

CONSULTATION REPORT: BRANDEWYNKOP CONSERVATIO MANAGEMENT PLAN, EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE

Report for:

Gibson Bay Wind Farm (RF) (Pty) Ltd
102 Rivonia Road, Tower 2, 5th Floor, Sandton, 2196
Tel: 010 344 0200
Email: pamela.mabecephiwa@enel.com



Dr Jayson Orton
ASHA Consulting (Pty) Ltd
40 Brassie Street, Lakeside, 7945
Tel: (021) 788 1025 | 083 272 3225
Email: jayson@asha-consulting.co.za

28 September 2020

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. RESPONSES	1
2.1. Newspaper advertising and site notices.....	1
2.2. Email to academic I&APs	2
2.3. Further correspondence	3
2.3.1. Caryl Logie	3
2.3.2. Alex Mackay	4
2.3.3. Matt Lotter	4
3. CONCLUSION	6

1. INTRODUCTION

This describes the responses received during the formal consultation process for the Brandewynkop Conservation Management Plan (CMP). The process is described in Section 3.4.2 of the CMP report.

2. RESPONSES

2.1. Newspaper advertising and site notices

Two responses were received (Table 1) and screenshots of the emails are reproduced below.

Table 1: Responses to the newspaper and site advertisements.

Name	Organisation	Date	Interest
Wentzel Coetzer	Conservation Outcomes & Greater Kromme Stewardship	20 July 2020	Requested registration as an I&AP
Caryl Logie	---	05 August 2020	Requested registration as an I&AP. Interested in vegetation protection with specific reference to certain Vulnerable and Critically Endangered orchids.

Public Participation Process: Draft Conservation Management Plan for the protection of Heritage R...



From [Wentzel Coetzer](#)
to jayson@asha-consulting.co.za

Mon 2020/07/20 10:44



Dear Dr Jayson Orton,

I would like to register as an Interested and Affected Party in the above matter.

Kind regards,

Wentzel Coetzer

Biodiversity Stewardship Facilitator

Conservation Outcomes

Cell: +27 72 534 5914

Email: wentzel@conservation-outcomes.org

Website: www.conservation-outcomes.org

GKS Website: www.gksinitiative.co.za

GKS Facebook: www.facebook.com/GreaterKromme



CONSERVATION
OUTCOMES



Gibson Bay Wind Farm



From Bartle Logie
to jayson@asha-consulting.co.za

Wed 2020/08/05 20:48

⚠ Download pictures or always download pictures from this sender. To preserve privacy, external content was not downloaded.

Dear Dr Orton

I would like to register as an I&AP for the above windfarm . I am particularly interested in the protection of vegetation on Brandewynkop in order to save certain Vulnerable and Critically Endangered Orchids.

Kind regards

Caryl Logie.

Virus-free. www.avast.com

2.2. Email to academic I&APs

Two responses were received (Table 2) and screenshots of the emails are reproduced below.

Table 2: Responses to the email to academic I&APs.

Name	Organisation	Date	Interest
Alex Mackay	University of Wollongong	28 August 2020	Asked about potential preservation of faunal material in buried archaeological deposits.
Matt Lotter	University of Johannesburg	02 September 2020	Asked questions about the report, the process and the archaeology of the area.

RE: Brandewynkop CMP for comment



From Alexander Mackay
to Jayson

Fri 2020/08/28 03:43

📧 You replied to this message on Friday, 28 August 2020 08:54:30.

Thanks for sharing, Jayson. Very interesting area. What are the prospects for fauna in the still-buried horizons? Didn't seem all that great, but the area might be worth further work anyway given the questions it raises about landscape use and technological behaviour.


Re: Brandewynkop CMP for comment



From Matt Lotter
to Jayson

Wed 2020/09/02 15:24
 

 You replied to this message on Sunday, 06 September 2020 12:43:20.

 Screenshot 2020-09-02 at 12.59.00.png (3,7 MB)

Hi Jayson,

I hope you have been keeping well. Apologies for my delayed response with this, I have just been wading through a pile of other things. Thank you though for adding me as a stakeholder. On another matter, any more news on what came of that proposed mining application at Canteen Kopje?

Thanks for supplying the Brandewynkop CMP. This is a thorough report and it is great to see that the GBWF is getting involved to help manage this area even though it is beyond their immediate development interests.

I have a few comments and questions here and there to add, but please bear with me as I only skimmed through the supporting appendices so some of these things may have been dealt with there...

- 1) Given the location of the nearby Klipdrift Dam, were there any heritage sites identified in this area prior to the dam development?
- 2) Just beyond the CMP area and adjacent to the no-go area, in the west, there is some farmland that appears to have been developed between March and June 2017 (based off of Google Earth images, see my attached screenshot). Out of curiosity, were any reports completed here (prior to that bush clearing) that confirm the archaeology 'drops off' as one moves away from this dune area? I see there were some heritage finds based on your survey through this area (following the road). Points 1635-1644.
- 3) Other than the GKC stating their interests in having the area managed and conserved, did they provide any detailed documentation of their ties to the land (i.e., did they detail aspects of their intangible heritage for the area)?
- 4) For ease of understanding, it may be worthwhile to show the current GBWF delineation boundary to show its location (presumably to the southwest) in relation to the CMP area and the no-go areas, for Figures 1 and 2.
- 5) Given the proximity of the Klipdrift Dam, would consultation with a member of the local water board (or dam development authority) have been needed? Perhaps they could have shed some light on the archaeology nearby as noted during the dam development, but probably not!
- 6) Were any formal meetings held with the GKC, or was all correspondence via their comments (over email) for the CMP report drafts?
- 7) Has anyone expressed interest yet in conducting research in the area (e.g., Alex or Sarah)?
- 8) Regarding Section 7.2, should the alien vegetation not just be left? I only suggest this because it is helping to stabilise the current landscape, and especially the (potential) subsurface archaeology. Removing it would presumably expose the entire landscape and would only promote further deflation and erosion. What is the overall goal with removing the vegetation, to restore the natural landscape?
- 9) Figures A4.4-4.6 do look to be ESA-like, and A4.5 looks to be cleaver-like. Although Earlier Stone Age material seems less common in the nearby area, it does seem to be around based on these pieces, even if just sporadically (but you do mention this in the appendix).

This whole landscape seems really interesting!

Thanks,
Matt

2.3. Further correspondence

2.3.1. Caryl Logie

I&AP requested assistance with understanding the location of the CMP area. On receiving same, I&AP noted that the orchids of interest occurred further to the south and should not be of further concern to the CMP.

2.3.2. Alex Mackay

I&AP was informed that with only one bone seen, good preservation of faunal remains was unlikely.

2.3.3. Matt Lotter

Several emails were exchanged with this I&AP with the text of these reproduced in collated form. First correspondence from the I&AP is in black text. The responses are in blue. Follow-up comments from the I&AP are in red and final responses are in green.

1) Given the location of the nearby Klipdrift Dam, were there any heritage sites identified in this area prior to the dam development?

The dam dates to between 1971 and 1994 from the aerial photos. It was likely built before anyone was interested.

I thought that this may be the case.

2) Just beyond the CMP area and adjacent to the no-go area, in the west, there is some farmland that appears to have been developed between March and June 2017 (based off of Google Earth images, see my attached screenshot). Out of curiosity, were any reports completed here (prior to that bush clearing) that confirm the archaeology 'drops off' as one moves away from this dune area? I see there were some heritage finds based on your survey through this area (following the road). Points 1635-1644.

This was just alien vegetation clearing. Technically would require an HIA but no chance that a farmer would do this...

Fair enough.

3) Other than the GKC stating their interests in having the area managed and conserved, did they provide any detailed documentation of their ties to the land (i.e., did they detail aspects of their intangible heritage for the area)?

Only that they recognise all archaeology there as being related to their ancestors in the greater scheme of things and they see this as important.

Fair enough. How involved are they at sites like Klasies then, and/or Pinnacle Point? Or, are their interests much more local?

I am not aware of any wider interest, but only because I have not looked into it.

4) For ease of understanding, it may be worthwhile to show the current GBWF delineation boundary to show its location (presumably to the southwest) in relation to the CMP area and the no-go areas, for Figures 1 and 2.

There isn't really a boundary of the wind farm - it is just its roads and turbines and associated infrastructure. Everything else in between is farm land. I do think, though, that the caption on Figure 2 could say that the wind farm is visible as gravel roads to the SW.

Yes this minor caption change would be perfect. Thanks. It will just help the reader situate the relevant development/heritage sensitive areas.

5) Given the proximity of the Klipdrift Dam, would consultation with a member of the local water board (or dam development authority) have been needed? Perhaps they could have shed some light on the archaeology nearby as noted during the dam development, but probably not!

I do not know the status of this dam, whether it is municipal or for farming... But see answer to 1 - I don't think anyone would know. Easiest would be to go there when the dam is empty and look at the substrate.

Either way though, I guess what is most important is that archaeology has been found within the relevant delineation.

6) Were any formal meetings held with the GKC, or was all correspondence via their comments (over email) for the CMP report drafts?

There was a formal meeting on 17.03.2019 (see section 3.4.1), but no members of the GKC attended- only their representative Kobus Reichert.

Thanks for clarifying this.

7) Has anyone expressed interest yet in conducting research in the area (e.g., Alex or Sarah)?

No.

Matt Caruana and I will have a chat about this. From your end having been on the landscape, do you think there could be some decent preservation within some of the palaeosols (although overall the organic preservation would be nothing like at the coastal MSA sites)?

I suspect that bone will be all but absent. Who knows how many deflation/reburial cycles have happened. I am not even sure there will be in situ material but you never know, maybe ESA lower down?

8) Regarding Section 7.2, should the alien vegetation not just be left? I only suggest this because it is helping to stabilise the current landscape, and especially the (potential) subsurface archaeology. Removing it would presumably expose the entire landscape and would only promote further deflation and erosion. What is the overall goal with removing the vegetation, to restore the natural landscape?

Yes, that was the primary intention. Of course one has to think beyond just the archaeology. It is a whole cultural landscape and the alien vegetation does not belong in that landscape. The dune field would have been a fully mobile aeolian system until it was choked by all the alien vegetation.

It seems like this vegetation removal would then require constant maintenance in the future, which would form part of the management plan. Is there any intention though to clear the whole dune system running west towards the coast? I wonder if this could then be developed into a larger nature reserve area?

Not that I know of. I am not sure anyone would clear the dune area if it were not for the CMP.

9) Figures A4.4-4.6 do look to be ESA-like, and A4.5 looks to be cleaver-like. Although Earlier Stone Age material seems less common in the nearby area, it does seem to be around based on these pieces, even if just sporadically (but you do mention this in the appendix). Yes, I specifically highlighted these ones as possible (but perhaps unlikely) ESA artefacts. They stand out because I highlighted them with photos in order to demonstrate the range of variation but it must be remembered that there were thousands of other artefacts with just these few being possible ESA. They are also on the small end of the scale for ESA artefacts (but probably *just* within the limits).

Yes they do look quite small. It is interesting how there are the massive ESA accumulations at Geelhoutboom and then minimal evidence here, in a very similar landscape/palaeoenvironmental setting. A larger landscape study here could be really really cool!

3. CONCLUSION

Only very minimal updates to the CMP have been made owing to responses received during the consultation process. As such, the CMP is deemed by the authors to be acceptable and has now been uploaded to SAHRIS for formal ratification.