

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED AGGENEYS PHOTO-VOLTAIC SOLAR POWER PLANT ON PORTION 1 OF THE FARM AROAMS 57, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

(Assessment conducted under Section 38 (8) of the
National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999)

Prepared for:
Digby Wells Environmental
Private Bag X10046
Randburg, 2125.
Johan Nel
Tel: 011 789 9495
Cell: 072 288 5496
Email: johan.nel@digbywells.com

April 2012



Prepared by:

Lita Webley & David Halkett
ACO Associates
8 Jacobs Ladder
St James
7945

Phone (021) 650 2357
Fax (021) 650 2352

acoassociates@gmail.com
Lita@webleyonline.com

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Archaeology Contracts Office at the University of Cape Town was appointed by Digby Wells Environmental, on behalf of the client Orlight South Africa, to undertake an Impact Assessment for the construction of a 70MW solar facility on 350ha of land on the farm Aroams 57, in the Namakwa District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. The proposed facility will be located on either side of the N14, half way between Springbok and Pofadder. It is lies on the plains between Black Mountain and the Gamsberg.

This assessment forms part of the EIA process. The Notice of Intent to Develop and Scoping phase was undertaken by Digby Wells Environmental. The NID was submitted to SAHRA (SAHRA file number: 9/2/066/0047) and they have requested a palaeontological and archaeological impact assessment. They have also asked that the “archaeological impact assessment should also assess whether the cumulative impact of the solar energy facilities proposed on the same property may compromise the cultural landscape and its archaeological significance”.

This report is based on a background study of the published and unpublished literature for the area as well as fieldwork undertaken by Lita Webley and David Halkett on the 16 April 2012. A desktop palaeontological study was also undertaken by Dr John Pether and is appended. No significant limitations to conducting the survey were encountered.

The following heritage indicators were identified:

Palaeontology:

- The bedrock under the property is unfossiliferous and of no palaeontological significance. The potential for fossils in the Quaternary sand cover is very low.

The Pre-colonial Archaeology:

- Stone artefacts scatters from the Middle Stone Age are sparsely distributed across the study area and are found on gravel pavements between the vegetation;
- The absence of associated archaeological material, and lack of discrete individual sites reduces the significance of the material overall;
- Further mitigation of sites is considered unnecessary in this case.

The Built Environment:

- There are no buildings of heritage significance on the site.

Graves:

- A few cairns were identified but their purpose was unclear. Due care should be taken during construction of the site and if human remains are uncovered, work should stop in that area and SAHRA should be notified.

Cultural Landscape:

- The proposed solar plant is positioned on both sides of the N14 and is located 2.5km east of the Gamsberg. A number of solar facilities have been proposed for this area and the cumulative impact needs to be considered by the Visual Impact Specialist;
- The cultural landscape of the surrounding area has been significantly impacted by mining activities;
- However, in view of the discussion around the significance of the Gamsberg as a “genocide site” it is recommended that the Visual Impact specialist consider the impact of the proposed development with respect to the mountain.

Summary

The potential impacts resulting from the installation of a solar power plant on the heritage resources of the sites are considered to be of minor significance, and no mitigation is recommended. However, the potential cumulative impact of a number of such facilities on the archaeological landscape of the Gamsberg should be examined by the Visual Impact specialist.

SPECIALIST TEAM AND DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

David Halkett (BA, BA Hons, MA (UCT)) is an Archaeologist and Member of the Association of Professional Archaeologists of Southern Africa (ASAPA) accredited with Principal Investigator status. He has been working in heritage management for 23 years and has considerable experience in impact assessment with respect to a broad range of archaeological and heritage sites including those in the Northern Cape. He is a member of the Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites Committee and the Impact Assessment Committee of the Heritage Western Cape (HWC), the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority.

Lita Webley (BA, BA Hons, MA (Stellenbosch), PhD (UCT)) is an Archaeologist and member of ASAPA accredited with Principal Investigator status. She has been involved with heritage and archaeological impact assessments on a part-time basis since 1996 and full time since 2008. Her PhD thesis was concerned with the archaeology of the Namaqualand region of the Northern Cape and she is familiar with the heritage of the region.

John Pether (MSc. Pr. Sci. Nat.(Earth Sci)) is an independent consultant/researcher and authority on coastal-plain and continental-shelf palaeoenvironments.

Mr David Halkett, Dr Lita Webley and Mr John Pether are independent specialist consultants who are in no way connected, financially or otherwise, with the proponent, other than in the delivery of consulting services on the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	6
2. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS	6
3. TERMS OF REFERENCE	7
4. LEGISLATION.....	8
5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	8
6. BACKGROUND TO THE AREA	10
6.1 Palaeontology.....	10
6.2 Archaeological Background.....	10
5.2 Historical Background	11
7. SURVEY METHODS.....	12
6.1 Limitations	12
8. FINDINGS	13
8.1 Pre-colonial Archaeology	13
8.2 Built Environment.....	15
8.3 Cultural Landscape	15
9. IMPACT IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT	15
10. MITIGATION AND ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES.....	17
11. CONCLUSIONS	17
12. REFERENCES.....	18
13. Appendix A: Palaeontological Impact Assessment	
14. Appendix B: Visual Impact Assessment	

1. INTRODUCTION

The Archaeology Contracts Office at the University of Cape Town was appointed by Digby Wells Environmental, on behalf of the client Orlight South Africa, to undertake an Impact Assessment for the construction of a 70MW solar facility on 350ha of land on Portion 1 the farm Aroams 57, in the Namakwa District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. The proposed facility will be located on either side of the N14, half way between Springbok and Pofadder. It lies on the sandy plains between Black Mountain and the Gamsberg (Figure 1). This is to meet the growing demand for electricity generation and cleaner energy production in South Africa.




Figure 1: The location of the proposed facility on the N14 between Aggeneys and Pofadder. Note the location of the Gamsberg to the south-east.

2. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The Aggeneys solar project will have a generation capacity of 70MW resulting in the physical alteration of approximately 350ha of agricultural land on the farm Aroams 57. Only one preliminary layout has been proposed for the development (Figure 2). The facility may connect to the Aggeneys or Gamsberg substation through the establishment of an overhead power line, which could be 66kV or 132kV. Where possible the transmission route will be situated within, or parallel to, an existing servitude. The project will require the establishment of a ground mounting system, solar PV panels, inverters, switchboard and transformers.

Access roads to the facility from the nearest public road onto the site will be required. Internal site roads will also be required to access the solar panels for maintenance purposes. The solar panel plant will be fenced off from the surrounding farms. The site will need to be cleared of vegetation.

The following associated infrastructure will be required:

- Temporary container homes during the construction phase
- Office and technical service buildings
- Electricity distribution lines (from substation to Eskom power line)
- A perimeter high security fence
- Roads within the development footprint

The “no go” option (no development of the site) will also be considered.




Figure 2: The location and design of the proposed facility on either side of the N14. The town of Aggeneys is located to the west.

The location and design of the proposed facility takes into consideration the position of sensitive features on the landscape, including a drainage channel which crosses the area from north-east to south-west. For this reason, the facility is positioned in the south-eastern corner of the property (Figure 2).

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

This assessment includes:

- A site visit and desk top study to determine the pre-history and history of the property;
- The rating of significance of heritage resources on the property;
- An assessment of whether the development of the property will result in a loss of significant heritage resources;
- Recommendations for mitigation if necessary.

4. LEGISLATION

The National Heritage Resources Act, No 25 of 1999 (Section 38 (1)) makes provision for a compulsory notification of the intent to development when any development exceeding 5000 m² in extent, or any road or linear development exceeding 300m in length is proposed.

The NHRA provides protection for the following categories of heritage resources:

- Cultural landscapes (Section 3(3))
- Buildings and structures greater than 60 years of age(Section 34)
- Archaeological sites greater than 100 years of age(Section 35)
- Palaeontological sites and specimens
- Shipwrecks and aircraft wrecks
- Graves and grave yards (Section 36).

Only the Western Cape and Kwa-Zulu Natal have functioning Provincial Heritage Authorities, and consequently SAHRA administers heritage in the remaining provinces particularly where archaeology and palaeontology are the dominant concerns. Heritage Northern Cape (Ngwao Boswa Kapa Bokoni) deals largely with built environment issues at this stage. Amongst other things the latter administers:

- World Heritage Sites
- Provincial Heritage Sites
- Heritage Areas
- Register Sites
- 60 year old structures
- Public monuments & memorials

Archaeology, including rock art, graves of victims of conflict and other graves not in formal cemeteries are administered by the national heritage authority, SAHRA.

Digby Wells Environmental submitted a cultural resources pre-assessment report or Notice of Intent to Develop to SAHRA in January 2012.

SAHRA (SAHRA file number: 9/2/066/0047) have requested a palaeontological and archaeological impact assessment. Further, they have asked that the archaeological impact assessment should also assess whether the cumulative impact of the solar energy facilities proposed on the same property may compromise the cultural landscape and its archaeological significance.

5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The topography and landscape is described as fairly uniform. The area has an elevation of 880m above mean sea level and the landscape is north facing. It is flat and bordered on the north by steep hills, the outlying foothills of Aggeney's mountain range. The study area consists of red sandy soils and some rocky sections. There is one major drainage line running in a south-westerly direction from the north-eastern corner to the south-western corner. This drainage line spans up to about 50 metres wide. A smaller drainage line, which

is about 25 metres wide, flows in a south-south-westerly direction to meet up with the larger drainage line in the study area.



Plate 1: View across the flat grassy plains of the proposed facility with the mountains in the background.



Plate 2: View of the drainage channel which flows across the area. Large areas of the surface are covered in gravel consisting of quartz nodules. The stone artefacts occur in these gravels.



Plate 3: There are a few low rocky ridges in the northern portions of the property.

The drainage lines as well as 100m buffer zone adjoining the drainage lines are to be avoided. This results in a decrease in available surface area for infrastructure. Small trees (including kokerbome) occur along drainage lines and on rocky hillsides. The plains are dominated by low shrubs (generally less than 1 m in height) intermixed with grasses, succulents and geophytes.

In terms of human elements, there are farm fences and a small brick building as well as a wind pump. There are two existing transmission lines that divide the site in two. The site can be accessed directly from the N14 via the existing farm road. There is a two track service road that follows the transmission line.

6. BACKGROUND TO THE AREA

6.1 Palaeontology

The report on the palaeontology of the area was undertaken by Dr John Pether and is appended in full. In brief, the PIA report describes the bedrock of the area as comprising ancient basement rocks of the Bushmanland Terrance of the Namaqua Province. These are very old rocks and not of palaeontological interest. The overlying Quaternary sand cover is a combination of alluvium in the drainage lines and colluvium closer to the bedrock outcrops.

6.2 Archaeological Background

Information on the pre-colonial archaeology of the area is largely derived from a number of impact assessment reports which have been undertaken in the last few years. In general, Morris (2011c) notes that archaeological visibility is low around Aggeneys and Pofadder.

Beaumont *et al.* (1995) has described the widespread but low density stone artefact scatter of Early and Middle Stone Age material across areas of Bushmanland to the south of the study area. Systematic collections have been made at "Olyvenkolk, south-west of Kenhardt and at Maans Pannen to the east of Gamoep. The artefacts included a fresh component of Middle Stone Age (MSA) with prepared cores, blades and points, and a large aggregate of moderately to heavily weathered Earlier Stone Age (ESA)". This remark is contradicted by Morris's (2011a) later statement that "substantial MSA sites are uncommon in Bushmanland" (1995:241). Certainly, the CRM studies which have been conducted in the area around Kenhardt during the last two years have shown substantial distributions of Middle Stone Age material.

Less information is available on the Early and Middle Stone Age around Aggeneys and Pofadder. Morris's (2010) surveys of the northern slopes of the Gamsberg (2.5km east of the proposed facility) have identified five "significant locales" on the northern rim of the mountain. It includes an MSA factory site of high significance, two ESA (Acheulian) workshop site, a mixed ESA and MSA site and a small cave which did not appear to contain any deposit. Morris explains the presence of the MSA site in proximity to the Gamsberg as the need for access to suitable raw material. This is not easily accessible on the plains between Aggeneys Mountain and the Gamsberg.

Pelser (2011) in his survey of an area around the Paulputs substation near Pofadder describes finding material from the Middle and Later Stone Age, although his illustrations appear to be of LSA artefacts made on quartz. He also mentions the presence of ostrich eggshell. According to Morris (2011a) Later Stone Age (LSA) sites are the predominant archaeological trace noted in surveys in the Aggeneys-Pofadder region. Morris's (2010) surveys of the northern slopes of the Gamsberg identified very few isolated LSA flakes. To the north-west of the Gamsberg however, he found two stone cairns which could represent

graves, as well as a ceramic LSA site, comprising ostrich eggshell, pottery, stone tools made on quartz, glass and porcelain. These isolated LSA settlements occur on the plains, near little rocky outcrops, rather than on the slopes of the Gamsberg itself. Morris's site B3, to the north of the N14 linking Aggeneys to Pofadder, also consists of a ceramic LSA site with pottery, stone tools, ostrich eggshell and glass. In addition he reports on "boat-shaped grinding grooves in the outcropping bedrock". These sites probably represent transient settlement by transhumant hunter-gatherers or herders, moving through the area. Morris refers to Beaumont *et al.* (1995) who have written that "virtually all the Bushmanland sites [LSA] so far located appear to be ephemeral occupations by small groups in the hinterland on both sides of the [Orange] river" (1995:263). This was in sharp contrast to the substantial herder encampments along the Orange River floodplain itself.

In fieldwork conducted by Webley & Halkett (2011) for a new transmission line commencing at the Aggeneis substation, it was observed that LSA sites (consisting mainly of quartz flakes) were concentrated at the base of small koppies. This information is supported by Morris (2011a, b & c) and Pelsler (2011). "Surveys have located signs of human occupation mainly in the shelter of granite koppies, on red dunes which provided clean sand for sleeping, or around the seasonal pans (Beaumont *et al.* 1995).

Morris (2010) refers to an unpublished report by Janette Deacon of rock paintings on a boulder next to the Aggregate Quarry at Black Mountain Mine, Aggeneys. These are simple finger paintings including two "Star" motifs and an indented oval shaped image.

Finally, field work undertaken during the Scoping Phase (Digby & Wells Environmental 2012) describes quartz lithics scattered throughout the area. The authors report that the artefacts are mainly flakes with some formal scrapers noted. The authors briefly surveyed rock outcrops on the site for rock art, but no evidence of this was found.

5.2 Historical Background

Morris (2010) has summarised the colonial history of this frontier zone in his reports for the Aggeneys and Gamsberg areas. Early travel accounts show that "Place names were becoming fixed in this colonial frontier period (in a cadastral sense, on maps and in farm names), many such names having Khoe-San origins encapsulating vestiges of pre-colonial/indigenous social geography".

Morris (2010) comments that place names, such as Aggeneys/Aggeneis and Gams (Gamsberg) are derived from Nama names. He reviews the various interpretations for the name Aggeneys including the oral history which suggests that a massacre of Bushmen took place in a kloof at Aggeneys (Nienaber & Raper 1977:173). Other interpretations include the possibility that it means "place of red clay" or that it is associated with reeds. Morris (2010) also refers to the thesis by Burger (1986) which links the killing of the Bushmen with the Gamsberg rather than Aggeneys.

Nienaber and Raper cite a local farmer who similarly asserted that the origin of *Gams* or *Gaams* was in the word *Tha-aams*, where *Tha* means "grass" and *aams* means "mouth". The Nama */Gâ-ams* literally means "Grasmond" or "Grasfontein" (Nienaber & Raper 1977).

Morris (2010) comments that recently appreciation has started emerging regarding the "genocide against the Bushmen in this area, with certain mountainous areas (like Gamsberg near Aggeneys) being likely massacre sites". This has resulted in moves to include the Gamsberg in a potential /Xam and Khomani Heartland World Heritage Site. This is further discussed below.

According to the Surveyor General's records, the farm Aroams 57 was surveyed and granted in 1895. This suggests a relatively recent date for the settlement of the area. Morris (2011c) explains that the name is derived from the Nama \ddot{a} aro- meaning "wag-'n-bietjie" tree (*Ziziphus mucronatus*) and *am* or *am-s* meaning "mouth". The name could thus be translated as "Wag-'n-bietjebosfontein" (Nienaber & Raper 1977).

7. SURVEY METHODS

The property was visited by Lita Webley and David Halkett on the 16 April 2012. The survey was conducted by vehicle and on foot, and a Garmin GPS unit was used to record sites. No archaeological material was removed from the project area, but recorded and photographed *in situ*. Walk paths and site locations were recorded with GPS and finds were photographed and described. The assessment was primarily concerned with palaeontology and archaeology (as per the recommendations of SAHRA), but consideration was also given to the built environment where appropriate.

6.1 Limitations

We were able to access both sides of the N14. Although there are few roads across the property, the low shrub and the level topography meant that we could drive in the veld. Archaeological visibility was good.

- As with all archaeological surveys, it is not possible to be completely confident that all archaeological sites were identified during the fieldwork. Surface distributions give only a general indication of sub-surface remains. It is always possible that sub-surface archaeological sites may be present which were not identified during the survey;
- The only significant limitation is that we were not able to follow the route of the proposed new transmission line (Figure 2) as it crosses adjoining lands. These are not accessible because of locked gates. The transmission line crosses behind a koppie, and there may be Stone Age material on the lower slopes of the koppie. This is not considered to be a major limitation;
- Morris (2010) has also commented elsewhere in the area on the considerable "background noise" of massively preponderant small nodules of white quartz strewn over most the land surfaces. This may hamper the identification of artefacts, as local assemblages of are dominated by stone artefacts made from such nodules.

8. FINDINGS




Figure 3: Map of tracks and location of sites recorded in Table 1.

8.1 Pre-colonial Archaeology

We found a dense background scatter of quartz flakes across the south-western section of the property. The material is particularly prevalent in those areas where the soil surface is covered in quartz pebbles and cobbles. These quartz “floors” occur in patches between the knee high grasses and are easy to see (Plate 4). The concentrations of stone tools appear to be highest near the drainage channel (see Figure 3).



Plate 4: Stone artefact scatters are found in these open patches of soil between the vegetation cover.

The artefacts comprise predominantly quartz flakes, cores and chunks, although quartzite stone artefacts are also present. Some of the quartzite flakes were side-struck and most of the flakes are quite large. The size of the artefacts suggests that they are of Middle Stone Age date. There are no distinctive features of the artefacts to categorically classify them as MSA, but they certainly do not conform to LSA design or size. In general, the scatter of stone tools is very widely distributed and does not appear to be concentrated in any specific location. The identification of “sites” in Table 1 is not a reflection of a site with *in situ* artefact distribution related to prehistoric settlement. It is merely a centre point of a scatter of stone tools.



Plate 5 & 6: Site L03 quartz and quartzite flakes. The scale is in centimetres.



Plate 7: Site 002 (scale 14 cm); **Plate 8:** A small (Fauresmith?) handaxe from Site 003.

Site 003 included a small handaxe which may be attributed to the Fauresmith, a final phase of the Early Stone Age.

Site L06 consisted of a single quartz bladelet which was the only suggestion of a Later Stone Age presence on the site.

A small koppie to the north of the proposed facility (Figure 3) contained a higher concentration of stone artefacts, particularly in quartzite. The koppie is located near a small farm building, and there are fragments of glass in the area, suggesting that livestock may have been kraaled in the shelter of the koppie in the recent past.

Rocky outcrops to the north of the area were also examined for signs of engravings, but the rock was not of a suitable dolerite material for engravings. A slight overhang in one of the

rocky outcrops outside the study area was examined for signs of rock paintings, but none were found.

8.2 Built Environment

There is a small brick farm building located to the north of the proposed facility (Plate 9). It was constructed within the last few decades and has no heritage significance.

There is also evidence of some recent drilling in the area, including some stone cairns with glass and tin nearby (Plate 10). Although the cairns could indicate graves, they are more likely to relate to mining activities.



Plate 9: Small farm building near a rocky koppie outside the study area; **Plate 10:** Evidence for drilling in the study area.

8.3 Cultural Landscape

Morris (2010) comments in his “Cultural Heritage of the Gamsberg” that “a call has been made for massacre sites to be identified and declared as Provincial Heritage Sites”. This Morris points out would influence plans with respect to mining at Gamsberg. He also notes that sites such as the Gamsberg could ultimately form part of a /Xam and Khomani Heartland World Heritage Site, already on South Africa’s tentative list. However, it is likely that the main centre for the /Xam WHS will be further south-east, between Kenhardt and Carnarvon.

Gamsberg is about 2.5km directly east of the proposed facility (Figure 1) and the facility will therefore be clearly visible from the mountain, which forms a significant element of the cultural landscape of the area. It is likely that there will be a cumulative visual impact on the Gamsberg since several solar facilities are proposed for this particular area.

However, this Cultural Landscape has already been impacted by open cast mining at Black Mountain and mining shafts sunk into the northern rim of the Gamsberg. It could be argued that the landscape has already been significantly transformed by mining activities.

9. IMPACT IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT

The construction of the proposed facility may result in the physical disturbance and potential destruction of the context of surface and sub-surface material as a result of site clearance, the construction of lay down areas, the installation of solar PV panels during the construction phase and the construction of access roads.

With respect to Palaeontology, the PIA report indicates that the bedrock under the property is unfossiliferous and of no palaeontological significance. The potential for fossils in the Quaternary sand cover is very low.

The stone artefact scatters which we have recorded during our survey are considered to be of minor significance. They are probably not in original context, and not associated with other archaeological material, such as bone, which could provide valuable information on prehistoric lifeways. There do not appear to be “archaeological sites” with stone tools left in their original context. For this reason, we believe the impact of the proposed development on the archaeology of the area to be low.

Table 2: Summary of impacts to archaeological material

Nature of Impact: Impacts to archaeological material could involve destruction of material at solar panel footings, underground cabling, access roads, etc.		
	Pre- Mitigation	Post- Mitigation
Extent	Local	Local
Magnitude	On-site	On-site
Duration	Permanent	Permanent
Intensity	Negligible	Negligible
Probability	Definite	Definite
Significance	Low	Low
Mitigation: Although some archaeological material will be impacted, the impact is considered Low. Lack of site boundaries or associated organic remains or reduces scientific value greatly. In the <u>unlikely</u> event that unmarked graves are present and found during the construction phase, work at that location must be halted, the feature should be cordoned off and the heritage authority (SAHRA) notified. They are likely to suggest mitigation in the form of exhumation. No mitigation has been suggested.		
Cumulative Impacts: The cumulative impact of several such facilities will result in the potential destruction of large scatter of archaeological material.		
Operational Phase: n/a		
Decommissioning Phase: n/a		

* Once archaeological material is destroyed, it cannot be renewed or replaced.

There are no buildings or structures on that portion of the property identified for the development of the facility. The impacts to the Built Environment are considered to be negligible.

Table 3: Summary of impacts to Cultural Landscape

Nature of Impact: The proposed facility may have a negative visual impact on the cultural landscape and its archaeological significance		
	Pre- Mitigation	Post- Mitigation
Extent	Local	Local
Magnitude	Regional	Local
Duration	Long term	Long term
Intensity	Medium	Medium
Probability	Definite	Definite
Significance	Medium	Medium
Mitigation: A Visual Impact Assessment by a specialist which considers the proposed impact of the development on the Cultural Landscape, particularly the archaeological landscape.		
Cumulative Impacts: The cumulative impact of several such facilities will result in “industrialization” of the archaeological landscape.		
Operational Phase: n/a		
Decommissioning Phase: n/a		

10. MITIGATION AND ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

No Palaeontological mitigation will be required. The PIA report recommends that “an alert for the uncovering of fossil bone and implements be included in the construction EMP for the project”.

The lack of *in situ* archaeological surface sites or indications of stratified archaeological deposits means that the archaeological material on site has limited scientific value. We have photographed and recorded small collections of material across the solar plant site and believe that these are representative of the material as a whole. Further mitigation is unlikely to result in a greater understanding of the material and the various time periods, and as a result we do not believe further intervention from an archaeological point of view is necessary.

In the event that human remains are uncovered beneath the soil surface during the construction of the facility, work in that location should stop, and the heritage authorities (SAHRA) should be notified. They may recommend exhumation.

There are no issues relating to the Built Environment (e.g. buildings or structures older than 60 years which are protected by the NHRA). No mitigation is required.

SAHRA have requested that the assessment should whether the “cumulative impact of the solar energy facilities proposed on the same property may compromise the cultural landscape and its archaeological significance”. The most significant aspect of the archaeological landscape in the area is the Gamsberg, which is located 2.5km east of the proposed facility. Morris (2010) has discussed the importance of the Gamsberg as a potential “genocide site for the San” and the possibility (albeit unlikely) of its incorporation into a /Xam and Khomani Heartland World Heritage Site”. Morris (pers. com.) points to the impact of mining both at Aggeneys Mountain and at Gamsberg and the fact that the area has already been transformed by not only mining, but also by a substation and transmission lines.

Nevertheless, it is recommended that the Visual Impact Specialist consider the cumulative visual impact of several solar facilities in this area, on the archaeological landscape of the Gamsberg.

According to the NID application completed by Johan Nel of Digby Wells Environmental for SAHRA, at least two other applications for solar energy facilities are proposed on the same property and the cumulative impact of several facilities may be high.

The “no-go” alternative would mean that the status quo is retained and that the heritage resources of the area are maintained in their current condition.

11. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the following heritage indicators were considered:

Palaeontology:

- The bedrock under the property is unfossiliferous and of no palaeontological significance. The potential for fossils in the Quaternary sand cover is very low.

The Pre-colonial Archaeology:

- Stone artefacts scatters from the Middle Stone Age are sparsely distributed across the study area and are found on gravel pavements between the vegetation;

- The absence of associated archaeological material, and lack of discrete individual sites reduces the significance of the material overall;
- Further mitigation of sites is considered unnecessary in this case.

The Built Environment:

- There are no buildings of heritage significance on the site.

Graves:

- A few cairns were identified. They probably relate to drilling on site but could possibly be graves. Due care should be taken during construction of the site and if human remains are uncovered, work should stop in that area and SAHRA should be notified.

Cultural Landscape:

- The proposed solar plant is positioned on both sides of the N14 and is located 2.5km east of the Gamsberg. A number of solar facilities have been proposed for this area and the cumulative impact needs to be considered;
- The cultural landscape of the surrounding area has been significantly impacted by mining activities;
- However, in view of the discussion around recognising the Gamsberg as a “genocide site” it is recommended that the Visual Impact specialist consider the impact of the proposed development with respect to the mountain.

The potential impacts resulting from the installation of a solar power plant on the heritage resources of the sites are considered to be of minor significance, and no mitigation is recommended. However, the potential cumulative impact of a number of such facilities on the nearby archaeological significance of the Gamsberg should be examined by the Visual Impact specialist.

12. REFERENCES

Beaumont, P.B., Smith A.B. and Vogel J.C. 1995. Before the Einiqua: The archaeology of the frontier zone. In Smith A.B. ed. Einiqualand: Studies of the Orange River frontier. UCT Press: 236-264.

Burger, C.R. 1986. 'N ondersoek na die oorsprong en betekenis van plek- en plaasname in die Landdrostdistrik Namakwaland. Unpublished MA thesis: University of Stellenbosch.

Digby Wells Environmental. January 2012. Draft Scoping Report. Proposed development of five solar photovoltaic power plants in the Northern Cape and Western Cape Provinces. Unpublished report for Orlight SA (Pty) Ltd.

Morris, D. 2010. Cultural Heritage Assessment: Gamsberg. Supplementary observations to a previous specialist report on archaeological resources. Unpublished report.

Morris, D. 2011a. A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Aggeneis – Paulputs 220kV transmission line. Unpublished report for SSI Engineers and Environmental Consultants.

Morris, D. 2011b. SATO Energy Holdings: Zuurwater Photovoltaic Energy Generation Facility development near Aggeneys, Northern Cape. Unpublished report for SATO Energy Holdings.

Morris, D. 2011c. Black Mountain Concentrated Solar Power Facility development at Aggeneys, Northern Cape. Unpublished report for Aurora Power Solutions (Pty) Ltd.

Nienaber, G.S., & Raper, P.E. 1977. *Toponymica Hottentotica*. SA Naamkundesentrum RGN Naamkudesreeks 6.

Pelser, A.J. 2011. A Report on an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) for the proposed solar energy plant on Konkoonsies 91, Pofadder District, Northern Cape. Unpublished report for Robert de Jong & Associates.

Webley, L. & Halkett, D. 2011. Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed Aggeneis – Oranjemond 400kV line and substations upgrade, Northern Cape Province. Unpublished report for Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd.

SAHRA 2009. Archaeology, Palaeontology & Meteorite Unit. Report Mapping Project. Version 1.0

Appendix 1: Location of archaeological sites.

Site Name	GPS Co-ordinates	Description	Significance	Mitigation
L01	S29.24015100 E18.88197200	Quartz flakes in an open area between grasses	Low	No
L02	S29.23894600 E18.88050100	Quartz flakes	Low	No
L03	S29.23818300 E18.88215000	Quartz flakes	Low	No
L04	S29.23771400 E18.88386000	Black quartz core	Low	No
L05	S18.88386000 E18.88331100	Two side struck flakes out of a dark quartz	Low	No
L06	S29.23743100 E18.88194500	One quartz bladelet on clear quartz, not retouched. Possibly LSA	Low	No
L07	S18.88194500 E18.88295700	One large quartzite flake near koppie	Low	No
L08	S29.23625600 E18.88435500	One quartzite flake, possibly MSA	Low	No
L09	S29.23496400 E18.88469600	Single quartz flake on plains	Low	No
L010	S29.23460300 E18.88437100	Two quartz flakes and 3 quartz cores near the koppie	Low	No
L011	S29.23524000 E18.88521400	On other side of N14 in plains, 5 quartz flakes.	Low	No
001	S29.24015100 E18.88197200	old borehole w cement cap (BH-AMS-1)	Low	No
002	S29.23894600 E18.88050100	widely dispersed stone artefact scatter including cores and flakes on fine quartzite and quartz on a generally gravel strewn pavement - msa	Low	No
003	S29.23818300 E18.88215000	isolated core/biface (Fauresmith?)	Low	No
004	S29.23771400 E18.88386000	widely dispersed stone artefact scatter including cores and flakes on fine quartzite and quartz on a generally gravel strewn pavement - msa?	Low	No
005	S29.23724400 E18.88331100	more concentrated scatter of stone flakes on gravel pavement,	Low	No

		quartzite and quartz - msa		
006	S29.23743100 E18.88194500	isolated large quartzite core - msa	Low	No
007	S29.23664700 E18.88295700	general artefact scatter - msa	Low	No
008	S29.23625600 E18.88435500	general artefact scatter - msa	Low	No
009	S29.23496400 E18.88469600	general artefact scatter - msa	Low	No
010	S29.23460300 E 18.88437100	general artefact scatter - msa	Low	No
011	S29.23524000 E18.88521400	general artefact scatter - msa	Low	No
012	S29.22190200 E18.90572800	small overhang below boulders on edge of a koppie just outside solar area. Ephemeral stone age artefact "scatter" (lsa/msa?). Also tins, and metal frags, bottle glass. Sandy floor but no real deposit	Low	No
013	S29.22878100 E18.90623200	isolated artefact - flake	Low	No
014	S29.23922900 E18.88809200	isolated artefact - flake	Low	No
015	S29.24372100 E18.90065900	isolated artefact - flake	Low	No
016	S29.24396000 E18.90038400	isolated artefacts including a core at a residual dry pan - msa	Low	No
017	S29.24027900 E18.89987000	Heap of rocks with bully beef can nearby. Probably an old prospecting drill hole.	Low	No

Appendix A: Palaeontological Impact Assessment

Appendix B: Visual Impact Assessment