regard to proposed development of Erf 2 in-Gordons Bay, the following recommendations are made.
- The site is assigned a low archaeological sensitivity rating.
- The property is suitable for development.
- No further detailed studies are required.

The above recommendations are subject to the approval of the South African Heritage Resources Agency.

\section*{1. INTRODUCTION}

\subsection*{1.1 Background}

Crowther Campbell and \& Associates has requested the Agency for Cultural Resource Management undertake an archaeological sensitivity assessment of Erf 2 in-Gordons Bay.

The aim of the study is to assess the archaeological sensitivity of the site, and to guide proposed development of the property, which envisages tourist accommodation, including chalets, a guest lodge, and tourist related activities.

\section*{2. TERMS OF REFERENCE}

The terms of reference for the archaeological assessment were:
1. to provide a broad baseline description of the archaeological/heritage resource potential of the site, placing the site in a regional context;
2. to provide specific information relating to the archaeology and heritage resources of the site, with reference to sites of special concern and their heritage status:
3. to map the site into zones and rank these zones according to their sensitivity from an archaeological and heritage perspective; and
4. to provide a justification as to the ranking of the zones as reported.

\section*{3. THE STUDY SITE}

The study site for the proposed development is illustrated in Figure 1.
Erf 2 Gordons Bay is located against the mountainside above the Gordons Bay Harbour.

The 13.4 ha site is currently undeveloped and largely in a natural state although the northern corner of the site is infested with alien vegetation.

\section*{4. APPROACH TO THE STUDY}

The approach used in the sensitivity assessment entailed a ground survey of the property.

A desktop study was also undertaken.

The sensitivity of the site was determined accordina to the criterie speciffed it the Specialist Briefing Document (Crowther Campbell \& Associates. 2002).

\section*{5. A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE STUDY AREA}

A Harge number of archeeological sites have been documented along the Coast on either side of Gordons Bay (Kaplan 1993a). Unfortunately, many O" these sites have been destroyed as a result of recreational and residential development along the sensitive coastline.

Later Stone Ag9 (LSA) sholl middens were recorded among the send dunes all the way betwoen Gordons Bay and the Strand (Ruditir 1908), whilt shel
 Rooi Els, Pringle Bay and Betty's Bay (Kaplan 1893a). Rock shelters alsc occur at the mouth of the Steenbras River (Schapera 1830), and at Rool Els, while rare rock paintings have been recorded near the Steenbras River Dam (Kaplan 2002a).

\section*{6. RESULTS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICALHERITAGE SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT}

\section*{6. 1 Archaeological finds}

A handful of Early Stone Age \(^{2}\) (ESA) tools were located in the firebreak which cuts across the site. A few tools were also located on the steep gravel slopes in the northern portion of the property. The tools comprise malnly large flakes, split cobbles and cores, in fine-grained quartzite.

The tools in the firebreak occur in a disturbed context, while those on the steeper slopes are probably in-situ. ESA tools are common in the region and have been located in a variety of contexts, both coastal and inland (Kaplan 1993b, 1995, 1998, 2002a, b).

Importance of finds: low

\section*{Suggested mitigation: none required}

\section*{6. 42 Other Heritage finds}

No other heritage remains were located during the study
Jonathan - I'm nol enlirely clear on the difference between heritage and archaeological sitesiremains, and you seem to be using the terms interchangeably here. If my clarification is incortect. please ionorel Perhaps a brief explanation of the difference would be informative. Thanks.

\footnotetext{
A crm reforring to the last 2000 years of precoluniut histary it southern Africa.
"A term referring 10 the period benveen 2 million and 250 (000 years ago.
}

\section*{7. IMPACT STATEMENT}

The impact of proposed development on archaeological and heritage remains is considered to be low.

The probability of locating significant archaoological remains during implementation of the project is also considered to be low.

\section*{8. SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS}

The site has been assigned a low sensitivity rating (Table 1).
Table 1. Archaeological sensitivity assessment. Erf 2 Gordons Bay.
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline SENSITIVITY & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Significance of \\
Development
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Intensity \& Spatial \\
extent of effect of \\
development on the \\
site.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Vulnerabllityl \\
Imeplaceability
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{9. CONCLUDING STATEMENT}

The receiving environment is not considered to be archaeologically sensitive, vulnerabie or threatened.

\section*{10. RECOMMENDATIONS}
 archaeological recommendations are made.
- The site is essigned a low archaeological sensltivity rating.
- The property is suitable for development.
- No further detailed studies are required.

The above recommendations are subject to the approval of the South African Heritage Resources Agency,
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