

# McGregor Museum

## Department of Archaeology



# Heritage Impact Assessment for proposed drilling site at Middel Dam 112, west of Kimberley, Northern Cape

David Morris  
March 2021

# **Heritage Impact Assessment for proposed drilling site at Middel Dam 112, west of Kimberley, Northern Cape.**

David Morris, McGregor Museum, Kimberley  
P.O. Box 316 Kimberley 8300  
Tel 082 2224777 email [dmorriskby@gmail.com](mailto:dmorriskby@gmail.com)  
March 2021

## **Executive Summary**

A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment is presented.

Precise co-ordinates for one proposed drilling site was presented and De Beers Exploration personnel took the author directly to the specific sites in question. This report describes the archaeological/heritage traces that were observed at the surface.

It is possible, though not likely, that archaeological material of significance may occur subsurface. If encountered this should be brought to the attention of heritage authorities for further assessment, and mitigation if necessary.

In terms of this report, no significant heritage traces were found at the particular locale of proposed drilling, nor in the immediate vicinity, that are considered to require further mitigation.

The loss of heritage resources is assessed to be of **low** significance with and without the implementation of mitigation.

## **Background**

The McGregor Museum Archaeology Department was appointed by The De Beers Group of Companies: Exploration Office – DBGS in order to conduct a Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment at a proposed drilling site at Middel Dam 112, west of Kimberley, Northern Cape. This report addresses the possible impacts on heritage resources (archaeological and cultural) of this operation. It excludes palaeontological assessment.

The site was inspected on 3 February 2021 and relevant observations are indicated in this report.

Fieldnotes and photographs are lodged with the McGregor Museum, Kimberley.

## **Specialist**

The author is a professional archaeologist (PhD) accredited as a Principal Investigator by the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists. He has worked as a museum archaeologist and has carried out specialist research and surveys in the Northern Cape since 1985.

The author is independent of the organization commissioning this specialist input, and provides this heritage assessment (archaeology and colonial history but not palaeontology) within the framework of the National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999).

The National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999 (NHRA) protects heritage resources which include archaeological and palaeontological objects/sites older than 100 years, graves older than 60 years, structures older than 60 years, as well as intangible values attached to places. The Act requires that anyone intending to disturb, destroy or damage such sites/places, objects and/or structures may not do so without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority.

Heritage is assessed in terms of a NEMA application, and must comply with section 38(3) of the NHRA. SAHRA would then comment and make recommendations on the potential impacts.

(Where archaeological sites and palaeontological remains are concerned, the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) at national level acts on an agency basis for the Provincial Heritage Resources Agency (PHRA) in the Northern Cape. The Northern Cape Heritage Resources Authority (formerly called Ngwao Bošwa ya Kapa Bokone) is responsible for the built environment and other colonial era heritage and contemporary cultural values).

## **Description of environment and potential impacts**

The environment in question consists of essentially flat terrain about 27 km west of Kimberley and not far from the archaeological sites of Roodam and Doornlaagte (Fig. 2).

A subsurface anomaly, potentially an underlying kimberlite body, is mantled by unconsolidated sediment including calcrete nodules, supporting thornveld, with locally dispersed trees and karroid scrub where topsoil is shallow. At the time of the site visit, following months of exceptional rain in the 2020-21 rainy season, the grass was unusually high. The superficial unconsolidated sediment may mask underlying

archaeological material, as occurs at other sites in the region (e.g. Beaumont & Morris 1990).



Figure 1. Landscape and vegetation, following exceptional rains, at the Middel Dam 112 drill site.

The proposed drilling locality at 28°45'22.27"S 24°29'3.65"E is indicated in the following maps.




Figure 2. Location of site (white square labelled 1) west of Kimberley. The significant excavated Earlier Stone Age sites of Roodam 1 & 2 and Doornlaagte are indicated.




Figure 3. Portion of 1:50 000 sheet 2824CD showing Middel Dam 112 and the location of the drill site.





Figure 4. Google Earth image showing location of drill site (white square).

In terms of heritage features of the region, the following introductory comments may be made:


#### *Previous studies*

SAHRIS provides no pertinent records for the immediate vicinity. One case (6820) refers to the proposed Middel Dam 112 prospecting by De Beers as envisaged in the present report, and no heritage reports were as yet undertaken.

#### *Recent history*

A diagram at the Chief Surveyor General's office (Fig. 5) shows that the property was known as Middel Dam (Geyer's Portion) having been acquired by one Willem P Geyer as a Land Grant (GWLG 15-27) on 2 October 1878.

F Dg. N<sup>o</sup> B.3127-1878.  
 The numerical data are sufficiently consistent.  
 (Sgd.) Alex C. Bailie  
 Examiner.



The above diagram a,b,c,d, represents 889 morgen 494 sqroods of land called Middel Dam, (Geyer's Portion) situate in the Division of Kimberley, Griqualand West.

Bounded as indicated above.

Surveyed by me,  
 (Sgd) H. Van Renen.  
 Govt Surveyor.

Sheet. GN-B.

Copied from the diagram attached to  
Land Grant Title Deed dated the  
4-10-1878 in favour of  
Willelm P. Geyer  
 No. G.M.L. 6.15-27  
 28 OCT 1945 C. S. Karanick  
 for SURVEYOR-GENERAL

F

B/3127/1878.

Figure 5. Copy of a 1948 survey diagram derived from an 1878 Land Grant.

## Stone Age

Stone Age material found in the broader region spans the Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Ages through Pleistocene and Holocene times (Beaumont & Morris 1990). The most significant nearby sites are the Earlier Stone Age and Fauresmith excavations at Roodam to the south east and the Earlier Stone Age site at Doornlaagte (Beaumont & Morris 1990). Later Stone Age rock engravings are known to occur on dolerite hills in the wider environment, including Vaalpan/Meinheim (Fock & Fock 1989).

### **Description and evaluation of environmental issues and potential impacts**

Heritage resources including archaeological sites are in each instance unique and non-renewable resources. Area and linear developments can have a permanent destructive impact on these resources in cases where they are impacted. The objective of this study is to assess the significance of such resources, where present, and to recommend no-go or mitigation measures (where necessary) to facilitate or constrain the development.

Area impacts that would be spatially constrained within a few metres would occur in the area of the drilling sites under consideration. An existing farm road provides access close to the drill site; no scraping or other major modification of the surface is anticipated to manoeuvre drilling equipment to the site.

### **Direct, indirect and cumulative impacts (in terms of nature and extent)**

The destructive impacts that are possible in terms of heritage resources would be direct once-off events occurring during drilling.

Indirect and cumulative impacts could result from on-going use of the site should further developments ensue.

### **Statement of significance**

In addition to guidelines provided by the National Heritage Resources Act, a set of criteria based on Deacon and Whitelaw 1997 for assessing archaeological significance has been developed for Northern Cape settings (Morris 2000a).

### *Estimating site potential*



Table 1 is a classification of landforms and visible archaeological traces for estimating the potential for archaeological sites (after J. Deacon nd, National Monuments Council). Type 3 sites tend to be those with higher archaeological potential. There are notable exceptions, such as the renowned rock art site Driekopseiland, near Kimberley, which is on landform L1 Type 1. Generally, moreover, the older a site the poorer the preservation. Estimation of potential, in the light of such variables, thus requires some interpretation.

*Assessing site value by attribute*

The second matrix (Table 2) is adapted from Whitelaw (1997), who developed an approach for selecting sites meriting heritage recognition status in KwaZulu-Natal. It is a means of judging a site’s archaeological value by ranking the relative strengths of a range of attributes. While aspects of this matrix remain qualitative, attribute assessment is a good indicator of the general archaeological significance of a site, with Type 3 attributes being those of highest significance.

**Table 1. Classification of landforms and visible archaeological traces for estimating the potential for archaeological sites (after J. Deacon, National Monuments Council).**

Class	Landform	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
L1	Rocky surface	Bedrock exposed	Some soil patches	Sandy/grassy patches
L2	Ploughed land	Far from water	In floodplain	On old river terrace
L3	Sandy ground, inland	Far from water	In floodplain or near feature such as hill	On old river terrace
L4	Sandy ground, Coastal	>1 km from sea	Inland of dune cordon	Near rocky shore
L5	Water-logged deposit	Heavily vegetated	Running water	Sedimentary basin
L6	Developed urban	Heavily built-up with no known record of early settlement	Known early settlement, but buildings have basements	Buildings without extensive basements over known historical sites
L7	Lime/dolomite	>5 myrs	<5000 yrs	Between 5000 yrs and 5 myrs
L8	Rock shelter	Rocky floor	Sloping floor or small area	Flat floor, high ceiling
Class	Archaeo-logical traces	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
A1	Area previously excavated	Little deposit remaining	More than half deposit remaining	High profile site
A2	Shell or bones visible	Dispersed scatter	Deposit <0.5 m thick	Deposit >0.5 m thick; shell and bone dense
A3	Stone artefacts or stone walling or other feature visible	Dispersed scatter	Deposit <0.5 m thick	Deposit >0.5 m thick

**Table 2. Site attributes and value assessment (adapted from Whitelaw 1997)**

Class	Attribute	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
1	Length of sequence/context	No sequence Poor context Dispersed distribution	Limited sequence	Long sequence Favourable context High density of arte/ecofacts
2	Presence of exceptional items (incl regional rarity)	Absent	Present	Major element
3	Organic preservation	Absent	Present	Major element
4	Potential for future archaeological investigation	Low	Medium	High
5	Potential for public display	Low	Medium	High
6	Aesthetic appeal	Low	Medium	High
7	Potential for implementation of a long-term management plan	Low	Medium	High

### **Methodology for HIA assessment**

A field visit to inspect the proposed drill site was undertaken on 3 February 2021 in the company of De Beers Exploration geologist Jacobus van den Heefer. An assessment was made of heritage traces at the proposed drilling locale.

Vegetation cover was thicker than usual (significantly higher rainfall) at the site which has a mantling of aeolian sand and local calcrete exposures. Archaeological materials may occur sub-surface.

### **Observations**

Proposed Drillhole is to be situated at 28°45'22.27"S 24°29'3.65"E. The surface here consists of Hutton sand cover with calcrete exposure in places. It is situated away from dolerite hills that occur in the wider landscape. A low density of artefacts was noted in association with the surface calcrete occurrences some 10 m from the proposed drill site, these being of the nature of 'background scatter' (Orton 2016).




Figure 6a & b. Flaked hornfels pieces in the vicinity of the drill site.



The likelihood of subsurface archaeological material occurring here is considered to be possible, probably being similar to the 'background scatter' noted at the surface, but with possibility of material in underlying sediments similar to that found during quarrying at Roidam and Doornlaagte. The highly localised nature of the drilling is unlikely to have any major impact.

No colonial era traces were observed.

There are no dolerite hills in close proximity to the drill site where rock engravings might occur. The owner of the property said he had not noticed engravings in the hills on the farm.

### **Characterising the significance of heritage traces and contexts**

In terms of Tables 1 and 2 (above), the classification of landforms and visible archaeological traces for estimating the potential for archaeological sites at the proposed drilling site (Table 1) suggests landscape L3 Type 1 (generally poor potential) and archaeological trace Class A3 Type 1 (likely to be insignificant). Table 2 site attribute and value assessment criteria suggest Type 1 for all of the Classes 1-7 (low significance).

Archaeological significance in terms of these criteria for the drilling site is thus consistently LOW.

### **Characterising the significance of impacts**

The following criteria are used in this study to characterise the significance of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts:

- The **nature**, which shall include a description of what causes the effect, what will be affected, and how it will be affected.
- The **extent**, wherein it will be indicated whether the impact will be local (limited to the immediate area or site of development) or regional:
  - local extending only as far as the development site area – assigned a score of 1;
  - limited to the site and its immediate surroundings (up to 10 km) – assigned a score of 2;
  - will have an impact on the region – assigned a score of 3;
  - will have an impact on a national scale – assigned a score of 4;
  - or
  - will have an impact across international borders – assigned a score of 5.
- The **duration**, wherein it will be indicated whether:
  - the lifetime of the impact will be of a very short duration (0–1 years) – assigned a score of 1;
  - the lifetime of the impact will be of a short duration (2–5 years) – assigned a score of 2;
  - medium-term (5–15 years) – assigned a score of 3;

- long term (> 15 years) - assigned a score of 4; or
  - permanent - assigned a score of 5.
- The **magnitude**, quantified on a scale from 0-10, where a score is assigned:
  - 0 is small and will have no effect on the environment;
  - 2 is minor and will not result in an impact on processes;
  - 4 is low and will cause a slight impact on processes;
  - 6 is moderate and will result in processes continuing but in a modified way;
  - 8 is high (processes are altered to the extent that they temporarily cease); and
  - 10 is very high and results in complete destruction of patterns and permanent cessation of processes.
- The **probability of occurrence**, which shall describe the likelihood of the impact actually occurring. Probability will be estimated on a scale, and a score assigned:
  - Assigned a score of 1-5, where 1 is very improbable (probably will not happen);
  - Assigned a score of 2 is improbable (some possibility, but low likelihood);
  - Assigned a score of 3 is probable (distinct possibility);
  - Assigned a score of 4 is highly probable (most likely); and
  - Assigned a score of 5 is definite (impact will occur regardless of any prevention measures).
- the **significance**, which shall be determined through a synthesis of the characteristics described above (refer formula below) and can be assessed as low, medium or high.
- the **status**, which will be described as either positive, negative or neutral.
  - the degree to which the impact can be reversed.
  - the degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources.
  - the *degree* to which the impact can be *mitigated*.

The **significance** is determined by combining the criteria in the following formula:

**S= (E+D+M) P**; where

S = Significance weighting

E = Extent

D = Duration

M = Magnitude

P = Probability

The **significance weightings** for each potential impact are as follows:

- < 30 points: Low (i.e. where this impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area),
- 30-60 points: Medium (i.e. where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area unless it is effectively mitigated),
- > 60 points: High (i.e. where the impact must have an influence on the decision process to develop in the area).

***Impact table summarising the significance of impacts the Scholtzfontein South proposed drilling site***

<b>Nature</b>		
Acts or activities resulting in disturbance of surfaces and/or sub-surfaces containing artefacts (causes) resulting in the destruction, damage, excavation, alteration, removal or collection from its original position (consequences), of any archaeological material or object (what affected).		
	<b>Without mitigation</b>	<b>With mitigation</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Local (1)	Local (1)
<b>Duration</b>	Permanent (5) where archaeological material is impacted – but this has been rated as insignificant and not requiring mitigation	Permanent – but no mitigation regarded as necessary (5)
<b>Magnitude</b>	Minor (2)	Minor (2)
<b>Probability</b>	Improbable (2)	Improbable (2)
<b>Significance</b>	<b>Low (16)</b>	<b>Low (16)</b>
<b>Status (positive or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	No	No
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	Low density of artefacts in the vicinity of the proposed drilling site. As 'background scatter', no irreplaceable loss expected.	
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	Minimal traces noted on the surface: Not regarded as necessary other than by way of on-going management as per EMP in case unexpected archaeological material is encountered sub-surface.	On-going management as per EMP



<b>Mitigation:</b>		
Specific mitigation measures at the drilling sites not regarded as necessary. Possible subsurface Stone Age archaeological traces including possible artefact occurrences. Report immediately to SAHRA if any major feature is found.		
<b>Cumulative Impacts:</b>		
Where any archaeological contexts occur the impacts are once-off permanent destructive events. Future infrastructure development may lead to spatially extended impacts in the vicinity. EMP should provide for on-going monitoring.		
<b>Residual Impacts:</b>		
Depleted archaeological record if/where present.		

## MEASURES FOR INCLUSION IN THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

OBJECTIVE: Archaeological or other heritage materials occurring in the path of any surface or sub-surface disturbances associated with any aspect of the development are highly likely to be subject to destruction, damage, excavation, alteration, or removal. The objective should be to limit such impacts to the primary activities associated with drilling and hence to limit secondary impacts during the medium and longer term if further development occurs.

<b>Project component/s</b>	Any road construction over and above what is necessary and any extension of other components.
<b>Potential Impact</b>	The potential impact if this objective is not met is that wider areas or extended linear developments may result in further destruction, damage, excavation, alteration, removal or collection of heritage objects from their current context in the area.
<b>Activity/risk source</b>	Activities which could impact on achieving this objective include deviation from the planned drilling site and of access road/s without taking heritage impacts into consideration.
<b>Mitigation: Target/Objective</b>	A drilling environmental management plan that takes cognizance of heritage resources in the event of any future expansion, access roads or other infrastructure.

<b>Mitigation: Action/control</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>
Provision for on-going heritage monitoring in a facility environmental management plan which also provides guidelines on what to do in the event of any major heritage feature being encountered during any phase of development or operation.	Environmental management provider with on-going monitoring.	Environmental management plan to be in place before commencement of development.
Localize drilling activity and impacts in the immediate vicinity of the proposed drilling site.		

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	Inclusion of further heritage impact consideration in any future expansion or infrastructural elements. Immediate reporting to relevant heritage authorities of any heritage feature discovered during drilling operations.
<b>Monitoring</b>	Officials from relevant heritage authorities (National and Provincial) to be permitted to inspect the operation at any time in relation to the heritage component of the management plan.

## CONCLUSIONS

A low density 'background scatter' of probably Pleistocene age was noted in the area on localised surface occurrences of calcrete. No colonial era or other cultural resources were in evidence. Archaeological significance was determined to be consistently low in terms of all criteria by which they were measured. Some potential for subsurface material occurring is pointed out but the impacts of the drill hole are considered to be minimal. Steps for reporting in the event of archaeological material being found are indicated.

It is not regarded as necessary to carry out mitigation.

## Acknowledgements

I thank geologist Jacobus van den Heever who took me to inspect the site.

## References

- Beaumont, P.B. & Morris, D. 1990. *Guide to archaeological sites in the Northern Cape*. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.
- Deacon, J. nd. Archaeological Impact Assessment - specialist input to planning and design. Unpublished notes compiled for the National Monuments Council.
- Fock, G.J. & Fock, D.M.L. 1989. *Felsbilder in Südafrika Teil III: Die Felsbilder im Vaal-Oranje-Becken*. Köln: Böhlau Verlag.
- Kurtz, J.M. 1988. The Albania Settlement of Griqualand West, 1866-1878. Masters Thesis, Rhodes University.
- Morris, D. 2000a. Gamsberg Zinc Project environmental impact assessment specialist report: archaeology. Unpublished report, McGregor Museum.
- Orton, J. 2016. Prehistoric cultural landscapes in South Africa: a typology and discussion. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 71: 119-129.