



SiVEST SA (PTY) LTD

**PROPOSED 200MWac LION THORN SOLAR
PHOTOVOLTAIC FACILITY PROJECT, NORTH WEST
PROVINCE, SOUTH AFRICA**

Heritage Scoping Assessment

DFFE Reference: TBA
Report Prepared by: PGS Heritage Pty Ltd
Issue Date: 20 June 2023
Version No.: 0.1

Declaration of Independence

- I, Jessica Angel, declare that –
- General declaration:
- I act as the independent heritage practitioner in this application
- I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have expertise in conducting heritage impact assessments, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I will comply with the Act, Regulations and all other applicable legislation;
- I will take into account, to the extent possible, the matters listed in section 38 of the NHRA when preparing the application and any report relating to the application;
- I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- I will ensure that information containing all relevant facts in respect of the application is distributed or made available to interested and affected parties and the public and that participation by interested and affected parties is facilitated in such a manner that all interested and affected parties will be provided with a reasonable opportunity to participate and to provide comments on documents that are produced to support the application;
- I will provide the competent authority with access to all information at my disposal regarding the application, whether such information is favourable to the applicant or not
- All the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct;
- I will perform all other obligations as expected from a heritage practitioner in terms of the Act and the constitutions of my affiliated professional bodies; and
- I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 71 of the Regulations and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the NEMA.

Disclosure of Vested Interest

- I do not have and will not have any vested interest (either business, financial, personal or other) in the proposed activity proceeding other than remuneration for work performed in terms of the Regulations;

HERITAGE CONSULTANT: PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd

CONTACT PERSON: Jessica Angel - Archaeologist
Tel: +27 (0) 12 332 5305
Email: jessica@pgsheritage.co.za

SIGNATURE:





SiVEST Environmental Prepared by: **PGS Heritage Pty Ltd for SiVEST**
Project Description: **Proposed 200MWac Lion Thorn Solar Photovoltaic Facility and Electrical Grid Infrastructure - HIA**

Version No. 1.0

Date: 8 August 2023

Page i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT

Report Title	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF THE LION THORN SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC FACILITY, NORTH WEST PROVINCE, SOUTH AFRICA		
Control	Name	Signature	Designation
Author	Jessica Angel		Senior Archaeologist/ PGS Heritage
Reviewed	Wouter Fourie		Principal Heritage Specialist
Reviewed			SiVEST/Environmental Division

Date:	20 June 2023
Document Title:	Heritage Impact Report
Author:	Jessica Angel
Revision Number:	1.0
Checked by:	
For:	SiVEST Environmental Division

PGS confirms that this HSA report is done in accordance with the QMS implemented by PGS Heritage. The report structure and format followed is that of SIVEST Environmental as per the appointment scope and deliverable of SIVEST. The authors did implement the PGS HIA SOP and requirements.

SiVEST SA (PTY) LTD

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF THE 200MWac LION THORN SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC FACILITY PROJECT, NORTH WEST PROVINCE, SOUTH AFRICA

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd (PGS) was appointed by SiVEST (PTY) Ltd (hereafter referred to as “SiVEST”), on behalf of Upgrade Energy Africa (Pty) Ltd (hereafter referred to as “Upgrade Energy”), to undertake a Heritage Scoping Assessment (HSA) for the proposed construction of the 200MWac Lion Thorn Solar Photovoltaic Facility in the North West Province of South Africa.

1. SITE NAME

The 200MWac Lion Thorn Solar Photovoltaic Facility.

2. SITE LOCATION

The proposed SEF is located 9 km east of Leeudoringstad in the Maquassi Hills Local Municipality within the North West Province (**Figure 1**).

The SEF total development footprint will be approximately 324 ha (including supporting infrastructure on site, excluding the underground cables), and incorporates the following farm portions:

- T95338/1996 Lion Thorn




Figure 1: Locality of the study area and proposed layout and development area for Lion Thorn SEF that was assessed during the fieldwork.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Upgrade Energy (Pty) Ltd (UE) intends to develop the proposed Lion Thorn PV solar facility and associated infrastructure. The solar facility will have a generating capacity of up to 200 MWac. The total development footprint of the project will approximately be 324 ha (including supporting infrastructure on site, excluding the underground cables).

4. HERITAGE RESOURCES IDENTIFIED

The fieldwork component of the study was aimed at identifying tangible remains of archaeological, historical and heritage significance. A systematic controlled-exclusive surface survey was conducted on foot over two days by one archaeologist (Jessica Angel) and one field technician (Xander Fourie) from PGS. The fieldwork was conducted between the 6th and 7th of June 2023.

Heritage resources are unique and non-renewable, and as such, any impact on such resources must be seen as significant.

4.1 Archaeology, built environment and burial grounds and graves

The fieldwork conducted for the evaluation of the possible impact of the Lion Thorn SEF has revealed the presence of two (2) heritage resources.

Burial ground

One (1) burial ground (**LT002**) was identified and rated as having high heritage significance.

Archaeological features

One (1) Stone Age site find spot (**LT001**) of a low-density Stone Age surface artefact scatter rated as having low heritage significance was located. This is from the Later Stone Age (LSA). This site was located within a previously excavated area, believed to be for diamond prospection (relayed during conversation with the landowner) so the sites scientific potential and heritage significance is somewhat lowered. Based on findings from a range of other heritage reports in the area, these types of sites are to be expected in this region.

5. PALAEOLOGICAL DESKTOP STUDY

As per the palaeontological desktop assessment (Butler, 2023), the proposed Lion Thorn Solar PV and grid infrastructure development is underlain by the Allanridge Formation (Ventersdorp Supergroup). Updated Geology compiled by the Council of Geosciences (Pretoria) also indicates that the development is underlain by the Allanridge Formation of the Ventersdorp Supergroup. The PalaeoMap on the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) database indicates that the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the Allanridge Formation is Zero (grey) (Almond and Pether 2008, SAHRIS website). A Low Palaeontological Significance has thus been allocated to the project.

It is thus considered that the proposed development will not lead to detrimental impacts on the palaeontological resources of the area. The construction and operation of the project may be authorised, as the whole extent of the development footprint is not considered sensitive in terms of palaeontological heritage. If fossil remains or trace fossils are discovered during any phase of construction, either on the surface or exposed by excavations the Chance Find Procedure must be implemented immediately and the Environmental Control Officer (ECO) in charge of these developments must report to SAHRA (Contact details: SAHRA, 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town. PO

Box 4637, Cape Town 8000, South Africa. Tel: 021 462 4502. Fax: +27 (0)21 462 4509. Web: www.sahra.org.za) so that mitigation can be carry out by a palaeontologist.

Before any fossil material can be collected from the development site the specialist involved would need to apply for a collection permit from SAHRA. Fossil material must be housed in an official collection (museum or university), while all reports and fieldwork should meet the minimum standards for palaeontological impact studies proposed by SAHRA (2012). These recommendations should be incorporated into the Environmental Management Plan for the proposed development.

It is consequently recommended that no further palaeontological heritage studies, ground truthing and/or specialist mitigation are required pending the discovery of newly discovered fossils

6. ANTICIPATED IMPACTS ON HERITAGE RESOURCES

The pre-construction and construction phase of the proposed development will entail surface clearance as well as excavations into the superficial sediment cover and underlying bedrock (e.g., for fencing and new access roads).

From an archaeological perspective, the proposed layout will not change the impact on the identified heritage resources from the initial field assessment.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The calculated impact as summarised in **Section 9** of this report confirms the impact of the proposed SEF will be reduced with the implementation of the mitigation measures. This finding in addition to the implementation of a chance finds procedure, as part of the EMP, will mitigate possible impacts on unidentified heritage resources. **The following mitigation measures will be required:**

Table 1: Heritage management recommendations.

Area and site no.	Mitigation measures
General project area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implement a chance to find procedures in case where possible heritage finds are uncovered.
Burial ground (LT002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site should be demarcated with a 50-meter no-go-buffer-zone and the graves should be avoided and left in situ. ▪ If the site is going to be impacted directly and the graves need to be removed a grave relocation process for these sites is recommended as a mitigation and management measure. This will involve the necessary social consultation and public participation process before grave relocation permits can be applied for with SAHRA under the NHRA and National Health Act regulations.

SiVEST Environmental Prepared by: PGS Heritage Pty Ltd for SiVEST
 Project Description: Proposed 200MWac Lion Thorn Solar Photovoltaic Facility and Electrical Grid Infrastructure - HIA

Version No. 1.0

Date: 8 August 2023

Page vi

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACT, 1998 (ACT NO. 107 OF 1998) AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REGULATIONS, 2014 (AS AMENDED) - REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIALIST REPORTS (APPENDIX 6)

Regulation GNR 326 of 4 December 2014, as amended 7 April 2017, Appendix 6	Section of Report
1. (1) A specialist report prepared in terms of these Regulations must contain- a) details of- i. the specialist who prepared the report; and ii. the expertise of that specialist to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae;	Page ii of Report- Contact details and company Section 1.2 and Appendix A
b) a declaration that the specialist is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority;	Page ii
c) an indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared;	Section 1.1
(cA) an indication of the quality and age of base data used for the specialist report;	Section 2, 6 and 7
(cB) a description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change;	Section 8, 9 and 10
d) the date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment;	Section 2 and 6
e) a description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process inclusive of equipment and modelling used;	Section 2
f) details of an assessment of the specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the proposed activity or activities and its associated structures and infrastructure, inclusive of a site plan identifying site alternatives;	Section 7 and 8
g) an identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers;	Section 8 and 12
h) a map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers;	Section 8
i) a description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;	Section 3
j) a description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity, (including identified alternatives on the environment) or activities;	Executive Summary and Section 9, 10, 11 and 12

Regulation GNR 326 of 4 December 2014, as amended 7 April 2017, Appendix 6	Section of Report
k) any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr;	Section 11
l) any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation;	Section 11
m) any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation;	Section 8 and 11
n) a reasoned opinion- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. (as to) whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (iA) regarding the acceptability of the proposed activity or activities; and ii. if the opinion is that the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan; 	Executive Summary; Section 12
o) a description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of preparing the specialist report;	
p) a summary and copies of any comments received during any consultation process and where applicable all responses thereto; and	
q) any other information requested by the competent authority.	
2) Where a government notice <i>gazetted</i> by the Minister provides for any protocol or minimum information requirement to be applied to a specialist report, the requirements as indicated in such notice will apply.	NEMA Appendix 6 and GN648

SiVEST (PTY) LTD

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF THE LEEUDORINGSTAD 132KV POWERLINE, NORTH WEST PROVINCE, SOUTH AFRICA

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Contents

1.	SITE NAME.....	III
2.	SITE LOCATION.....	III
3.	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	IV
4.	HERITAGE RESOURCES IDENTIFIED	IV
4.1	Archaeology, built environment and burial grounds and graves	v
5.	PALAEONTOLOGICAL DESKTOP STUDY	V
6.	ANTICIPATED IMPACTS ON HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	VI
7.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	VI
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	18
1.1	Terms of Reference	18
1.2	Specialist Credentials	18
2.	ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	19
2.1	Site Significance classification standards.....	20
3.	ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS	22
4.	TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION	23
4.1	Project Location and Description.....	23
4.1.1	SEF	23
4.2	Project Description.....	24
4.2.1	Solar Facility Components.....	24
4.3	Location Alternatives.....	25
4.3.1	Reason for the location chosen.....	25

4.3.2	Need and Desirability:	25
4.4	Technology Alternatives.....	25
4.5	SEF Alternatives	26
4.6	No-Go Alternative	26
5.	LEGAL REQUIREMENT AND GUIDELINES	27
5.1	Statutory Framework: The National Heritage Resources (Act 25 of 1999)	27
5.1.1	Section 35 – Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites.....	27
5.1.2	Section 36 – Burial Grounds & Graves	27
5.1.3	Section 38 HIA as a Specialist Study within the EIA in Terms of Section 38(8)	28
5.1.4	Notice 648 of the Government Gazette 45421	29
5.1.5	NEMA – Appendix 6 requirements	31
6.	DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT.....	32
7.	BACKGROUND RESEARCH	34
7.1	Archival/Historical Maps.....	34
7.1.1	SUD AFRICA, 1866.....	34
7.1.2	BLOEMHOF, 1900.....	35
7.1.3	1: 50 000 Topographical Map 2726AB– First Edition 1969.....	36
7.2	Historical Overview of the Study Area	37
7.3	South Africa Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS)	43
7.3.1	Previous Archaeological and Heritage Studies from the General Region around the Study Area	43
7.3.2	Previous Archaeological and Heritage Studies Associated with the Current Project.....	44
7.4	Findings of the historical desktop study.....	45
7.4.1	Palaeontological Heritage.....	45
7.4.2	Heritage Screening	47
7.4.3	Heritage Sensitivity	47
7.4.4	Possible Heritage Finds.....	47
8.	FIELDWORK FINDINGS.....	48
8.1	Sites	51
8.1.1	Selected Photographic Record.....	52
9.	IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS	53
9.1	General Observations	53
9.2	Pre-construction.....	55

10.	COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES	57
10.1	The No-Go Alternative	57
11.	GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND MITIGATION MEASURES	57
11.1	Construction Phase.....	57
11.2	Chance Finds Procedure	57
11.3	Possible finds during construction.....	58
11.4	Timeframes.....	58
11.5	Heritage Management Plan for EMPr implementation.....	59
12.	CONCLUSION	61
12.1	Palaeontological Desktop Study	61
12.2	Anticipated impacts.....	62
12.3	Recommendations	62
12.4	General.....	63
13.	REFERENCES.....	64
13.1	Internet	66
13.2	Google Earth.....	67

List of Tables

Table 1: Heritage management recommendations.....	vi
Table 2: Rating system for archaeological resources	20
Table 3: Rating system for built environment resources	21
Table 4: Reporting requirements for GN648	29
Table 5: Landform type to heritage find matrix	47
Table 6: Heritage Resources identified during the field survey	51
Table 7: Assessment of the Impact of Proposed SEF on Heritage Sites	55
Table 8: Assessment of paleontological heritage impacts for the proposed Leeudoringstad SEF (Construction Phase).....	56
Table 9: Lead times for permitting and mobilisation	58
Table 10: Heritage Management Plan for EMPr implementation.....	59
Table 11: Heritage management recommendations.....	63

List of Figures

Figure 1: Locality of the study area and proposed layout and development area for Lion Thorn SEF that was assessed during the fieldwork.	iv
Figure 2: Human and Cultural Timeline in Africa (Morris, 2008).	xvi
Figure 3: Lion Thorn SEF Site Locality	23
Figure 4: DFFE Screening tool outcome indicating low significance rating for archaeology and cultural heritage.....	30

Figure 5: DFFE Screening tool outcome indicating medium significance rating for palaeontology.	31
Figure 6: View of grazing lands.	33
Figure 7: View of existing powerlines.	33
Figure 8: Section of the 1866 Sud Africa map (orange polygon: approximate location of study area).	35
Figure 9: Section of the 1900 Bloemhof map highlighting the name of the Leeuwbosch farm (University of Cape Town Libraries, South Africa).	36
Figure 10: First Edition of 2726AB Topographic Map 1: 50 000 dating to 1969, showing the proposed development, with no depicted heritage features.	37
Figure 11: Extract of the 1 in 250 000 SAHRIS PalaeoMap (Council of Geosciences) indicates that the proposed development is underlain by sediments with a Low (blue) Palaeontological Sensitivity.	46
Figure 12: Track log recordings from the field assessment.	49
Figure 13: Locality of the heritage resources identified within the study area. See inset A below.	50
Figure 14: LSA flakes from LT001.	52
Figure 15: General view of the cemetery at LT002.	52
Figure 18: LSA flakes and previously excavated find spot at LT001.	77
Figure 19 - Stone packed graves at LT002.	79
Figure 20: General views of cemetery.	80

List of Appendices

Appendix A – CV
Appendix B – Site Descriptions (incl. photographs)
Appendix C – Impact Assessment Methodology
Appendix D – Site Sensitivity Verification Report
Appendix E – Terms of Reference

Glossary of Terms

Archaeological resources

This includes:

- material remains resulting from human activity which are in a state of disuse and are in or on land and which are older than 100 years including artefacts, human and hominid remains and artificial features and structures;
- rock art, being any form of painting, engraving or other graphic representation on a fixed rock surface or loose rock or stone, which was executed by human agency and which is older than 100 years, including any area within 10m of such representation;
- wrecks, being any vessel or aircraft, or any part thereof, which was wrecked in South Africa, whether on land, in the internal waters, the territorial waters or in the maritime culture zone of the republic as defined in the Maritimes Zones Act, and any cargo, debris or artefacts found or associated therewith, which is older than 60 years or which SAHRA considers to be worthy of conservation;
- features, structures and artefacts associated with military history which are older than 75 years and the site on which they are found.

Cultural significance

This means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance

Development

This means any physical intervention, excavation, or action, other than those caused by natural forces, which may in the opinion of the heritage authority in any way result in a change to the nature, appearance or physical nature of a place or influence its stability and future well-being, including:

- construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change in use of a place or a structure at a place;
- carrying out any works on or over or under a place;
- subdivision or consolidation of land comprising a place, including the structures or airspace of a place;
- constructing or putting up for display signs or boards;
- any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land; and
- any removal or destruction of trees, or removal of vegetation or topsoil

Early Stone Age

The archaeology of the Stone Age between 700 000 and 2 500 000 years ago.

Fossil

Mineralised bones of animals, shellfish, plants and marine animals. A trace fossil is the track or footprint of a fossil animal that is preserved in stone or consolidated sediment.

Heritage

That which is inherited and forms part of the National Estate (historical places, objects, fossils as defined by the National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999).

Heritage resources

This means any place or object of cultural significance and can include (but not limited to) as stated under Section 3 of the NHRA,

- places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance;
- places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
- historical settlements and townscapes;
- landscapes and natural features of cultural significance;
- geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;
- archaeological and palaeontological sites;
- graves and burial grounds, and
- sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa;

Holocene

The most recent geological time period which commenced 20 000 years ago.

Late Stone Age

The archaeology of the last 30 000 years associated with fully modern people.

Late Iron Age (Early Farming Communities)

The archaeology of the last 1000 years up to the 1800's, associated with iron-working and farming activities such as herding and agriculture.

Middle Stone Age

The archaeology of the Stone Age between 20 000-300 000 years ago, associated with early modern humans.

Site

Site in this context refers to an area place where a heritage resource is located and not a proclaimed heritage site as contemplated under s27 of the NHRA.




Figure 2: Human and Cultural Timeline in Africa (Morris, 2008).

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Description
AIA	Archaeological Impact Assessment
APHP	Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners
ASAPA	Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
CRM	Cultural Resource Management
DFFE	Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
DWS	Department of Water and Sanitation
ECO	Environmental Control Officer
EIA practitioner	Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ESA	Early Stone Age
GN	Government Notice
GPS	Global Positioning System
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
HSA	Heritage Scoping Assessment
HWC	Heritage Western Cape
I&AP	Interested & Affected Party
LSA	Late Stone Age
LIA	Late Iron Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age
NCA	National Competent Authority
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act
NW DEDECT	North West Department of Economic Development, Environment, Conservation and Tourism
NWPHA	North West Provincial Heritage Authority
PGS	PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency
SEF	Solar Energy Facility
SIVEST	SiVEST (PTY) Ltd
Upgrade Energy	Upgrade Energy Africa (Pty) Ltd

SiVEST (PTY) LTD

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF THE 200MWac LION THORN SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC FACILITY, NORTH WEST PROVINCE, SOUTH AFRICA

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd (PGS) was appointed by SiVest (PTY) Ltd (hereafter referred to as “SiVEST”), on behalf of Upgrade Energy Africa (Pty) Ltd (hereafter referred to as “Upgrade Energy”), to undertake a Heritage Scoping Assessment (HAS) as part of the Scoping and Environmental Impact Report (S&EIR) process for the proposed 200-megawatt (MWac) photovoltaic (PV) plant project in the North West Province of South Africa.

1.1 Terms of Reference

The aim of the study is to identify possible archaeological heritage sites and finds that may occur in the proposed development area. The Heritage Scoping report aims to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in the development of a comprehensive Environmental Management programme (EMPr) to assist the project applicant in responsibly managing the identified heritage resources in order to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) (NHRA).

1.2 Specialist Credentials

This study was compiled by PGS and its appointed specialists and is detailed below:

The staff at PGS has a combined experience of nearly 90 years in the heritage consulting industry. PGS and its staff have extensive experience in managing HIA processes. PGS will only undertake heritage assessment work where they have the relevant expertise and experience to undertake that work competently.

Jessica Angel, the author of this report, is registered as a Professional Archaeologist with the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA). She has 10 years of experience in the heritage assessment field and holds a Master’s degree (MSc) in Archaeology from the University of the Witwatersrand.

Wouter Fourie, the Project Coordinator, is registered with the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) as a Professional Archaeologist and is accredited as a Principal Investigator; he is further an Accredited Professional Heritage Practitioner with the Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners (APHP).

2. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

This HSA report was compiled by PGS for the proposed development of the Lion Thorn Solar PV Facility. The applicable maps, tables, and figures are included as stipulated in the NHRA (no 25 of 1999), the NEMA (no 107 of 1998). The HIA process consisted of three steps:

Step I – Literature Review: A detailed archaeological and historical overview of the study area and surroundings were undertaken. This work was augmented by an assessment of reports and data contained on the SAHRIS. Additionally, an assessment was made of the available historic topographic maps. All these desktop study components were undertaken to support the fieldwork.

Step II – Physical Survey: The fieldwork was conducted on the 6th and 7th of June 2023. The fieldwork team consisted of one archaeologist, (Jessica Angel) and one field technician (Xander Fourie). Throughout the fieldwork, hand-held GPS devices were used to record the tracklogs showing the routes followed by the archaeological fieldwork team. All sites identified during the fieldwork were photographically and qualitatively recorded, and their respective localities were documented using a hand-held GPS device. The proposed 200MWac Solar PV facility was surveyed as per the KML files received from the client.

Step III – The final step involved the recording and documentation of relevant archaeological resources, the assessment of resources in terms of the HIA criteria and report writing, as well as mapping and constructive recommendations.

The significance of heritage sites was based on four main criteria:

- Site integrity (i.e., primary vs. secondary context),
- Amount of deposit, range of features (e.g., stonewalling, stone tools and enclosures),
- Density of scatter (dispersed scatter)
 - Low - <10/50m²
 - Medium – 10-50/50m²
 - High - >50/50m²
- Uniqueness; and
- Potential to answer present research questions.

Impacts on these sites by the development will be evaluated as follows:

2.1 Site Significance classification standards

Site significance classification standards use is based on the heritage classification of s3 in the NHRA and developed for implementation keeping in mind the grading system approved by SAHRA for archaeological impact assessments. The update classification and rating system as developed by Heritage Western Cape (2016) is implemented in this report

Site significance classification standards prescribed by the Heritage Western Cape Guideline (2016), were used for the purpose of this report (**Table 2** and **Table 3**).

Table 2: Rating system for archaeological resources

Grading	Description of Resource	Examples of Possible Management Strategies	Heritage Significance
I	Heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance. Current examples: Langebaanweg (West Coast Fossil Park), Cradle of Humankind	May be declared as a National Heritage Site managed by SAHRA. Specific mitigation and scientific investigation can be permitted in certain circumstances with sufficient motivation.	Highest Significance
II	Heritage resources with special qualities which make them significant, but do not fulfil the criteria for Grade I status. Current examples: Blombos, Paternoster Midden.	May be declared as a Provincial Heritage Site managed by North West Provincial Heritage Authority (NWPHA). Specific mitigation and scientific investigation can be permitted in certain circumstances with sufficient motivation.	Exceptionally High Significance
III	Heritage resources that contribute to the environmental quality or cultural significance of a larger area and fulfils one of the criteria set out in section 3(3) of the Act but that does not fulfil the criteria for Grade II status. Grade III sites may be formally protected by placement on the Heritage Register.		
IIIA	Such a resource must be an excellent example of its kind or must be sufficiently rare. Current examples: Varschedrift; Peers Cave; Brobartia Road Midden at Bettys Bay	Resource must be retained. Specific mitigation and scientific investigation can be permitted in certain circumstances with sufficient motivation.	High Significance
IIIB	Such a resource might have similar significances to those of a Grade III A resource, but to a lesser degree.	Resource must be retained where possible where not possible it must be fully investigated and/or mitigated.	Medium Significance
IIIC	Such a resource is of contributing significance.	Resource must be satisfactorily studied before impact. If the recording already done (such as in an HIA or permit application) is not sufficient, further recording or even mitigation may be required.	Low Significance
NCW	A resource that, after appropriate investigation, has been determined to not have enough heritage significance to be retained as part of the National Estate.	No further actions under the NHRA are required. This must be motivated by the applicant or the consultant and approved by the authority.	No research potential or other cultural significance

Table 3: Rating system for built environment resources

Grading	Description of Resource	Examples of Possible Management Strategies	Heritage Significance
I	Heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance. Current examples: Robben Island	May be declared as a National Heritage Site managed by SAHRA.	Highest Significance
II	Heritage resources with special qualities which make them significant in the context of a province or region, but do not fulfil the criteria for Grade I status. Current examples: St George's Cathedral, Community House	May be declared as a Provincial Heritage Site managed by NWPFA.	Exceptionally High Significance
II	Such a resource contributes to the environmental quality or cultural significance of a larger area and fulfils one of the criteria set out in section 3(3) of the Act but that does not fulfil the criteria for Grade II status. Grade III sites may be formally protected by placement on the Heritage Register.		
IIIA	Such a resource must be an excellent example of its kind or must be sufficiently rare. These are heritage resources which are significant in the context of an area.	This grading is applied to buildings and sites that have sufficient intrinsic significance to be regarded as local heritage resources; and are significant enough to warrant that any alteration, both internal and external, is regulated. Such buildings and sites may be representative, being excellent examples of their kind, or may be rare. In either case, they should receive maximum protection at local level.	High Significance
IIIB	Such a resource might have similar significances to those of a Grade III A resource, but to a lesser degree. These are heritage resources which are significant in the context of a townscape, neighbourhood, settlement or community.	Like Grade IIIA buildings and sites, such buildings and sites may be representative, being excellent examples of their kind, or may be rare, but less so than Grade IIIA examples. They would receive less stringent protection than Grade IIIA buildings and sites at local level.	Medium Significance
IIIC	Such a resource is of contributing significance to the environs These are heritage resources which are significant in the context of a streetscape or direct neighbourhood.	This grading is applied to buildings and/or sites whose significance is contextual, i.e. in large part due to its contribution to the character or significance of the environs. These buildings and sites should, as a consequence, only be regulated if the significance of the environs is sufficient to warrant protective measures, regardless of whether the site falls within a Conservation or Heritage Area. Internal alterations should not necessarily be regulated.	Low Significance
NCW	A resource that, after appropriate investigation, has been determined to not have enough heritage significance to be retained as part of the National Estate.	No further actions under the NHRA are required. This must be motivated by the applicant and approved by the authority. Section 34 can even be lifted by NWPFA for structures in this category if they are older than 60 years.	No research potential or other cultural significance

3. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Not detracting in any way from the comprehensiveness of the fieldwork undertaken, it is necessary to realise that the heritage resources located during the fieldwork do not necessarily represent all the possible heritage resources present within the area. Various factors account for this, including the subterranean nature of some archaeological sites, land access restrictions and the current dense vegetation cover. As such, should any heritage features and/or objects not included in the present inventory be located or observed, a heritage specialist must immediately be contacted.

Such observed or located heritage features and/or objects may not be disturbed or removed in any way until such time that the heritage specialist has been able to make an assessment as to the significance of the site (or material) in question. This applies to graves and cemeteries as well. If any graves or burial places are located during the development, the procedures and requirements pertaining to graves and burials will apply as set out in **Section 11** .

4. TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION

The following information has been supplied by SiVEST.

4.1 Project Location and Description

The proposed SEF is located 9 km east of Leeudoringstad in the Maquassi Hills Local Municipality within the North West Province (**Error! Reference source not found.**).




Figure 3: Lion Thorn SEF Site Locality

4.1.1 SEF

The SEF total development footprint as shown on the locality map below (**Figure 3**) will be approximately 324 ha (including supporting infrastructure on site, excluding the underground cables), and incorporates the following farm portions:

- T95338/1996 Lion Thorn

4.2 Project Description

Lion Thorn Solar PV intends to develop a PV solar facility and associated infrastructure on T95338/1996 Lion Thorn, North West Province situated approximately 9km east of Leeudoringstad. The solar facility will have a generating capacity of up to 200 MWac. The total development footprint of the project will approximately be 324 ha (including supporting infrastructure on site, excluding the underground cables).

The term PV describes a solid-state electronic cell that produces direct current electrical energy from the radiant energy of the sun through a process known as the PV Effect. This refers to light energy placing electrons into a higher state of energy to create electricity. Each PV cell is made of silicon (i.e. semiconductors), which is positively and negatively charged on either side, with electrical conductors attached to both sides to form a circuit. This circuit captures the released electrons in the form of an electric current (direct current). The key components of the proposed project are described below:

4.2.1 Solar Facility Components

- **PV Panel Array:** To produce up to 200 MWac the facility will require numerous linked cells placed behind a protective glass sheet to form a panel. Multiple panels will be required to form the solar PV arrays which will comprise the PV facility.
- **BESS:** The battery energy storage system will make use of Lithium-ion (Lithium Iron Phosphate / Sodium Sulphur) or Vanadium Redox technology and will have a capacity of up to 4.5 GWh. The extent of the system will be ~4.57 ha. It must be noted that should the facility layout not require the development and operation of a BESS, the area allocated for the placement of the BESS will be used for panel placement within the development footprint.
- **Inverters:** Sections of the PV array will be wired to inverters. The inverter is a pulse-width mode inverter that converts direct current (DC) electricity to alternating current (AC) electricity at grid frequency.
- **Connection to the grid:** Connecting the array to the electrical grid requires the transformation of the voltage from 33 kV to 132 kV. The normal components and dimensions of a distribution-rated electrical substation will be required. A switching substation with a capacity of 33 kV/ 132 kV will also be required.
- **Electrical reticulation network:** An internal electrical reticulation network will be required and will be laid ~2-4 m underground as far as practically possible.
- **Supporting Infrastructure:** The following auxiliary buildings with basic services including water and electricity will be required on the site:
 - Operations and Maintenance building/ office (~2500 m² [square metres])

- Switch gear and relay room (~800 m²)
 - Staff lockers and changing room (~200 m²)
 - Security control (~60 m²)
 - Permanent Laydown Area (~8 ha)
- **Roads:** Access will be obtained via the existing R502. The main access road providing direct access to the project will be up to 8 m wide.
 - **Fencing:** For health, safety and security reasons, the facility will be required to be fenced off from the surrounding farms. The project will have permanent security on site for 24 hrs per day, 7 days a week.

4.3 Location Alternatives

No other location alternatives are being considered. Renewable Energy (RE) development in South Africa (SA) is highly desirable from a social, environmental and development point of view and a solar energy installation is more suitable for the site due to the high solar resource.

4.3.1 Reason for the location chosen.

This site is preferred due to the suitable climate, conditions, and topography. Proximity to the substation on the property and knowledge of an upgrading to the 132 kV powerline is also available. Based on the above site-specific attributes, the study area is considered highly preferred in terms of the development of a solar PV facility. As such, no property / location alternatives have been considered.

4.3.2 Need and Desirability:

- Increased surety of supply.
- Lesser dependence on fossil fuel generated power.
- Growing demand for electricity fueled by economic growth, lack of generation capacity by Eskom, etc.
- Need for cleaner electricity/ CDM project.
- Employment opportunities.

4.4 Technology Alternatives

No other activity alternatives are being considered. Renewable Energy development in SA is highly desirable from a social, environmental and development point of view.

4.5 SEF Alternatives

Design and layout alternatives will be considered and assessed as part of the S&EIR and BA/Registration Process. These include alternatives for the PV area, SS locations, cable network route and also for the construction/ laydown area. Two locations have been identified for the SS.

4.6 No-Go Alternative

The 'no-go' alternative is the option of not undertaking the proposed SEF projects. Hence, if the 'no-go' option is implemented, there would be no development. This alternative would result in no environmental impacts from the proposed project on the site or surrounding local area. It provides the baseline against which other alternatives are compared and will be considered throughout the report.

5. LEGAL REQUIREMENT AND GUIDELINES

5.1 Statutory Framework: The National Heritage Resources (Act 25 of 1999)

The NHRA has applicability, as the study forms part of an overall HIA in terms of the provisions of Section 34, 35, 36 and 38 of the NHRA and forms part of a heritage scoping study that serves to identify key heritage resources, informants, and issues relating to the palaeontological, archaeological, built environment and cultural landscape, as well as the need to address such issues during the impact assessment phase of the HIA process.

5.1.1 Section 35 – Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites

According to Section 35 (Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites) and Section 38 (Heritage Resources Management) of the NHRA, PIAs and AIAs are required by law in the case of developments in areas underlain by potentially fossiliferous (fossil-bearing) rocks, especially where substantial bedrock excavations are envisaged, and where human settlement is known to have occurred during prehistory and the historic period.

5.1.2 Section 36 – Burial Grounds & Graves

A section 36 permit application is made to the SAHRA or the competent provincial heritage authority which protects burial grounds and graves that are older than 60 years and must conserve and generally care for burial grounds and graves protected in terms of this section, and it may make such arrangements for their conservation as it sees fit. SAHRA must also identify and record the graves of victims of conflict and any other graves which it deems to be of cultural significance and may erect memorials associated with these graves and must maintain such memorials. A permit is required under the following conditions:

Permitting requirements for burial grounds and graves older than 60 years (prehistoric) and historic burials to the SAHRA:

- a) destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves.
- b) destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or

- c) bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.
- d) SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for the destruction or damage of any burial ground or grave referred to in subsection (3)(a) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has made satisfactory arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the contents of such graves, at the cost of the applicant.

5.1.3 Section 38 HIA as a Specialist Study within the EIA in Terms of Section 38(8)

A NHRA Section 38 (Heritage Impact Assessments) application to SAHRA is required when the proposed development triggers one or more of the following activities:

Permitting requirements for demolition of built environment features:

- a) the construction of a road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;
- b) the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50 m in length;
- c) any development or other activity which will change the character of a site,
 - i. exceeding 5 000 m² in extent; or
 - ii. Involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or
 - iii. involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or
 - iv. the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;
- d) the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m² in extent; or
- e) any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority

In this instance, the heritage assessment for the property is to be undertaken as a component of the BA for the project. Provision is made for this in terms of Section 38(8) of the NHRA, which states that:

This is an HIA submitted to the relevant authority in terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act. The commenting authority is the SAHRA. The authorising government agency is the North West Department of Economic Development, Environment, Conservation and Tourism (NW DEDECT).

An HIA report is required to identify, and assess archaeological resources as defined by the Act, assess the proposal's impact on the said archaeological resources, review alternatives and recommend mitigation (see methodology above).

Section 38 (3) Impact Assessments are required, in terms of the statutory framework to conform to basic requirements as laid out in Section 38(3) of the NHRA. These are:

- The identification and mapping of heritage resources in the area affected
- The assessment of the significance of such resources
- The assessment of the impact of the development on the heritage resources
- An evaluation of the impact on the heritage resources relative to sustainable socio/economic benefits
- Consideration of alternatives if heritage resources are adversely impacted by the proposed development
- Consideration of alternatives
- Plans for mitigation in the future

5.1.4 Notice 648 of the Government Gazette 45421

Although minimum standards for archaeological (2007) and paleontological (2012) assessments¹ were published by SAHRA and Heritage Western Cape²³, GN.648 requires sensitivity verification for a site selected on the national web based environmental screening tool for which no specific assessment protocol related to any theme has been identified. The requirements for this Government Notice (GN) are listed in **Table 4** and the applicable section in this report noted. The screening tool indicated a **low to high** archaeological and cultural heritage significance (**Figure 4**) and palaeontology as very medium (**Figure 5**).

Table 4: Reporting requirements for GN648

GN 648	Relevant section in report	Where not applicable in this report
2.2 (a) a desktop analysis, using satellite imagery;	Section 7	
2.2 (b) a preliminary on-site inspection to identify if there are any discrepancies with the current use of land and environmental status quo versus the environmental sensitivity as identified on the national web-based environmental screening tool, such as new developments, infrastructure, indigenous/pristine vegetation, etc.	Section 6	-

¹ South African Heritage Resources Agency. 2007. *Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment Reports*. May 2007.


² Heritage Western Cape. 2016. *Guide for Minimum Standards for Archaeology and Palaeontology Reports Submitted to Heritage Western Cape*. June 2016.

³ Heritage Western Cape 2016. *Guidelines for Heritage Impact Assessments required in terms of Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)*.

2.3(a) confirms or disputes the current use of the land and environmental sensitivity as identified by the national web-based environmental screening tool;	Section 6	-
2.3(b) contains motivation and evidence (e.g., photographs) of either the verified or different use of the land and environmental sensitivity;	Section 6 provides a description of the current use and confirms/doesn't confirm the status in the screening report.	-



Screening Report Map



5 June 2023

Legend

Site Area	Very High
EIA Application Development Footprint	High
EIA Application Site	Low
National Jurisdiction Area	

Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Combined Sensitivity

Source: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Imagio, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swire, Esri (The Netherlands), NCC, iQOO/QianduoMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Copyright 2023
National Department of Environmental Affairs,
Government of South Africa

Figure 4: DFFE Screening tool outcome indicating low significance rating for archaeology and cultural heritage.




Figure 5: DFFE Screening tool outcome indicating medium significance rating for palaeontology.

5.1.5 NEMA – Appendix 6 requirements

The HIA report has been compiled considering the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014 (as amended) Appendix 6 requirements for specialist reports as indicated in the table on page vi and vii of this report.

6. DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT

A site visit was conducted by one archaeologist and one field technician from PGS from 6th-7th June 2023. The general vicinity of the proposed development area was assessed as per the KML file received from the client. At times, the archaeological visibility of the area was not ideal for surveying due to dense grass vegetation cover.

The study area is located approximately 9 km east of Leeudoringstad, within the Maquassi Hills Local Municipality within the Dr Kenneth Kaunda District Municipality in the North West Province. It can be accessed via the tarred R502, and informal roads. Portions of the study area have been disturbed by the construction of farm roads, grazing, prospecting and natural erosion (incl. sheet erosion and animal burrows). Existing infrastructure includes fences and powerlines.

The general landscape of the proposed development area comprised of rock outcrops and flat alluvial plains that were mostly covered in moderate vegetation.

In terms of geology and soils, the area is characterised by the Allanridge Formation (Andesite, tuff), Rietgat Formation (Andesite to dacitic volcanic rocks, minor conglomerate, greywacke and shale) and Alluvium, Colluvium, Eluvium, gravel, scree, sand, soil and debris (Council of Geoscience, 2022).

In terms of vegetation, the study area is characterised by the following vegetation type.

The **Vaal-Vet Sandy Grassland** (Gh10) vegetation type: "Plains-dominated landscape with some scattered, slightly irregular undulating plains and hills. Mainly low-tussock grasslands with an abundant karroid element. Dominance of *Themeda triandra* is an important feature of this vegetation unit. Locally low cover of *T. triandra* and the associated increase in *Elionurus muticus*, *Cymbopogon pospischilii* and *Aristida congesta* is attributed to heavy grazing and/or erratic rainfall." (www.sanbi.org; Mucina & Rutherford, 2006).

Photographs of the general study area are provided below.



Figure 6: View of grazing lands.



Figure 7: View of existing powerlines.

7. BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The previous section provided a topographical description of the proposed development area. This section seeks to describe the historical origins of the receiving environment.

The examination of heritage databases, historical data and cartographic resources represents a critical additional tool for locating and identifying heritage resources and in determining the historical and cultural context of the study area. Therefore, an internet literature search was conducted, and relevant archaeological and historical texts were also consulted. Relevant topographic maps and satellite imagery were studied.

7.1 Archival/Historical Maps

The examination of historical data and cartographic resources represents a critical tool for locating and identifying heritage resources and in determining the historical and cultural context of the study area. Relevant topographic maps and satellite imagery were studied to identify structures, possible burial grounds or archaeological sites present in the footprint area.

Historical topographic maps (1:50 000) for various years (1947, 1953, 1968, 1969, 1982) were available for utilisation in the background study. These maps were assessed to observe the development of the area, as well as the location of possible historical structures and burial grounds. The study area was overlain on the map sheets to identify structures or graves situated within or immediately adjacent to the study area that could possibly be older than 60 years and thus protected under Section 34 and 36 of the NHRA.

7.1.1 SUD AFRICA, 1866

(David Rumsey Historical Map Collection: reference cfP6163)

The map depicted in **Figure 8** below is titled “*Sud Africa*”. The full title is: “*Sud Africa. Bearbeitet von Adolf Graf. Terrain v. G. Dietrich. Gest. v. G. Haubold. Weimar: Geographisches Institut. (to accompany) Hand - Atlas Der Erde Und Des Himmels.*”. The map dates from 1866 and the author was Adolf Graf (Publisher: Geographisches Institut (*Weimer, Germany*)). The map was colour coded by Europeans and shows the routes followed by the principal explorers from 1831 to 1862. The red represents the route that the Boers would have taken.




Figure 9: Section of the 1900 Bloemhof map highlighting the name of the Leuwbosch farm (University of Cape Town Libraries, South Africa).

7.1.3 1: 50 000 Topographical Map 2726AB– First Edition 1969

A section of the First Edition of the 2726AB (HARRISBURG) Topographical Sheet is depicted in **Figure 10**. This map sheet was based on aerial photography undertaken in 1961, was surveyed in 1969 and drawn by the Trigonometrical Survey Office in 1970.

No heritage sites occur within the proposed development area.




Figure 10: First Edition of 2726AB Topographic Map 1: 50 000 dating to 1969, showing the proposed development, with no depicted heritage features.

7.2 Historical Overview of the Study Area

DATE	DESCRIPTION
2.5 million to 250,000 years ago	<p>The Earlier Stone Age is the first and oldest phase identified in South Africa's archaeological history and comprises two technological phases. The earliest of these technological phases is known as Oldowan, which is associated with crude flakes, and hammer stones and dates to approximately 2 million years ago. The second technological phase in the Earlier Stone Age of Southern Africa is known as the Acheulean and comprises more refined and better made stone artefacts such as the cleaver and bifacial handaxe. The Acheulean phase dates back to approximately 1.5 million years ago.</p> <p>Prof. Revil Mason identified early Stone Age material along the banks of the Vaal River during an archaeological survey of the footprint of the Oppermansdrift Dam (Bloemhof Dam) in 1966</p>
250,000 to 40,000 years ago	<p>The Middle Stone Age is the second oldest phase identified in South Africa's archaeological history. This phase is associated with flakes, points and blades manufactured by means of the so-called 'prepared core' technique.</p>

DATE	DESCRIPTION
	<p>No MSA sites are known from the vicinity of the study area.</p>
<p>40,000 years ago to the historic past</p>	<p>The Later Stone Age is the third archaeological phase identified and is associated with an abundance of very small artefacts known as microliths. A well-known feature of the Later Stone Age is rock art in the form of rock paintings and engravings.</p> <p>The Munro Site found by Revil Mason during his survey of the Oppermansdrift Dam also included a Later Stone Age component. The Later Stone Age is also associated with rock engravings and rock paintings. Rock engravings are known from the direct and wider vicinity of the study area (Bergh, 1998). Dr. Benjamin Smith of the Rock Art Research Institute at the University of Witwatersrand indicates that two San rock engraving sites are located on the farm Kareeboom 228 HO (Smith, 2011). This farm is located approximately 30 km West of the present study area.</p>
<p>1500 – 1700</p>	<p>This period is associated with a Late Iron group referred to as the Olifantspoort facies of the Urewe Tradition. The Olifantspoort facies originated from the Icon facies (AD1300 – 1500) and led to the Thabeng facies (AD1700 – 1840) (Huffman, 2007). The Olifantspoort facies (with the Letsibogo facies in Botswana and the Madikwe facies in the area between Makapansgat and Botswana) represents the second phase in the development of Moloko and were represented by an absence of any stonewalling. Olifantspoort pottery is characterised by “multiple bands of fine stamping or narrow incision separated by colour” (Huffman, 2007:193).</p>
<p>1700 – 1820</p>	<p>This period is associated with the Late Iron Age group known as the Thabeng facies of the Urewe Tradition. As indicated above this facies followed on the Olifantspoort facies as the third facies in the development of Moloko in this area. The Thabeng pottery is characterised by “incised triangles, coloured chevrons and arcades” (Huffman, 2007:197) whereas the settlements are stonewalled. Their layout conformed to Type Z settlements which can be described as “...a loose circle of individual bilabial households surrounding the core...” (Huffman, 2007:41).</p>
<p>1795</p>	<p>During this time Legassick (2010) indicates that the study area fell within the Rolong sphere of influence.</p> <p>Before this time the Rolong were mainly settled south of the Vaal River. Under their leader Tau (c. 1700 – 1760) they were a strong group with a vast sphere of influence and in control of strong trade networks. However, after his death the Rolong moved northward to settle along the headwaters of the Molopo River. The period after Tau’s death saw fissures develop which (after the death of Tau’s son Ratlou and in turn the death of his son Seitshiro) led to the division of the once united Rolong into at least five groups, namely the Rolong-Mariba, Rolong-Ratlou, Rolong-Tshidi, Rolong-Seleka and Rolong-Rapulana. In roughly 1790 the Rolong-Seleka, followed by the Rolong-Rapulana, left the Molopo River to settle at Thabeng near Klerksdorp (Legassick, 2010).</p>
<p>Early 1820s</p>	<p>During the early 1820s Burchell records the Tlhaping at Dithakong, the missionary Broadbent records the Rolong on top of the Platberg (at Thabeng) and the Kubung were associated with several localities in the Free State such as OMB1. These three groups form a South-western</p>

DATE	DESCRIPTION
	Sotho-Tswana cluster which can be associated with Thabeng pottery and Type Z walling (Huffman, 2007).
1823	As a result of increasing numbers of raiding groups crossing over the Vaal River from the south as part of the social dynamics of the Difaqane, the Rolong-Seleka abandoned their settlement at Thabeng and moved along the northern bank of the Vaal River in a western direction.
February 1823	<p>The Methodist Reverends Samuel Broadbent and Thomas Hodgson (with their respective families) established a mission station on the farm Leeuwfontein a short distance east of Wolmaransstad (Oberholster, 1972) and approximately 27 km west of the present study. The two missionaries had met Chief Sefunelo of the Rolong-Seleka on his movement away from Thabeng, and asked him to settle in this vicinity (Legassick, 2010). It is worth noting that Breutz (1955) indicates that the Rolong-Seleka was already settled here when the missionaries arrived.</p> <p>It is significant to note that the Broadbent mission station was the first one to be established north of the Vaal River (Oberholster, 1972).</p> <p>During 1824 Hodgson was instructed to return to Cape Town with the Reverend Archbell sent up to replace him. However, before Archbell could reach the mission station Broadbent left due to ill health. Although Hodgson rebuilt the mission station in 1826 he later abandoned it and moved to Boetsap (Oberholster, 1972).</p>
January 1824	The Taung under their leader Moletsane attacked the Rolong-Seleka of Sefonela at their settlement in the vicinity of the Broadbent mission station. This attack was believed to have been in response to an earlier attack of the Rolong-Seleka on them. The Rolong-Seleka were forced to abandon their settlement, and eventually joined to the Rolong-Ratlou and Rolong-Tshidi at Phitsane on the Molopo River (Legassick, 2010). The mission station was also destroyed during the attack.
c. 1827	During this time the Taung under Moletsane crossed over the Vaal River from the south and settled along the Makwassie Stream. From here they undertook various attacks on the peripheral settlements and outposts of the Khumalo-Ndebele of Mzilikazi, who were established along the Magaliesberg Mountains further to the east (Bergh, 1998).
c. July 1829	The Khumalo-Ndebele attacked the Taung along the Makwassie Stream in response to an attack, which a combined Taung, Griqua and Koranna force had made the previous year on the Ndebele. The Taung were defeated and fled to the Modder River to the south (Bergh, 1998).
1839	<p>In 1839 the town and district of Potchefstroom were established (Bergh, 1998). This followed on the arrival of the Voortrekkers in the wider landscape during 1836.</p> <p>The establishment of a Voortrekker town at Potchefstroom led to the increasing expansion of white farms toward the west. As a result, the 1840s saw the establishment of the first white farms along the Makwassie Stream. Some of the earliest farms on the eastern bank of the Makwassie Stream</p>

DATE	DESCRIPTION
	included Vlakfontein, Rietfontein, Zedelingsfontein and Goedvoorzicht (Bergh, 1998). These farms are all located north of Wolmaransstad.
1841 - 1850	During this time the establishment of farms by Voortrekkers expanded from Potchefstroom and reached the Makwassie Stream (Bergh, 1998).
April - June 1871	<p>An arbitration commission held hearings in Bloemhof during this period. The commission was asked to provide an arbitrated solution to the exact position of the western boundary of the <i>Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek</i>. It came because of increasing levels of disagreement and discontent between the Z.A.R. on the one hand, and the Rolong, Tlhaping and the Koranna (amongst others) on the other. The commission comprised the British magistrate at Klipdrif, John Campbell and the Z.A.R. magistrate of Wakkerstroom, A.A. O' Reilly. When the two individuals failed to reach an agreement, the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, R.W. Keate, was asked to provide the final recommendations of the commission.</p> <p>Near the study area the Keate Award (as Keate's findings are referred to) defined the western boundary of the Z.A.R. along the Makwassie Stream (Bergh, 1998). This means that the study area now fell outside of the Z.A.R.</p>
1881	After the end of the Anglo-Transvaal War (also referred to the First Boer War), which terminated the two-year British annexation of the Z.A.R., the Pretoria Convention of 1881 redefined the western boundary of the Z.A.R. The recommendations of the convention were largely based on the investigations undertaken by Lieutenant-Colonel C.J. Moysey who had been appointed by the British government during the previous year to investigate the Keate Award of 1871 through map surveys and field assessments. According to the recommendations of the Pretoria Convention the western boundary of the Z.A.R. was moved from the Makwassie Spruit to roughly the Harts River. In 1884 the western boundary of the Z.A.R. was again moved further west as a result of the recommendations of the London Convention (Bergh, 1998).
19 August 1884	The government of the <i>Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek</i> (Z.A.R.) provided permission for a town to be established in the Makwassie ward. This permission came as a result of the investigations undertaken by J.M.A. Wolmarans and Commandant Piet Cronjé of Potchefstroom. Although stands for the town were already being laid out in 1888, a dispute arose as to exactly where the new town should be established. The three disputed localities for the new town were Witpoort in the east, portions of the farms Rooderand and Vlakfontein in the centre and Leeufontein in the west. When President Paul Kruger heard of the dispute, he paid a visit to the area and personally viewed each of the three possibilities. Before he returned to Pretoria, he decided that the town would be laid out on the western bank of the Makwassie Stream on portions of the farms Rooderand and Vlakfontein. On 16 February 1891 the town of Wolmaransstad was officially proclaimed by the government of the Z.A.R (Van Zijl, 1966).
1899 – 1902	A number of significant events can be associated with the general vicinity of the study area during the South African War.

DATE	DESCRIPTION
	<p>The town of Wolmaransstad was occupied by Republican forces at the beginning of 1901 and shortly thereafter a military court known as the <i>Militaire Hof voor de Westelijke Districten der ZAR</i> was established by the Boer authorities. The reason for the establishment of an almost permanent court in the town was due to the fact that Wolmaransstad was not connected to the railway system and as a result British forces only occupied the town for short periods of time. Although the court proceedings took place under difficult circumstances due to the effect of war and numerous attacks on the town, a large number of cases were tried. Of specific interest is that the court had jurisdiction in terms of Boer forces and men in both the Z.A.R. and Free State Republic. Boer general and later prime minister of South Africa, General Jan Smuts, referred to this court as the start of a united South Africa because of its jurisdiction over international boundaries between the Boer republics. However, the British viewed the court in a completely different light and after the war numerous attempts were made to have at least some members of the court charged with war crimes (Blake, 2010).</p> <p>During the war the nearby town of Wolmaransstad was attacked and occupied by the British on a number of occasions. One of these attacks took place on 5 March 1901 when a British column under Lord Methuen attacked the town. The column then turned south intending to assist the British garrison at Hoopstad. However, a skirmish developed with the local Boer commando between Wolmaransstad and the Vaal River. The British eventually managed to reach Commando Drift but found the river in flood and had to follow the bank of the river for almost 10 days before eventually reaching Fourteen Streams (Van Zijl, 1966).</p> <p>Two more attacks on Wolmaransstad took place on 17 December 1901 and 28 December 1901. On 10 February 1902 Lieutenant-Colonel Von Donop occupied the town again after receiving instructions to do so from Lord Methuen. He remained in town for roughly a month (Van Zijl, 1966).</p>
c. 1910	<p>The town of Makwassie (also known as Maquassi) was established during this time. The establishment of the town was as a result of the work undertaken by local shopkeeper Charles Cherrie. The first health committee of the town had Cherry as chairman and R. Reid, J. Lamont, H. Bloch as well as P. Quin as members. The secretary was Jack Wride (Van Zijl, 1966).</p>
1911	<p>The discovery and proclamation of an extensive diamond field at Mooifontein (north-west of Bloemhof) in 1911 attracted roughly 5,000 people to these diggings with other 1,200 fortune seekers setting their sights on the Bloemhof townlands. By the end of the year the two fields had yielded more than 37,000 carats, a yield that was maintained for the following two years as well (Van Onselen, 1996).</p>
1914 - 1915	<p>Even before the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, the Union of South Africa's responsibility to Britain in such a war was the subject of a heated debate for quite some time. With the outbreak of hostilities the South African Government of General Louis Botha notified Britain of their willingness to assist in the war effort.</p> <p>Many of the Afrikaans people found it intolerable that South Africa should assist their erstwhile enemy in her international conflicts and more so against a country with which they still had very strong ties. Subsequently many of them rose up in armed rebellion under the leadership of former</p>

DATE	DESCRIPTION
	<p>Boer Generals such as Christiaan de Wet and J.C.G. Kemp. Another such a rebellion leader was Boer War leader General Christiaan Frederik Beyers who at the time was the commander of the Union Defence Force. After resigning his post he became one of the leaders of the rebellion.</p> <p>He instructed the members of his commando that they should never be the first to shoot at government troops. As a result he spent most of his time as rebel leader on the move to stay ahead of the government troops. Eventually his commando only comprised 25 men and they were chased without recourse from Kroonstad to the Vaal River. On the morning of 8 December 1914 government troops attacked the commando where they were camped in close vicinity to the Vaal River on the Free State farm Greyling's. In an attempt to allow their leader to escape, 23 members of the commando resisted while Beyers and Jan Pieterse tried to cross over the Vaal River on horseback. The river was however in flood and both men drowned (Van Zijl, 1966).</p> <p>As the South African government did not want to allow the family of General Beyers to bury him in Makwassie, he was buried in the Van Zijl family cemetery on the farm Oersonskraal 207 HO directly east of present-day Makwassie. Pieterse was buried on the Free State side of the river (Möller, n.d.).</p> <p>Van Onselen (1996) indicates that on 1 November 1914 a skirmish took place between rebels under the command of P.J.K. van Vuuren and government troops on the farm Zoutpan 212 HO. Another skirmish took place shortly thereafter at the railway siding by the name of Kingswood.</p>
October 1918	<p>The Influenza Pandemic reached the general vicinity of the study area during this time. In his book <i>The Seed of Mine</i> Dr. Charles van Onselen (1996) relates how the crowded and unsanitary diamond diggings dotted across the wider landscape, resulted in large numbers of fatalities. At the diggings on the farms Kameelkuil 88 HO and London 112 hundreds of people died. One eyewitness account reveals how dozens of corpses were buried in mass graves near these diggings. As people started leaving the diggings out of fear of getting infected, they brought the disease to their homesteads, villages and farms. Many of these returning workers also died along the roads on their way home and were often buried where they died. The farms themselves were also not immune to the disease and many people died because of it on the farms as well (Van Onselen, 1996).</p>
1920	<p>The Town Leeudoringstad was established.</p>
1922	<p>The diamond diggings in the wider vicinity were expanded in 1922 with the proclamation of Kareepoort 210 HO (with a number of other farms in the district which appears to have included Oersonskraal, Boskuil and Kareepan) as alluvial diggings. Thousands of white and black unemployed flocked to these diggings. On the farm Kareepoort a number of informal 'locations' comprising clusters of makeshift shanties and cabins sprung up. These included Fly Camp, Velskoen, Vuilkantien and Rooistad (Van Onselen, 1996).</p>
1932	<p>17 July 1932 when a train carrying 320 to 330 tons of dynamite from the De Beers factory at Somerset West to the Witwatersrand exploded and flattened the town of Leeudoringstad.</p>

in Klerksdorp, Northwest Province. - **The study area was situated approximately 48km north of the current study area. No sites of any cultural heritage significance were recorded.**

- VAN SCHALKWYK, J., 2013. Heritage impact Assessment for the proposed development of a PV Power Plant on a portion of the farm Matjesspruit 145HP, Leeudoringstad Region, North West Province. - **The study area was situated 8km south west to the current study area. Graves, historical structures and stone age material was recorded.**
- DREYER. C., 2014. First phase archaeological and historical investigation of the proposed Eskom Power Line at Brakspruit near Klerksdorp, North West Province. – **The study area was situated approximately 50km north west of the current study area. Two large graveyards were recorded.**
- PELSER, A. J., 2015. Phase 1 HIA report for the proposed Wolmaransstad extension 17 Township Development on the remaining extent of Portion 32 of the farm Wolmaransstad Town and Townlands 184HO, Wolmaransstad, Northwest Province. - **The study area was situated approximately 30km west of the current study area. Several historical structures and Stone Age material were located.**
- VAN der WALT, J., 2017. Archaeological Impact Assessment for the proposed Orkney Solar Farm, North West Province. - **The study area was situated approximately 48km north east to the current study area. Two cemeteries, widely dispersed scatters of isolated MSA tools, one stone cairn of unknown purpose and the foundations of 7 demolished structures (farm labourer dwellings) were identified.**
- Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd, 2020. Phase 1 HIA For Mining Right Application On The Farm Kafferskraal 400 IP, Klerksdorp, In City Of Matlosana Local Municipality, North West Province - **The study area was situated approximately 45km north east of the current study area. A LIA site with three stone walled clusters and seven burial sites were located.**
- PELSER, A. J., 2021. Phase 1 HIA report for the proposed Township establishment (Flimedia Extension 3) on portion 127 & 128 of the Farm Elandsheuvel 402IP City of Matlosana Local Municipality (Klerksdorp), Northwest Province. - **The study area was situated approximately 45km north-east of the current study area. Two low significance sites, one recent structure and one MSA/LSA scatter, were recorded.**
- VAN der WALT, J., 2022. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Doornhoek 1 PV Facility and associated infrastructure, Klerksdorp, North West Province. - **The study area was situated approximately 45km north west of the current study area. Heritage finds in the area are limited to ruins and a low-density scatter of Stone Age material outside of the Project footprint.**

7.3.2 *Previous Archaeological and Heritage Studies Associated with the Current Project*

- PGS Heritage Pty Ltd, 2021a. HIA: Development of the 9.9MW Leeuwbosch 1 Solar PV Plant, 9.9MW Leeuwbosch 2 Solar PV Plant and Associated infrastructure near Leeudoringstad in the North West Province. – **“The fieldwork identified 13 heritage resources in the greater study area of the Leeuwbosch 1 and 2 Solar PV projects, however, none of the heritage resources identified are within the development footprint of Leeuwbosch 1 Solar PV or Leeuwbosch 2 Solar PV, as the layout design took the position of these resources into consideration”. Square single stone packed foundations, ash middens, burial ground, and a historic handling kraal were recorded.**




Figure 11: Extract of the 1 in 250 000 SAHRIS PalaeoMap (Council of Geosciences) indicates that the proposed development is underlain by sediments with a Low (blue) Palaeontological Sensitivity.

It is thus considered that the proposed development will not lead to detrimental impacts on the palaeontological resources of the area. The construction and operation of the project may be authorised, as the whole extent of the development footprint is not considered sensitive in terms of palaeontological heritage. If fossil remains or trace fossils are discovered during any phase of construction, either on the surface or exposed by excavations the Chance Find Procedure must be implemented immediately and the Environmental Control Officer (ECO) in charge of these developments must report to SAHRA (Contact details: SAHRA, 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town. PO Box 4637, Cape Town 8000, South Africa. Tel: 021 462 4502. Fax: +27 (0)21 462 4509. Web: www.sahra.org.za) so that mitigation can be carry out by a palaeontologist.

Before any fossil material can be collected from the development site the specialist involved would need to apply for a collection permit from SAHRA. Fossil material must be housed in an official collection (museum or university), while all reports and fieldwork should meet the minimum standards for palaeontological impact studies proposed by SAHRA (2012). These recommendations should be incorporated into the Environmental Management Plan for the proposed development.

It is consequently recommended that no further palaeontological heritage studies, ground truthing and/or specialist mitigation are required pending the discovery of newly discovered fossils.

7.4.2 Heritage Screening

A Heritage Screening Report was compiled using the DFFE National Web-based Environmental Screening Tool as required by Regulation 16(1)(v) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2014, as amended. According to the Heritage screening report, the directly affected area has a **low** sensitivity rating (**Figure 4**). The field work in the study area demonstrates that only one burial ground warrants conservation. Therefore, in the case of this study area, the DFFE screening tool sensitivity map is only partly supported based on the findings of this fieldwork

7.4.3 Heritage Sensitivity

The sensitivity maps were produced by overlying:

- Satellite Imagery;
- Current Topographical Maps;
- First edition Topographical Maps dating from the 1940's

This enabled the identification of possible heritage sensitive areas around the proposed development area. No heritage features were identified.

Observation of the previous heritage reports has shown that archaeological sites are in abundance in the surrounding areas and especially near certain landscape features. This factor needs to be held in consideration.

7.4.4 Possible Heritage Finds

The evaluation of satellite imagery and the analysis of the studies previously undertaken in the area has indicated that certain areas may be sensitive from a heritage perspective. The analysis of the studies conducted in the area assisted in the development of the following landform to heritage find matrix in **Table 5**.

Table 5: Landform type to heritage find matrix

Landform Type	Heritage Type
Crest and foot hill	LSA and MSA scatters, LIA settlements
Crest of small hills	Small LSA sites – scatters of stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell, pottery and beads

Watering holes/Pans/Rivers	LSA sites, LIA settlements
Farmsteads	Historical archaeological material
Ridges and drainage lines	LSA sites, LIA settlements

The findings can be compiled and combined to produce a heritage sensitivity map for the project based on the desktop assessment. However in the case of this project, no heritage sensitivities were located.

8. FIELDWORK FINDINGS

A survey of the study area was conducted from the 6th – 7th June 2023. One archaeologist and one field technician from PGS conducted a vehicle and foot-survey of the proposed development area. The fieldwork was logged with GPS devices to provide a tracklog of the area covered (**Figure 12**).

The fieldwork identified two heritage finds that were then classified as LSA and burial grounds. The fieldwork confirmed the presence of 1 LSA site (**LT001**) and 1 burial ground (**LT002**) that may be affected by the proposed development (**Figure 13**).

See **Section 11** for a discussion regarding the site-specific mitigation measures and the Guidelines for the Management Plan.

Refer to **Appendix B** for full site descriptions (incl. photographs).



Figure 12: Track log recordings from the field assessment.




Figure 13: Locality of the heritage resources identified within the study area. See inset A below.

8.1 Sites

Table 6: Heritage Resources identified during the field survey

Site Nr	Site Co-ordinates		Time Period	Brief Site Description	Grading	Heritage Significance
	x	y				
LT001	26.287591°	-27.199714°	Archaeological period	Small exposed LSA scatter – Exposed from prospecting excavations	Grade 3 - C (IIIC)	Low
LT002	26.310041°	-27.197675°	Historical Period	Burial ground of approximately 10 graves, located directly outside of the proposed project area	Grade 3 - A (IIIA) –	High



Figure 14: LSA flakes from LT001.



Figure 15: General view of the cemetery at LT002.

9. IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS

The fieldwork findings have shown that the study area is devoid of significant heritage sites apart from site LT002 which occurs directly outside of the proposed area. From the proposed location of the SEF, the cultural significance of the heritage resources and their context may be impacted by proximity to the development area.

Archaeological remains are rare objects, often preserved due to unusual circumstances and are non-renewable resources. When a development is proposed, and specialist studies are undertaken as part of the wider evaluation of heritage resources, this provides an opportunity into a depository that would not otherwise exist. In this sense the impact is POSITIVE for archaeology if efforts are made to preserve or mitigate heritage resources in the study footprint, prior to and during the construction phase of the development. For this reason, four development scenarios, informed by EIA constraints are considered in this study, including the no-development / no-go option.

The general nature of impacts from the proposed development will be visual regarding spatial and built heritage, and physical with regard to archaeological heritage resources. Mitigation measures for heritage resources will be recommended to mitigate impacts.

9.1 General Observations

In this section, an assessment will be made of the impact of the proposed development on the identified heritage sites. An overlay of all the heritage sites identified during the fieldwork over the proposed development footprint areas was made to assess the impact of the proposed development on these identified heritage sites. This overlay resulted in the following observations:

The following general observations will apply for the impact assessment undertaken in this report:

- The impact assessment rating is based on the rating scale as contained in **Appendix C**.
- A low density Stone Age scatter (**LT001**) of low heritage significance was located within the proposed development, however no mitigation is required for this site.
- A burial ground (**LT002**) of high heritage significance, were located directly outside of the proposed development area. As a result, an impact is expected from the proposed development on these sites.
- It is necessary to realise that the heritage resources located during the fieldwork do not necessarily represent all the possible heritage resources present within the area. Various factors account for this, including the size of the study area and the subterranean nature of some heritage sites. The impact assessment conducted for heritage sites assumes the possibility of finding heritage resources during the project life and has been conducted as such.

- Four project phases have been identified by SiVEST namely the design phase, construction phase, operation phase and decommissioning phase. As site clearing activities of the development footprint areas are grouped under the Construction Phase, the highest level of impact on the identified heritage sites is expected during this phase. No impacts are expected during the Design, Operational and decommissioning Phases. All the identified heritage sites are expected to be destroyed in terms of the pre-mitigation impact assessments undertaken below, whereas only those sites not mitigated by amendments to the proposed development footprints will also be destroyed in terms of the post-mitigation impact assessment calculations undertaken below.

The following impact rating tables are based on the proposed SEF development layout within the region.

9.2 Pre-construction

Table 7: Assessment of the Impact of Proposed SEF on Heritage Sites

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION										RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION									
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S	E		P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		
Pre-Construction Phase																						
Late Stone Age scatter (LT001)	The Stone Age scatter was exposed as a result of prospecting in the area and a low density scatter <10/50m2	1	3	4	2	4	1	14	-	Low	No Mitigation required	1	3	4	2	4	1	14	-	Low		
Burial Ground (LT002)	The burial Ground is located directly out side of the project boundry. The proposed construction of the SEF and associated infrastructure may impact this site	2	3	4	4	4	2	34	-	Medium	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The site should be demarcated with a 50-meter no-go-buffer-zone and the graves should be avoided and left in situ. If the site is going to be impacted directly and the graves need to be removed a grave relocation process for these sites is recommended as a mitigation and management measure. This will involve the necessary social consultation and public participation process before grave relocation permits can be applied for with SAHRA under the NHRA and National Health Act regulations. 	2	1	4	4	4	1	15	-	Low		

Table 8: Assessment of paleontological heritage impacts for the proposed Leeudoringstad SEF (Construction Phase)

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT / NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS	S		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS	S
Construction Phase																				
Fossil heritage resources	Disturbance, damage or destruction of fossils at or beneath the ground surface due to surface clearance and bedrock excavations	1	2	4	4	4	2	30	-	Medium	Chance Fossil Finds Procedure during construction phase.	1	2	4	4	4	1	15	-	Low

10. COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

No alternatives for the SEF were assessed. The entire proposed area was considered during the site visit and impact assessment.

10.1 The No-Go Alternative

Environmental and heritage legislation requires the consideration of the no-go option. There will be impacts as the project would not proceed. There would also be no socio-economic benefits or increase in energy generation of renewable energy sources.

11. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

11.1 Construction Phase

The project will encompass a range of activities during the construction phase, including vegetation clearance, excavations and infrastructure development associated with the project.

It is possible that cultural material will be exposed during construction and may be recoverable, keeping in mind delays can be costly during construction and as such must be minimised. Development surrounding infrastructure and construction of facilities results in significant disturbance, however foundation holes do offer a window into the past, and it thus may be possible to rescue some of the data and materials. It is also possible that substantial alterations will be implemented during this phase of the project, and these must be catered for. Temporary infrastructure developments are often changed or added to the project as required. In general, these are low impact developments as they are superficial, resulting in little alteration of the land surface, but still need to be catered for.

During the construction phase, it is important to recognize any significant material being unearthed, making the correct judgment on which actions should be taken. It is recommended that the following chance find procedure should be implemented.

11.2 Chance Finds Procedure

- A heritage practitioner / archaeologist should be appointed to develop a heritage induction program and conduct training for the ECO as well as team leaders in the identification of heritage resources and artefacts.

- An appropriately qualified heritage practitioner / archaeologist must be identified to be called upon if any possible heritage resources or artefacts are identified.
- Should an archaeological site or cultural material be discovered during construction (or operation), the area should be demarcated, and construction activities halted.
- The qualified heritage practitioner / archaeologist will then need to come out to the site and evaluate the extent and importance of the heritage resources and make the necessary recommendations for mitigating the find and the impact on the heritage resource.
- The contractor therefore should have some sort of contingency plan so that operations could move elsewhere temporarily while the materials and data are recovered.
- Construction can commence as soon as the site has been cleared and signed off by the heritage practitioner / archaeologist.

11.3 Possible finds during construction

The study area occurs within a greater historical and archaeological site as identified during the desktop and fieldwork phase. Soil clearance for infrastructure as well as the proposed development activities, could uncover the following:

- Historical homestead remains
- Unmarked graves
- Stone Age archaeology

11.4 Timeframes

It must be kept in mind that mitigation and monitoring of heritage resources discovered during construction activity will require permitting for collection or excavation of heritage resources and lead times must be worked into the construction time frames. **Table 9** gives guidelines for lead times on permitting.

Table 9: Lead times for permitting and mobilisation

Action	Responsibility	Timeframe
Preparation for field monitoring and finalisation of contracts	The contractor and service provider	1 month
Application for permits to do necessary mitigation work	Service provider – Archaeologist and SAHRA	3 months
Documentation, excavation and archaeological report on the relevant site	Service provider – Archaeologist	3 months
Handling of chance finds – Graves/Human Remains	Service provider – Archaeologist and SAHRA	2 weeks
Relocation of burial grounds or graves in the way of construction	Service provider – Archaeologist, SAHRA, local government and provincial government	6 months

11.5 Heritage Management Plan for EMPr implementation

Table 10: Heritage Management Plan for EMPr implementation

Area and site no.	Mitigation measures	Phase	Timeframe	The responsible party for implementation	Monitoring Party (frequency)	Target	Performance indicators (monitoring tool)
General project area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement chance find procedures in cases where possible heritage finds are uncovered. 	Pre-construction and Construction	During construction and operation	Applicant ECO Heritage Specialist	ECO (monthly / as or when required)	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation recommendations from SAHRA under Section 34-36 and 38 of NHRA	ECO Monthly Checklist/Report
LSA site (LT001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Mitigation required for this site, however If large quantities of Stone Age remains are discovered during construction, either on the surface or exposed by fresh excavations the Chance Find Protocol must be implemented by the ECO in charge of these developments. 	Construction	Prior to and during construction	Applicant ECO	Applicant ECO	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 36 and 38 of NHRA	ECO Monthly Checklist/Report
Burial ground (LT002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should be demarcated with a 50-meter no-go-buffer-zone and the graves should be avoided and left in situ. If the site is going to be impacted directly and the graves need to be removed a grave relocation process for these sites is recommended as a mitigation and management measure. This will involve the necessary social consultation and public participation process before grave relocation permits can be applied for with SAHRA under the NHRA and National Health Act regulations. 	Construction	Prior to and during construction	Applicant ECO	Applicant ECO	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 36 and 38 of NHRA	ECO Monthly Checklist/Report

Area and site no.	Mitigation measures	Phase	Timeframe	The responsible party for implementation	Monitoring Party (frequency)	Target	Performance indicators (monitoring tool)
Palaeontological finds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If fossil remains are discovered during construction, either on the surface or exposed by fresh excavations the Chance Find Protocol must be implemented by the ECO in charge of these developments. 	Construction	During construction	Applicant ECO Palaeontologist	Monthly	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35 of NHRA	ECO Monthly Checklist/Report

12. CONCLUSION

PGS was appointed by SIVEST, on behalf of Upgrade Energy to undertake a HSA as part of the S&EIA process for the proposed construction of the Lion Thorn SEF in the North West Province of South Africa.

Heritage resources are unique and non-renewable and as such any impact on such resources must be seen as significant.

The fieldwork conducted for the evaluation of the possible impact of the Lion Thorn SEF has revealed the presence of 2 heritage resources.

Archaeological features

One (1) Stone Age site find spot (**LT001**) of a low-density Stone Age surface artefact scatter rated as having low heritage significance was located. This is from the Later Stone Age (LSA). This site was located within a previously excavated area, believed to be for diamond prospection (relayed during conversation with the landowner) so the sites scientific potential and heritage significance is somewhat lowered. Based on findings from a range of other heritage reports in the area, these types of sites are to be expected in this region.

Burial ground

One (1) burial ground (**LT002**) was identified and rated as having high heritage significance.

12.1 Palaeontological Desktop Study

As per the palaeontological desktop assessment (Butler, 2023), the proposed Lion Thorn Solar PV and grid infrastructure development is underlain by the Allanridge Formation (Ventersdorp Supergroup). Updated Geology compiled by the Council of Geosciences (Pretoria) also indicates that the development is underlain by the Allanridge Formation of the Ventersdorp Supergroup. The PalaeoMap on the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) database indicates that the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the Allanridge Formation is Zero (grey) (Almond and Pether 2008, SAHRIS website).

A Low Palaeontological Significance has thus been allocated to the project.

It is thus considered that the proposed development will not lead to detrimental impacts on the palaeontological resources of the area. The construction and operation of the project may be authorised, as the whole extent of the development footprint is not considered sensitive in terms of palaeontological heritage. If fossil remains or trace fossils are discovered during any phase of construction, either on the surface or exposed by excavations the Chance Find Procedure must be implemented immediately and the Environmental Control Officer (ECO) in charge of these developments must report to SAHRA (Contact details:

SAHRA, 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town. PO Box 4637, Cape Town 8000, South Africa. Tel: 021 462

SIVEST Environmental

Prepared by: PGS Heritage Pty Ltd for SiVEST

Project Description: Proposed 200MWac Lion Thorn Solar Photovoltaic Facility and Electrical Grid - HIA

Version No. 1.0

4502. Fax: +27 (0)21 462 4509. Web: www.sahra.org.za) so that mitigation can be carry out by a palaeontologist.

Before any fossil material can be collected from the development site the specialist involved would need to apply for a collection permit from SAHRA. Fossil material must be housed in an official collection (museum or university), while all reports and fieldwork should meet the minimum standards for palaeontological impact studies proposed by SAHRA (2012). These recommendations should be incorporated into the Environmental Management Plan for the proposed development.

It is consequently recommended that no further palaeontological heritage studies, ground truthing and/or specialist mitigation are required pending the discovery of newly discovered fossils

12.2 Anticipated impacts

The design and construction phase of the proposed development will entail surface clearance as well as excavations into the superficial sediment cover and underlying bedrock (e.g., for powerlines and new access roads).

The entire proposed area of the project (no alternatives) were assessed during the site visit and impact assessment. The proposed area is considered acceptable subject to the recommended mitigation.

From an archaeological and historical structure perspective, the final proposed layout will not change the impact on the identified heritage resources from the initial field assessment. The possible construction impacts calculated on the tangible cultural heritage resources is overall **MODERATE NEGATIVE** rating but with the implementation of the recommended buffers and management guidelines will be reduced to a **LOW NEGATIVE** impact.

12.3 Recommendations

The calculated impact as summarised in **Section 9** of this report confirms the impact of the proposed powerline will be reduced with the implementation of the mitigation measures. This finding in addition to the implementation of a chance finds procedure, as part of the EMPr, will mitigate possible impacts on unidentified heritage resources. **The following mitigation measures will be required:**

- Kusel, U., 2006. Cultural Heritage Resources Impact Assessment of Goudkoppie Klerksdorp Northwest Province
- Kusel, U., 2007. Cultural Heritage Resources Impact Assessment of Goedvoorzicht 242 IP Hartbeesfontein, North west Province.
- Legassick, M. 2010. The politics of a South African frontier: the Griqua, the Sotho-Tswana and the missionaries, 1780 – 1840. Basler Afrika Bibliographien, Basel.
- Mason, R.J. 1969. The Oppermandrif Dam Archaeological Project: Vaal Basin in The South African Archaeological Bulletin, Vol. 24, No. 95/96, pp. 182-192.
- Morris, D. 2008. Archaeological and Heritage Phase 1, Impact Assessment for proposed upgrading of Sishen Mine Diesel Depot Storage Capacity at Kathu, Northern Cape. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.
- Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. (eds) (2006). The vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. Strelitzia 19. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.
- Oberholster, J.J. 1970. The Historical Monuments of South Africa. National Monuments Council, Cape Town.
- Pelser, A. J., 2012a. Report on a Phase 1 HIA for the Alabama Extension 4 Township Development on the remaining extent of portion 1 of Town & Townlands of Klerksdorp 424IP near Klerksdorp (Matlosana), Northwest Province.
- Pelser, A. J., 2012b. Report on a Phase 1 HIA for the Proposed Matlosana Estate & Uraniaville Ext 2 developments on various portions of portion 1 of the Farm Town & Townlands of Klerksdorp 424IP in Klerksdorp, Northwest Province.
- Pelser, A. J., 2015. Phase 1 HIA report for the proposed Wolmaransstad extension 17 Township Development on the remaining extent of Portion 32 of the farm Wolmaransstad Town and Townlands 184HO, Wolmaransstad, Northwest Province.
- Pelser, A. J., 2021. Phase 1 HIA report for the proposed Township establishment (Flimedia Extension 3) on portion 127 & 128 of the Farm Elandsheuvel 402IP City of Matlosana Local Municipality (Klerksdorp), Northwest Province.
- PGS Heritage Pty Ltd, 2021a. HIA: Development of the 9.9MW Leeuwbosch 1 Solar PV Plant, 9.9MW Leeuwbosch 2 Solar PV Plant and Associated infrastructure near Leeudoringstad in the North West Province.

PGS Heritage Pty Ltd, 2021b. HIA: Development of the 9.9MW Wildebeestkuil 1 Solar PV Plant & 132kV Power line, 9.9MW Wildebestkuil 2 Solar PV Plant & 132kV Power line and Associated infrastructure near Leeudoringstad in the North West Province.

PGS Heritage Pty Ltd, 2021c. HIA: Proposed Development of the 132/11kV Leeudoringstad Solar Plant Substation near Leeudoringstad in the North West Province.

Smith, B. 2011. Unpublished letter on information contained in the database of the Rock Art Research Institute, University of the Witwatersrand.

Van der Walt, J., 2007. AIA, Township development on Sub division of AH 19, Pretoriuskraal, Orkney, North West Province

Van der Walt, J., 2015. Archaeological scoping report for the proposed Orkney, north West province.

Van der Walt, J., 2017. Archaeological Impact Assessment for the proposed Orkney Solar Farm, North West Province.

Van der Walt, J., 2022. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Doornhoek 1 PV Facility and associated infrastructure, Klerksdorp, North West Province.

Van Onselen, C. 1996. The Seed is Mine: the life of Kas Maine. David Philip, Cape Town.

Van Schalkwyk, J., 2013. Heritage impact Assessment for the proposed development of a PV Power Plant on a portion of the farm Matjesspruit 145HP, Leeudoringstad Region, North West Province.

Van Zijl, P.H.S. 1966. Die Geskiedenis van Wolmaransstad. Die Wolmaransstadse Kultuurvereniging

13.1 Internet

DNGI GEOSPATIAL PORTAL

Council of Geoscience: Geology of South Africa Interactive Online Map

www.nwpg.gov.za

www.sanbi.org

www.wikipedia.org

13.2 Google Earth

All the aerial depictions and overlays used in this report are from Google Earth.



APPENDIX A – CV

PROFESSIONAL CURRICULUM VITAE FOR JESSICA ANGEL

Professional Archaeologist for PGS Heritage

Personal Details

- **Name:** Jessica
- **Surname:** Angel
- **Date of Birth:** 25-12-1983
- **Citizenship:** South African
- **Gender:** Female
- **Marital Status:** Single
- **Languages Spoken:** English and Afrikaans
- **Drivers Licence** Code B – competent 4x4 driver
- **First Aid** (Level 1)
- **Snake Handling and snake bite first aid** (March 2019. African Snakebite Institute – Johan Marias)

Education History

- **2002:** Matriculated from Northcliff High School with the following subjects: English, Afrikaans, Mathematics, Science, Biology and Art.
- **2005:** Completed BA at University of the Witwatersrand with Geography and Archaeology Majors.
- **2006:** Completed BSc Hons (Geography) at the University of the Witwatersrand with the following subjects: Environmental Management, Advanced Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Paleogeomorphology and Globalisation and Agro Food Restructuring.
- **2009 – 2013:** M.Sc Archaeology and Geography, with thesis title: *Mpumalanga Late Iron Age: Incorporating Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Archaeological Data to Better Understand Spatial and Temporal Distribution of Past Societies.* (Graduated March 2014).

Employment History

- **2015 – current:** Senior Archaeologist – PGS Heritage
- **2012-2013:** Basic internship at PGS. Duties include gaining familiarity with gathering relevant background data, field surveys, exhumations and report writing.
- **2013:** Heritage work at NGT. Background research, report writing and ground surveys.
- **2011:** Research Assistant: GIS work for Prof Karim Sadr. Duties include: Google Earth survey work and digitising. (Sadr, K & Rodier, X. 2012. Google Earth, GIS and stone-walled structures in southern Gauteng, South Africa. *Journal of Archaeological Science* xxx: 1-9)

Experience in the field of archaeology:

2012:

- First Phase Heritage Assessment. Belfast, Mpumalanga
- First Phase Heritage Assessment. Delareyville, Stone Age survey
- Heritage Assessment. Belfast Mpumalanga, Ndebele initiation site.

2013:

- Second Phase Impact Assessment. Pretoria East, Gauteng. Documentation and mapping the layout of an Iron Age site.
- Final Phase Impact Assessment. Grave Exhumation. Chlorkop, Gauteng
- First Phase Heritage Assessment. Belfast, Mpumalanga. Exxaro Paardeplaats Project.
- Grave Exhumation. Mafikeng. University of Pretoria research.
- First Phase Heritage Assessment. Port Nolloth, Namaqualand. Powerline.

2015

- Heritage inventory of the Ekuruleni area for Auracon
- Heritage Impact assessment, Heilbron, Freestate
- Second Phase Heritage Impact assessment. Documentation of an Iron age site, Rustenburg.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Mining of the farm Zandvoort 10. Carolina, Mpumalanga. (SAHRIS CaseID:11952)
- Heritage Impact Assessment. The Rand en Dal Ext13 proposed development on Portion 29 of the Farm Paardeplaats117 IQ, Krugersdorp, Gauteng. (SAHRIS CaseID:7176)
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Jeanette Project. Welkom, Freestate.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Sendawo 75MW Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Energy Facility. Vryburg, North West Province. (SAHRIS CaseID:9116)
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Tlisitseng 75MW Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Energy Facility. Lichtenburg, North West Province. (SAHRIS CaseID:9119)
- Second Phase Heritage Mitigation. Clanwilliam Dam Project. Clanwilliam, Western Cape. Heritage management and mitigation of 90 archaeological and historical sites that are to be impacted by the Raising of the Clanwilliam Dam wall. (Collections manager: three year contract).

2016

- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Ngwedi Loop. Rustenburg, North West Province
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed N2 Bypass. Butterworth, Eastern Cape

- Heritage Impact. Sibanye Gold Proposed PV Plant. Westonaria, Gauteng
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed City Parks Wetlands. Middle Soweto, Gauteng.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Newtown Development. Pilgrimsrest, Mpumalanga.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed development of the Platberg Wind Energy Facility and supporting electrical infrastructure. Victoria West, Northern Cape. (SAHRIS CaseID:9301)
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Aletta and Eureka Wind Energy Facility (WEF). Copperton, Northern Cape. (SAHRIS CaseID:9810)
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed upgrade of the Newlands Bulk Water Supply Scheme. East London, Eastern Cape.
- Heritage Impact Assessment, Leeuwbosch 44, Leeudoringstad, North West Province. Proposed construction of the 5MW Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Power Plant. (SAHRIS CaseID:10407)
- Heritage Impact Assessment, Wildebeestkuil 59, Leeudoringstad, North West Province. Proposed construction of the 5MW Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Power Plant.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed development of four Leeuwsberg Wind Farms for the Associated Grid Connection near Loeriesfontein, Northern Cape Province. (SAHRIS CaseID:12081, 12082, 12078, 12077)
- Heritage Fatal Flaw Assessment, for the inclusion in the Environmental Screening Investigation for the Proposed Arnot New Ash Disposal Facility, Mpumalanga.
- Heritage Walk Down and Management Plan. Upgrading of the 66KV Network to a 132KV Network in the Hotazel, Kuruman and Kathu Area, Northern Cape Province. Post Authorisation Walkdown from Mothibistad Substation to Sekgame Switching Station. (SAHRIS CaseID:11967)
- Heritage Screening of Portion 9 of the Farm Grootfontein 394 JR, Tswane, Gauteng.
- Second Phase Heritage Mitigation. Mitigation work required with respect to the heritage find PGS06 on the remainder of the farm number 469, Hay District (Registration division), Tsantsabane Local Municipality, Northern Cape Province, in respect to the ACWA Power Solar reserve, Redstone Solar Thermal Power Plant. (SAHRIS CaseID:10081)
- Second Phase Heritage Mitigation. Clanwilliam Dam Project. Continued from 2015

2017

- Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Lanseria Outfall Sewer, Johannesburg. (SAHRIS CaseID:11397)
- Heritage Study. Proposed opencast Mining on the Farm Kwaggafontein 8 IT, near Carolina, Mpumalanga Province. (SAHRIS CaseID:11952)
- Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed K60 Road Development, Rabie Ridge Gauteng.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Kimberly Ekapa Mining Joint Venture 2.8 Slimes Pipeline Project, Kimberly, Northern Cape Province.

- Heritage Screening and Site Assessment. MTK 39/2015/16 Mintek Derelict and Ownerless Mines Rehabilitation Programme 2016-2019. Msauli Mine, Steelpoort Mine, Penge Mine, Langerdraai Mine and Uitkuik Mine.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Phalandwa Extension Mine, Delmas, Mpumalanga.
- Site Assessment and Heritage Screening. Wadeville Extension 51. Township establishment and associated infrastructure development on Portion 273 and the remaining extent of Portion 267 on the Farm Klippoortjie 110 – IR. Ekurhuleni, Gauteng.
- Site assessment and Heritage Scoping. Proposed eMakhazeni Project near Belfast, Mpumalanga. (SAHRIS CaseID:12316)
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed extension of the mining operations at the existing Ilima Colliery (Old Pembani Colliery), Near Carolina, Mpumalanga. (SAHRIS CaseID:12793)
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Mlonzi Golf Estate and Hotel, near Lusikisiki, Eastern Cape.
- Second Phase Heritage Mitigation. Clanwilliam Dam Project. Continued from 2015

2018

- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Extension of the Mining Operations at the Existing Manungu Colliery, near Delmas, Mpumalanga.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Mashishing Housing Development, Lydenburg, Mpumalanga. (SAHRIS CaseID:12999)
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Phase 1B1 Thornhill Housing Development, Port Alfred, Eastern Cape Province.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Target to Freddies Pipeline, Allanridge, Freestate.
- Heritage Impact Assessment. Proposed Leslie Coal Mine near Leandra, Mpumalanga. (SAHRIS CaseID:12399)

2020

- Coega Zone 10, Coega IDZ, Eastern Cape Province. Colonial Period Phase 2 Mitigation Archaeological Excavation

2018 to 2023

- Presently employed on the Polihali Dam Project in Lesotho as Collections Manager (5 year contract).

The Polihali Dam Project is a 2nd Phase CRM operation in mitigation of total inundation of a range of cultural sites, including extant, historical and Stone Age sites. Nine (9) APC and thirty one (31) LSA sites are earmarked for detailed survey and excavation.

WOUTER FOURIE

Professional Heritage Specialist and Professional Archaeologist and Director PGS Heritage

Summary of Experience

Specialised expertise in Archaeological Mitigation and excavations, Cultural Resource Management and Heritage Impact Assessment Management, Archaeology, Anthropology, Applicable survey methods, Fieldwork and project management, Geographic Information Systems, including *inter alia* -

Involvement in various grave relocation projects (some of which relocated up to 1000 graves) and grave “rescue” excavations in the various provinces of South Africa

Involvement with various Heritage Impact Assessments, within South Africa, including -

- Archaeological Walkdowns for various projects
- Phase 2 Heritage Impact Assessments and EMPs for various projects
- Heritage Impact Assessments for various projects
- Iron Age Mitigation Work for various projects, including archaeological excavations and monitoring
- Involvement with various Heritage Impact Assessments, outside South Africa, including -
- Archaeological Studies in Democratic Republic of Congo
- Heritage Impact Assessments in Mozambique, Botswana and DRC
- Grave Relocation project in DRC

Key Qualifications

BA [Hons] (Cum laude) - Archaeology and Geography - 1997

BA - Archaeology, Geography and Anthropology - 1996

Professional Archaeologist - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) - Professional Member

Accredited Professional Heritage Specialist – Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners (APHP)

CRM Accreditation (ASAPA) -

- Principal Investigator - Grave Relocations
- Field Director – Iron Age
- Field Supervisor – Colonial Period and Stone Age
- Accredited with Amafa KZN

Key Work Experience

2003- current - Director – PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd

2007 – 2008 - Project Manager – Matakoma-ARM, Heritage Contracts Unit, University of the Witwatersrand

2005-2007 - Director – Matakoma Heritage Consultants (Pty) Ltd

SiVEST Environmental

Prepared by: PGS Heritage Pty Ltd for SiVEST

Project Description: **Proposed 200MWac Lion Thorn Solar Photovoltaic Facility and Electrical Grid - HIA**

Version No. 1.0

2000-2004 - CEO– Matakoma Consultants

1998-2000 - Environmental Coordinator – Randfontein Estates Limited. Randfontein, Gauteng



1997-1998 - Environmental Officer – Department of Minerals and Energy. Johannesburg, Gauteng

Worked on various heritage projects in the SADC region including, Botswana, Mozambique, Malawi, Mauritius, Zimbabwe, Zambia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo



APPENDIX B – Site Descriptions (incl. photographs)


Site number	Lat	Lon	Description	Heritage Significance	Heritage Rating
LT001	26.287591°	-27.199714°	<p>General Landscape Characteristics Grassy vegetation</p> <p>Site Conditions Overgrown/ limited visibility, Disturbed</p> <p>Time Period Stone Age</p> <p>Site Type Lithics Low Density Surface Scatter/Single find spot</p> <p>Site Extent 10m x 10m</p> <p>Notes Small amount of lithics.<10 exposed from previous excavated soil.</p>	Low	Grade 3 – C (IIC)

Site number	Lat	Lon	Description	Heritage Significance	Heritage Rating
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;">   </div> <p style="text-align: center;">Figure 16: LSA flakes and previously excavated find spot at LT001.</p>					

Site number	Lat	Lon	Description	Heritage Significance	Heritage Rating
LT002	26.310041°	-27.197675°	<p>General Landscape Characteristics Flat lying area</p> <p>Site Conditions Overgrown/ limited visibility, Disturbed</p> <p>Time Period Historical Period</p> <p>Site Type Graves</p> <p>Site Extent 10m x 10m</p> <p>Notes Approximately 10 graves stone packed. Unkept. One grave has remains of a brick border. No marked headstones. East to west orientation. Just outside of the project boundary. Farm owner states that the graves have been there over 20 years (his occupation on the property) and that there are no families who come maintain or visit the graves.</p>	High	Grade 3 - A (IIIA)



Figure 17 - Stone packed graves at LT002

Site number	Lat	Lon	Description	Heritage Significance	Heritage Rating
					
<p>Figure 18: General views of cemetery.</p>					



APPENDIX C – IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER		
A brief description of the environmental aspect likely to be affected by the proposed activity (e.g. Surface Water).		
ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT / NATURE		
Include a brief description of the impact of environmental parameter being assessed in the context of the project. This criterion includes a brief written statement of the environmental aspect being impacted upon by a particular action or activity (e.g. oil spill in surface water).		
EXTENT (E)		
This is defined as the area over which the impact will be expressed. Typically, the severity and significance of an impact have different scales and as such bracketing ranges are often required. This is often useful during the detailed assessment of a project in terms of further defining the determined.		
1	Site	The impact will only affect the site
2	Local/district	Will affect the local area or district
3	Province/region	Will affect the entire province or region
4	International and National	Will affect the entire country
PROBABILITY (P)		
This describes the chance of occurrence of an impact		
1	Unlikely	The chance of the impact occurring is extremely low (Less than a 25% chance of occurrence).
2	Possible	The impact may occur (Between a 25% to 50% chance of occurrence).
3	Probable	The impact will likely occur (Between a 50% to 75% chance of occurrence).
4	Definite	Impact will certainly occur (Greater than a 75% chance of occurrence).
REVERSIBILITY (R)		
This describes the degree to which an impact on an environmental parameter can be successfully reversed upon completion of the proposed activity.		
1	Completely reversible	The impact is reversible with implementation of minor mitigation measures
2	Partly reversible	The impact is partly reversible but more intense mitigation measures are required.
3	Barely reversible	The impact is unlikely to be reversed even with intense mitigation measures.
4	Irreversible	The impact is irreversible and no mitigation measures exist.
IRREPLACEABLE LOSS OF RESOURCES (L)		
This describes the degree to which resources will be irreplaceably lost as a result of a proposed activity.		
1	No loss of resource.	The impact will not result in the loss of any resources.
2	Marginal loss of resource	The impact will result in marginal loss of resources.
3	Significant loss of resources	The impact will result in significant loss of resources.
4	Complete loss of resources	The impact is result in a complete loss of all resources.
DURATION (D)		
This describes the duration of the impacts on the environmental parameter. Duration indicates the lifetime of the impact as a result of the proposed activity.		

1	Short term	The impact and its effects will either disappear with mitigation or will be mitigated through natural process in a span shorter than the construction phase (0 – 1 years), or the impact and its effects will last for the period of a relatively short construction period and a limited recovery time after construction, thereafter it will be entirely negated (0 – 2 years).
2	Medium term	The impact and its effects will continue or last for some time after the construction phase but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter (2 – 10 years).
3	Long term	The impact and its effects will continue or last for the entire operational life of the development, but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter (10 – 50 years).
4	Permanent	The only class of impact that will be non-transitory. Mitigation either by man or natural process will not occur in such a way or such a time span that the impact can be considered transient (Indefinite).
INTENSITY / MAGNITUDE (I / M)		
Describes the severity of an impact (i.e. whether the impact has the ability to alter the functionality or quality of a system permanently or temporarily).		
1	Low	Impact affects the quality, use and integrity of the system/component in a way that is barely perceptible.
2	Medium	Impact alters the quality, use and integrity of the system/component but system/ component still continues to function in a moderately modified way and maintains general integrity (some impact on integrity).
3	High	Impact affects the continued viability of the system/component and the quality, use, integrity and functionality of the system or component is severely impaired and may temporarily cease. High costs of rehabilitation and remediation.
4	Very high	Impact affects the continued viability of the system/component and the quality, use, integrity and functionality of the system or component permanently ceases and is irreversibly impaired (system collapse). Rehabilitation and remediation often impossible. If possible rehabilitation and remediation often unfeasible due to extremely high costs of rehabilitation and remediation.
SIGNIFICANCE (S)		
Significance is determined through a synthesis of impact characteristics. Significance is an indication of the importance of the impact in terms of both physical extent and time scale, and therefore indicates the level of mitigation required. This describes the significance of the impact on the environmental parameter. The calculation of the significance of an impact uses the following formula:		
Significance = (Extent + probability + reversibility + irreplaceability + duration) x magnitude/intensity.		

The summation of the different criteria will produce a non-weighted value. By multiplying this value with the magnitude/intensity, the resultant value acquires a weighted characteristic which can be measured and assigned a significance rating.

Points	Impact Significance Rating	Description
5 to 23	Negative Low impact	The anticipated impact will have negligible negative effects and will require little to no mitigation.
5 to 23	Positive Low impact	The anticipated impact will have minor positive effects.
24 to 42	Negative Medium impact	The anticipated impact will have moderate negative effects and will require moderate mitigation measures.
24 to 42	Positive Medium impact	The anticipated impact will have moderate positive effects.
43 to 61	Negative High impact	The anticipated impact will have significant effects and will require significant mitigation measures to achieve an acceptable level of impact.
43 to 61	Positive High impact	The anticipated impact will have significant positive effects.
62 to 80	Negative Very high impact	The anticipated impact will have highly significant effects and are unlikely to be able to be mitigated adequately. These impacts could be considered "fatal flaws".
62 to 80	Positive Very high impact	The anticipated impact will have highly significant positive effects.

APPENDIX D:

SITE SENSITIVITY VERIFICATION (IN TERMS OF PART A OF THE ASSESSMENT PROTOCOLS PUBLISHED IN GN 320 ON 20 MARCH 2020)

Introduction

PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd (PGS) was appointed by SiVest (PTY) Ltd (hereafter referred to as “SiVEST”), on behalf of Upgrade Energy Africa (Pty) Ltd (hereafter referred to as “Upgrade Energy”), to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) as part of the Basic Assessment (BA) for the proposed construction of the Lion Thorn SEF in the North West Province of South Africa.

The SEF project area is located approximately 9km east of Leeudoringstad, within the Maquassi Hills Local Municipality within the Dr Kenneth Kaunda District Municipality.

In accordance with Appendix 6 of the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998, as amended) (NEMA) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations of 2014, a site sensitivity verification has been undertaken in order to confirm the current land use and environmental sensitivity of the proposed project area as identified by the National Web-Based Environmental Screening Tool (Screening Tool).

2. Site sensitivity verification

The site sensitivity verification of the proposed Lion Thorn SEF is based on:

- A desktop review of (a) the relevant 1:50 000 scale topographic maps: 2726AB (HARRISBURG) – Current and historical editions (1947, 1953, 1968, 1969, 1982), (b) Google Earth© satellite imagery, (c) published historical and archaeological literature, as well as (d) several previous HIA and AIA assessments undertaken in the general vicinity of the study area.
- A two-day field assessment of the project area by the author and field assistants during the period 6 to 7 June 2023. Accessible portions of the proposed development area were surveyed.

3. Outcome of site sensitivity verification

The region surrounding the study area contains a long and rich archaeological and historical mining record. However, vast areas of the region have yet to be subjected to systematic analytical research.

Habitation of the general study area has taken place since the ESA time period. According to Breutz (1959), “stone tools dating to all phases of the Stone Age are found frequently in the region, especially in the vicinity

of watercourses and hills". There are also numerous sites with rock engravings found in the region (Bergh, 1998; Smith, 2011). Stone walled sites dating to the LIA, which can be linked to the Tswana occupation of the region, are also found on several of farms in the region (Breutz, 1959).

The evaluation of satellite imagery and the analysis of the studies previously undertaken in the area has indicated that certain areas may be sensitive from a heritage perspective. Archaeological surveys and studies in the area have shown dry riverbeds, riverbanks and confluence to be prime localities for historical and archaeological finds (Breutz, 1955, 1959; Mason, 1969).

The field work in the study area demonstrates that one LSA site (no mitigation required) and one burial ground of heritage significance warrant conservation.

4. National Environmental Screening Tool








The Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Sensitivity Map for the proposed project area prepared using the DFFE screening tool indicates a **Low Sensitivity** rating for the study area (**Figure 1**). The low rating as provided by the Environmental Screening Tool possibly reflects scarcity of heritage reports conducted in the general region. The field work in the study area demonstrates that only one burial ground of heritage significance warrant conservation.

Therefore, in the case of this study area, the DFFE screening tool sensitivity map is only partly supported based on the findings of this fieldwork.



5 June 2023

Legend

- | | |
|---|---|
|  Site Area | Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Combined Sensitivity |
|  EIA Application Development Footprint |  Very High |
|  EIA Application Site |  High |
|  National Jurisdiction Area |  Low |

0 5 10 km
 Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Copyright: 2023,
 National Department of Environmental Affairs,
 Government of South Africa.

Figure 1: Archaeology and Heritage screening map for the proposed SEF.

5. Conclusion

The Archaeological and Cultural Heritage sensitivity of the project areas for the proposed Leeudoringstad Lion Thorn SEF has been evaluated, based on desktop studies and a two-day field assessment.

It is concluded that the low rating as provided by the Environmental Screening Tool likely reflects the scarcity of heritage reports conducted in the region. The field work in the study area demonstrates that only one burial ground of heritage significance warrants conservation. This is most likely due to the level of disturbance and dense vegetation in the study area. Therefore, in the case of this study area, the DFFE screening tool sensitivity map is only partly supported based on the findings of this fieldwork.