

Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment of a proposed
new agricultural development on Kakamas South
Settlement No. 2094, Augrabies, NC Province.



Report prepared by
Paleo Field Services
PO Box 38806
Langenhovenpark
9330

August 2022

SUMMARY

A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment was carried out over a 19.7 ha area designated for new agricultural development on Kakamas South Settlement No. 2094, which is situated in the Kai! Garib Local Municipality near Augrabies in the Northern Cape Province. The study area lies on undulating terrain, about 12 km northwest of Kakamas, along the R64 (R369) provincial road on the way to Augrabies. The proposed footprint is underlain by metasedimentary rocks (Riemvasmaak Gneiss) that are capped by a thin veneer of bedrock – derived, gritty to gravelly top soils on the high ground, with sandy pediments and sandy dry stream beds predominating low-lying drainage lines to the south. An isolated piece of a polished grindstone (on basalt) was recorded, but there is no evidence of *in situ* Stone Age archaeological material, either as capped assemblages or distributed as *intact* surface scatters on the landscape within the boundaries of the proposed development footprint. A very low density (< 1 / 200 m) stone tool component included an assortment of debitage and crude flakes on crystalline quartz. There are no indications of rock art (fineline, scraped or pecked engravings), stonewalled structures or historically significant buildings older than 60 years, or aboveground evidence of graves or cairns within the boundary of the proposed footprint. The proposed development footprint is underlain by palaeontologically insignificant metamorphic rocks and geologically recent superficial sediments. The proposed development footprint and associated access road are not considered palaeontologically or archaeologically vulnerable and is assigned a site rating of Generally Protected C. It is advised that the proposed project can proceed with no further palaeontological or archaeological assessments required.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	2
Introduction	4
Locality data	5
Background	6
Field Assessment.....	7
Impact Statement and Recommendation	7
References	7
Tables and Figures	9
Appendix 1: Track Log.....	20

INTRODUCTION

A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment was carried out over a 19.7 ha area designated for new agricultural development on Kakamas South Settlement No. 2094, which is situated in the Kai! Garib Local Municipality near Augrabies in the Northern Cape Province (**Fig. 1**). The region's unique and non-renewable archaeological and palaeontological heritage sites are 'Generally' protected in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999, section 35) and may not be disturbed at all without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority. As many such heritage sites are threatened daily by development, both the environmental and heritage legislation require impact assessment reports that identify all heritage resources including archaeological and palaeontological sites in the area to be developed, and that make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact of the sites.

The primary legal trigger for identifying when heritage specialist involvement is required in the Environmental Impact Assessment process is the National Heritage Resources (NHR) Act (Act No 25 of 1999). The NHR Act requires that all heritage resources, that is, all places or objects of aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance are protected. Thus any assessment should make provision for the protection of all these heritage components, including archaeology, battlefields, graves, and structures over 60 years of age, living heritage and the collection of oral histories, historical settlements, landscapes, geological sites, palaeontological sites and objects.

The Act identifies what is defined as a heritage resource, the criteria for establishing its significance and lists specific activities for which a heritage specialist study may be required. In this regard, categories of development listed in Section 38 (1) of the NHR Act are:

- The construction of a road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;
- The construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length;
- Any development or other activity which will change the character of the site;
- Exceeding 5000 m² in extent;
- Involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof;
- Involving three or more subdivisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years;
- Costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).
- The rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m².

- Any other category of development provided for in regulations by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).

The involvement of the heritage specialist in such a process is usually necessary when a proposed development may affect a heritage resource, whether it is formally protected or unprotected, known or unknown. In many cases, the nature and degree of heritage significance is largely unknown pending further investigation (e.g. capped sites, assemblages or subsurface fossil remains). It is also possible that a site may contain heritage resources (e.g. structures older than 60 years), with little or no conservation value. In most cases it will be necessary to engage the professional opinion of a heritage specialist in determining whether or not further heritage specialist input in an EIA process is required. This may involve site-significance classification standards as prescribed by SAHRA (2005).

Methodology

The significance of the affected area was evaluated using existing field data, database information and published literature. This was followed by a field assessment (site visit) of the affected areas. A Garmin Etrex Vista GPS hand model (set to the WGS 84 map datum) and a digital camera were used for recording purposes. Relevant archaeological and palaeontological information, maps, Google Earth images and site records were integrated with data acquired during the on-site inspection.

Terms of reference:

- Identify and map possible heritage sites and occurrences using available resources.
- Determine and assess the potential impacts of the proposed development on potential heritage resources;
- Recommend mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts associated with the proposed development.

Archaeological rating of the footprints followed SAHRA-prescribed field rating categories listed in **Table 1**.

LOCALITY DATA

1 : 50 000 scale topographic map

1 : 250 000 scale geological map

The study area is located on undulating terrain, about 12 km northwest of Kakamas, along the R64 (R369) provincial road on the way to Augrabies (**Fig. 2 & 3**).

General site coordinates of the proposed development footprint (see **Fig. 2**):

- A) 28°41'21.94"S 20°26'55.53"E
- B) 28°41'24.73"S 20°27'0.77"E
- C) 28°41'42.20"S 20°26'49.21"E
- D) 28°41'43.18"S 20°26'50.32"E
- E) 28°41'54.56"S 20°26'41.83"E
- F) 28°41'50.78"S 20°26'34.64"E

BACKGROUND

Palaeontology

Potential palaeontological occurrences: Late Neogene vertebrate fossils associated with intact (Orange River) river terrace gravels; Quaternary vertebrate fossils associated with well-developed Pleistocene alluvial deposits.

The study area is underlain by gneiss (Riemvasmaak Gneiss) of the tectono-stratigraphic Namaqua–Natal Province (**Fig. 4**). With an approximate age of ~ 1500 - 1000 Ma, these metamorphic rocks consists almost exclusively of a pink-weathering granite gneiss (Cornell et al. 2006, **Fig. 6**).

Archaeology

Potential archaeological occurrences: Intact Stone Age open sites; rock shelters, burial cairns (graves placed underneath raised, man-made stones piles), unmarked graves, kraals & historically significant stone – built structures

The Middle Orange River and Bushmanland regions have been populated more or less continuously during prehistoric times (Beaumont *et al.* 1995). According to Beaumont (1986) archaeological visibility in the region was high during the Last Glacial Maximum, a viewpoint that is in contrast to that indicated for southern Africa as a whole (Deacon and Thackeray 1984). Early Stone Age artefacts have been recorded *in situ* at Kalkgaten on the farm Ratel Draai, while Middle Stone Age and Later Stone Age sequences have been recorded from a number of cave sites on the farms Zoovorbij, Droëgrond and Waterval in the Upington district (Beaumont et al. 1995) (**Fig. 7**). Archaeological and historical evidence also show that the region was extensively occupied by Khoi herders and San hunter-gatherers during the last 2000 years (Smith 1995). The principal Khoikhoi inhabitants of the Middle Orange River were the Einiqua who belonged to the same language group as the Namaqua and Korana, namely the Orange River Khoikhoi (Penn 2005). The Einiqua occupied the area around and east of the Augrabies Falls while the Korana occupied the Middle-Upper Orange River further to the east (Burchell 1822; Penn 2005). A large number of burial cairns were recorded on the Orange River in the Kakamas area on the farms Renosterkop, Rooipad and Augrabies Town and appear to be related to Khoekhoen people, specifically the

Einiqua, and historical data shows that a large number of the graves date to the 18th and early 19th centuries (Dreyer & Meiring 1937; Morris 1992, 1995) (**Fig. 7**).

FIELD ASSESSMENT

The proposed footprint lies on undulating terrain where metasedimentary rocks are capped by a thin veneer of bedrock – derived, gritty to gravelly top soils on the high ground, with sandy pediments and sandy dry stream beds predominating low-lying drainage lines to the south (**Fig. 8**). An isolated piece of a polished grindstone (on basalt) was recorded (**Fig. 9**), but there is no evidence of *in situ* Stone Age archaeological material, either as capped assemblages or distributed as *intact* surface scatters on the landscape within the boundaries of the proposed development footprint. A very low density (< 1 / 200 m) stone tool component included an assortment of debitage and crude flakes on crystalline quartz (**Fig. 10**). There are no indications of rock art (fineline, scraped or pecked engravings), stonewalled structures or historically significant buildings older than 60 years, or aboveground evidence of graves or cairns within the boundary of the proposed footprint.

IMPACT STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATION

The proposed development footprint is underlain by palaeontologically insignificant metamorphic rocks and geologically recent superficial sediments (Kalahari Group sand & sandy soils). The field assessment provided no aboveground evidence of prehistoric structures, buildings older than 60 years, or material of cultural significance or *in situ* archaeological sites within the study area. Given the nature of the underlying geology, potential impact on rock engraving sites within the study area is considered unlikely. The proposed development footprint and associated access road are not considered palaeontologically or archaeologically vulnerable and is assigned a site rating of Generally Protected C (**Table 1**). It is advised that the proposed project can proceed with no further palaeontological or archaeological assessments required.

REFERENCES

- Beaumont P.B. 1986. Where did all the young men go during 0-18 Stage 2? *Palaeoecology of Africa and the surrounding islands* 17: 79 – 88.
- Beaumont, P.B., Smith, A.B. & 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*. pp. 236-264. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Cornell, D.H., et al., 2006. The Namaqua-Natal Province. . In: Johnson, M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. and Thomas, R.J., (Eds). *The Geology of South Africa*. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg / Council for Geoscience, Pretoria. Pp 325-379.

Deacon, H.J. and Thackeray, J.F 1984. *Late Quaternary environmental changes and implications from the archaeological record in southern Africa*. In: J.C. Vogel (ed). *Late Cainozoic Palaeoclimates of the Southern Hemisphere* Balkema, Rotterdam. pp. 375 – 390.

Morris, A.G. 1995. The Einiqua: an analysis of the Kakemas skeletons. In: In: Smith, A.B. (ed.) *Einiqualand: studies of the Orange River frontier*. pp. 110 - 164. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Penn, N. 2005. *The Forgotten Frontier: Colonist and Khoisan on the Cape's Northern Frontier in the 18th Century*. Ohio University Press.

SAHRA, 2005. *Minimum Standards for the Archaeological and the Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment Reports*.

Smith, A. 1995. *Archaeological observations along the Orange River and its hinterland* In: Smith, A.B. (ed.) *Einiqualand: studies of the Orange River frontier*. pp. 265 - 300. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Smith, A. & Metelerkamp, W. 1995. *Ecology and Resources of the Middle and Lower Orange River and Hinterland* In: Smith, A.B. (ed.) *Einiqualand: studies of the Orange River frontier*. pp. 265 - 300. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Paleo Field Services act as an independent specialist consultant and do not have any financial interest in the undertaking of the activity other than remuneration for work as stipulated in the terms of reference. Paleo Field Services has no interest in secondary or downstream developments as a result of the authorization of this project.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Field rating categories as prescribed by SAHRA.

Field Rating	Grade	Significance	Mitigation
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1	-	Conservation; national site nomination
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2	-	Conservation; provincial site nomination
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3A	High significance	Conservation; mitigation not advised
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3B	High significance	Mitigation (part of site should be retained)
Generally Protected A (GP.A)	-	High/medium significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GP.B)	-	Medium significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GP.C)	-	Low significance	Destruction




Figure 1. Map of the study area marked on portion of 1:50 000 scale topographic map 2820CB Augrabies.



Figure 2. Aerial view and layout of the proposed development.



Figure 3. General view of site: from left to right, looking south, west & north,





Figure 4. Portion of 1:250 000 scale geological map 2820 Upington. The study area is underlain by granite gneiss (*Mrm*) of the Namaqua–Natal geological Province.




Figure 5. Study area marked on SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map (Sahrís 2022)



Figure 6. Granular textured, foliated gneiss outcrop.
Scale 1 = 10 cm





Figure 7. Location of known MSA, LSA & pastoralist sites (triangles) and burial sites (blue circles) in relation to position of study area (green star, above). Maps after Smith & Metelerkamp (1995) and Smith (1995).



Figure 8. The terrain is capped by a thin veneer of bedrock – derived, gritty to gravelly top soils on the high ground, with sandy pediments and sandy dry stream beds predominating low-lying drainage lines to the south.



Figure 9. Broken grindstone (above) and modern farm-related features recorded on site (below left & right).



Figure 10. Crude flake on crystalline quartz, proximal and ventral aspect (above & below respectively), showing characteristic morphological features.

APPENDIX 1: TRACK LOG

Index	Position
1	S28 41.450 E20 26.985
2	S28 41.579 E20 26.915
3	S28 41.644 E20 26.828
4	S28 41.725 E20 26.773
5	S28 41.819 E20 26.712
6	S28 41.922 E20 26.628
7	S28 41.854 E20 26.521
8	S28 41.822 E20 26.628
9	S28 41.760 E20 26.602
10	S28 41.693 E20 26.651
11	S28 41.714 E20 26.675
12	S28 41.779 E20 26.675
13	S28 41.668 E20 26.738
14	S28 41.558 E20 26.779
15	S28 41.585 E20 26.814
16	S28 41.512 E20 26.872
17	S28 41.488 E20 26.828
18	S28 41.437 E20 26.889
19	S28 41.534 E20 27.016

