

**A PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED
CONSTRUCTION OF A 55 MEGAWATT SOLAR FARM AND ASSOCIATED
INFRASTRUCTURE ON PORTION 2 OF THE FARM KRAAN VOGEL KUIL NO. 50,
PEARSTON, BLUE CRANE MUNICIPALITY, EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE**

Prepared for: CEN Integrated Environmental Management Unit
36 River Road
Walmer
Port Elizabeth
6070
Tel: 041 5812983
Fax: 041 5812983
Contact person: Dr M. Cohen
email: steenbok@aerosat.co.za

Compiled by: Dr Johan Binneman
On behalf of: Eastern Cape Heritage Consultants
P.O. Box 689
Jeffreys Bay
6330
Tel: 042 2960399
Cell: 0728006322
email: kobusreichert@yahoo.com

Date: Januarie 2012

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------|
| SUMMARY | 1 |
| PROJECT INFORMATION | 2 |
| BRIEF ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND | 2 |
| DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY | 4 |
| ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION..... | 4 |
| ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACTS | 6 |
| DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION | 8 |
| GENERAL REMARKS AND CONDITIONS | 9 |
| APPENDIX A: BRIEF LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS | 10 |
| APPENDIX B: IDENTIFICATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES AND MATERIAL FROM INLAND AREAS..... | 11 |
| MAPS | 12-13 |

A PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A 55 MEGAWATT SOLAR FARM AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE ON PORTION 2 OF THE FARM KRAAN VOGEL KUIL NO. 50, PEARSTON, BLUE CRANE MUNICIPALITY, EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE

Compiled by: Dr Johan Binneman
On behalf of: Eastern Cape Heritage Consultants
P.O. Box 689
Jeffreys Bay, 6330
Tel: 042 2960399
Cell: 0728006322

Note: This report follows the minimum standard guidelines required by the South African Heritage Resources Agency for compiling Archaeological Heritage Phase 1 Impact Assessment (AHIA) reports.

SUMMARY

Proposal

The original proposal was to conduct a phase 1 archaeological impact assessment of the proposed construction site for a 55 megawatt solar farm and associated infrastructure on Portion 2 of the Farm Kraan Vogel Kuil No. 50, Pearston, Blue Crane Municipality, Eastern Cape Province. The survey was conducted to establish the range and importance of possible exposed and *in situ* archaeological sites/materials, the potential impact of the development and to make recommendations to minimize possible damage.

The location of the development

The proposed 55 megawatt solar farm development is situated approximately 2.2 kilometres west of the town of Pearston. It is located south of the R337 gravel road between Pearston and Jansenville and on both sides of the gravel road to Waterford.

The investigation

Apart from one concentration of Later Stone Age stone tools and occasional Middle and Later Stone Age stone tools no other archaeological sites/materials were observed.

Cultural sensitivity

The proposed property for development is of low archaeological sensitivity. Development may proceed as planned.

Recommendations

1. No solar panels must be constructed within 20 metres of the concentration of Later Stone Age stone tools (GPS reading: 32.36.019S; 25.06.379E).
2. If any concentrations of archaeological material are uncovered during development, it should be reported immediately to the Albany Museum and/or the South African Heritage Resources Agency.

3. Construction managers/foremen should be informed, before construction starts, on the possible types of heritage sites which may be encountered during construction.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Status

The report is part of an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The type of development

The development will include the construction of a 55 megawatt solar farm and associated infrastructure of some 138 hectares in size. No further information is available.

The Developer:

Imveloyethu Power Company (Pty) Ltd

The Consultant

CEN Integrated Environmental Management Unit

36 River Road

Walmer

Port Elizabeth,

6070

Tel: 041 5812983

Fax: 041 5812983

Contact person: Dr M. Cohen

email: steenbok@aerosat.co.za

Terms of reference

To conduct a phase 1 archaeological impact assessment of the proposed construction site for a 55 megawatt solar farm and associated infrastructure on Portion 2 of the Farm Kraan Vogel Kuil No. 50, Pearston, Blue Crane Municipality, Eastern Cape Province. The survey was conducted to establish;

- the range and importance of possible exposed and *in situ* archaeological sites, features and materials,
- the potential impact of the development on these resources and,
- to make recommendations to minimize possible damage to these resources.

BRIEF ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Literature review

Little is known about the archaeology of the Pearston area because no systematic research or regional surveys/recordings have been conducted. There are a few reports of faded rock paintings and stone tools in the Bruintjies Hoogte Mountains to the east of Pearston. The closest and one of the most complete archaeological surveys in South Africa was conducted in the Agter Sneeuberg region in the central and upper Seacow River Area some 200 km north-

west (Sampson 1985). The only systematic survey and recording in the immediate vicinity was conducted in the Mountain Zebra National Park (Brooker 1974) and Deacon (1976) excavated Highlands Rock Shelter some 50-60 km to the north-east. Sampson's, Brooker's, and Deacon's research and surveys, together with records/collections of the Albany Museum, provide the background information for compiling an archaeological time sequence for the region.

The oldest evidence for occupation of the region are stone artefacts (small hand axes, sidescrapers and flakes) from the Earlier Stone Age, known as the 'final' Acheulian Industry which date older than 200 000 years. Excavations at the Cradock springs in the town yielded a number of these stone tools (Opperman pers. comm.). Sampson (1985) located a large number of sites and there is also a collection in the Albany Museum from the Cradock and Graaff Reinet area. Middle Stone Age (MSA) artefacts (long blades and points) are found throughout the region, but because these are found in the open it is difficult to know where they fit into the cultural time sequence. At Highlands Rock Shelter MSA stone tools, possibly a Howieson's Poort Industry, was dated older than 30 000 years (Deacon 1976). Sampson on the other hand reported many open-air MSA sites which he assigned to the Orangian Industry (dating between 128 000 - 75 000 years old), Florisbad and Zeekoegat Industries dating between 64 000 and 32 000 years old.

Without the aid of radiocarbon dating in the past, all Later Stone Age (LSA) assemblages were classified into three phases using mainly scrapers shape and size, namely, Smithfield A, large circular scrapers, Smithfield B, long, narrow end scrapers (both manufactured of black hornfels) and Smithfield C, small thumbnail scrapers (manufactured of chalcedonies and agates) (Goodwin and Van Riet Lowe 1929). When radiocarbon dating became available many years later it indicated that there were no sites which date between 9 500 and 4 600 years old for the drier inland plateaux (Deacon 1974). The LSA deposits at Highlands Rock Shelter date to 4 500 years old (Deacon 1976). Today the term Smithfield is only used for stone tool assemblages with backed bladelets and long end scrapers dating within the last 1000 years and replaces the term Smithfield B (Sampson 1988). The term Smithfield A has been replaced by Oakhurst and Smithfield C by Interior or Post-Wilton. Oakhurst is similar to the Albany Industry in the adjacent Cape Mountains, dating between 10 500 and 8 000 years old and also replaces the previously termed Lockshoek Industry (Sampson 1985).

The survey of the Mountain Zebra National Park (Brooker 1974) confirmed that the area is rich in archaeological remains and that some of the LSA time sequence for the region was present, as well as rock art. Unfortunately no rock engravings were found to compare with that of Samekoms, but there is another engraved and painted site listed in the Albany Museum records, only a few kilometres away. Unfortunately, apart from the stone tools, little else is preserved and it is not possible to reconstruct subsistence patterns. Better preservation of organic material at Highlands Rock Shelter provides some insight into hunter-gatherer subsistence in the area. Collecting of underground plant remains such as *Cyperus usitatus* and *Freesia corymbrosa* would appear to have been an important food source together with the hunting of mountain zebra/quagga, mountain reedbuck, warthog and various small antelope such as duiker, klipspringer and steenbok. Also listed in the museum records are freshwater shell middens along the banks of the Great Fish River and small quantities of crab and freshwater mussel were also found in the excavations. Many stock enclosures with stone walls and fragments of sand-tempered ceramic vessels are found throughout the Seacow River area and are most probably associated with Khoi pastoralists who settled in the area during the past 1 000 years.

References

Brooker, M. 1977. The archaeology of the Mountain Zebra Park. *Koedoe* 20:77-93.

- Deacon, H. J., 1976. Where hunters gathered: a study of Holocene Stone Age people in the Eastern Cape. South African Archaeological Society Monograph Series No. 1.
- Deacon, J. 1974. Patterning in the radiocarbon dates for the Wilton/Smithfield complex in southern Africa. The South African Archaeological Bulletin 25:3-18.
- Goodwin, A.J.H. & Lowe, C. van Riet. 1929. The Stone Age cultures of South Africa. Annals of the South African Museum.
- Sampson, C.G. 1985. Atlas of Stone Age settlements in the Central and Upper Seacow Valley. Memoirs van die Nasionale Museum Bloemfontein No.20.
- Sampson, C.G. 1988. Stylistic boundaries among mobile hunter-foragers. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Relevant impact assessments

- Binneman, J. 2011. A phase 1 archaeological impact assessment for the proposed construction of a 10 megawatt solar farm near Pearston, Blue Crane Municipality, Eastern Cape Province. Prepared for CEN Integrated Environmental Management Unit, Port Elizabeth.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY

Area Surveyed

Location data

The proposed area for the construction of a 55 megawatt solar farm is situated approximately 2.2 kilometres west of Pearston, Blue Crane Municipality, Eastern Cape Province. It is located on the farm Kraan Vogel Kuil No. 50, between (south) the gravel roads to Jansenville (R337) and on both sides of the road to Waterford (Maps 1-2).

Map

1:50 000 3225 CA Pearston

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION

Methodology and results

Due to the large size of the site it was unfeasible to do a complete survey. However, most of the area was investigated by two people on foot and from a vehicle, which provided an insight and understanding of the status of the archaeology of the area. GPS readings were taken with a Garmin and all important features were digitally recorded. The proposed area for development comprised of natural Karroo veld and is situated on a relatively flat plain. The immediate surrounds have been disturbed in the past by the construction of power and telephone lines, fencing and the usual small scale farming activities. The terrain is zoned for agricultural activities and comprised of orange brown alluvial soil covered by sparsely to dense low grass, shrubs and *euphorbia ferrox* vegetation. The underlying hard rock is exposed in places (Figs 1-6). In general the surface visibility was good, but surprisingly few archaeological sites/materials were observed.

The criteria follow for a 'recordable/representative archaeological site', was a minimum of 4 stone tools (and/or other material, such as bone, beads, shell) per square metre. This size for a


representative site was increased from one to four square metres when it turned out that the general area was not well presented by archaeological sites/materials. Occasional Middle Stone Age (older than 30 000 years) and Later Stone Age (younger than 30 000 years) stone tools were observed throughout the area investigated. Nevertheless, it is possible that concentrations of such materials may be covered by soil and vegetation.

Only one small area was observed with more than 4 stone tools per four square metres. The site measured approximately 10 x 10 metres and was situated on the western side of a ridge with a good view of the surrounding area (GPS reading: 32.36.019S; 25.06.379E). Several cores, flakes, chunks and retouched/utilised stone tools produced from grey/greenish fine grained sandstone were observed scattered within this small area (Figs 7-10). There were no other archaeological materials associated with the stone tools.

There are no graves or buildings older than 60 years. In general it would appear that it is unlikely that any sensitive archaeological remains will be exposed during the development. The area is of low cultural sensitivity and the proposed development may proceed.



Figs 1-6. Different views of the proposed site for the construction of a 55 megawatt solar farm.



Figs 1-6. General views of the proposed site for the construction of a 55 megawatt solar farm, orange brown alluvial soil (top left), exposed hard rock (top right) wide-angle views of the concentration of Later Stone Age stone artefacts (middle row) and close-up views of the stone tools – cores and flakes manufactured from grey/greenish fine grained sandstone (bottom row).

ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACTS

Pre-colonial archaeology

Nature of the impacts

From the investigation, it would appear that the proposed solar facility site is of low archaeological sensitivity. Apart from one small area where a number of Later Stone Age stone artefacts were exposed on an outcrop of hard rock, no other significant sites/materials were observed. The occasional stone tools observed throughout the area are of low cultural significance, but material may be covered by soil and grass. The main impact to archaeological

sites/remains (if any) will be the physical disturbance of the material and its context. The construction of the solar panels, cabling between the panels and access roads may expose, disturb and displace archaeological sites/material.

Extent of the impacts

Construction of the solar panels, cabling between the panels and access roads may impact on remains which are buried, but these impacts will be limited and restricted to the local area. The construction of the solar panels may disturb small areas and the negative impact on possible archaeological sites/materials may be relatively small. Other projects such as the construction of roads, buildings and underground lines will disturb large areas and may expose sites/materials on a larger scale. In both cases further disturbances of sites/materials can be limited by mitigation.

Table 1. Impacts on the pre-colonial archaeology.

| Nature: The potential impact of the construction of the solar panels, cabling between the panels, and access roads on above and below ground archaeology. | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------|
| | Without Mitigation | With Mitigation |
| Extent | Local (1) | Local (1) |
| Duration | Permanent (4) | Permanent (4) |
| Magnitude | Minor (2) | Minor (2) |
| Probability | Unlikely (2) | Unlikely (2) |
| Significance | Low < 20 | Low < 20 |
| Status (positive or negative) | Negative | Neutral |
| Reversibility | No | No |
| Irreplaceable loss of resources? | No, but in some cases, yes | No |
| Can impacts be mitigated? | Yes | |
| <p>Mitigation It is proposed that no solar panels be constructed within 20 metres of the concentration of Later Stone Age stone tools (GPS reading: 32.36.019S; 25.06.379E).</p> <p>No mitigation is proposed for the rest of the property before construction starts because the archaeological remains (if any) are of low significance (excluding human remains). However, if concentrations of archaeological materials are exposed then all work must stop for an archaeologist to investigate (see below).</p> <p>If any human remains (or any other concentrations of archaeological heritage material) are exposed during construction, all work must cease and it must be reported immediately to the nearest museum/archaeologist or to the South African Heritage Resources Agency, so that a systematic and professional investigation can be undertaken. Sufficient time should be allowed to investigate and to remove/collect such material. Recommendations will follow from the investigation.</p> | | |
| Cumulative impacts: n/a | | |
| Residual impacts: n/a | | |

Pre-colonial archaeological cultural landscape

Nature of the impact

The archaeological significance of the area is low and therefore the visual impact of the solar facility on the cultural landscape will be low as well. The development is relatively far removed from any major towns, highways and there are no historical buildings, graves or other features of importance on or near the site. Due to size of the solar panels they will have little visual impact on the landscape and ‘sense of place’.

Extent of impact

The visual impact of the solar panels will be restricted to the immediate area of the development and will have little negative effect on the cultural landscape and ‘significance/sense of place’. Notwithstanding, the ‘presence’ of the solar panels will be long term to permanent, but negative impacts can be mitigated.

Table 2. Impacts on the pre-colonial cultural landscape.

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Nature: The potential impact of the construction of the solar panels, cabling between the panels, and access roads on the cultural landscape and ‘sense of place’. | | |
| | Without Mitigation | With Mitigation |
| Extent | Local (1) | Local (1) |
| Duration | Long term/permanent (4) | Long term/permanent(4) |
| Magnitude | Minor (2) | Minor (2) |
| Probability | Unlikely (2) | Unlikely (2) |
| Significance | Low < 20 | Low < 20 |
| Status (positive or negative) | Negative | Negative |
| Reversibility | Reversible | Reversible |
| Irreplaceable loss of resources? | No | No |
| Can impacts be mitigated? | Yes | yes |
| Mitigation No mitigation is proposed because the archaeological remains are of low significance. | | |
| Cumulative impacts The cumulative impacts will only increase if further solar facilities are planned for adjoining areas, which may bring changes to the pre-colonial cultural landscape in terms of visual impacts and changes to ‘sense of place’. | | |
| Residual impacts: n/a | | |

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION

The proposed solar facility site on the farm Kraan Vogel Kuil No. 50, Pearston, is of low archaeological significance. Apart from one small concentration of Later Stone Age stone artefacts, no other significant sites/materials were observed. The occasional Middle and Later Stone Age stone tools observed throughout the area are of low cultural of significance, but material may be covered by soil and grass. Due to the size of the solar panels the visual impact on the surrounding cultural landscape will be low. Although it is unlikely that any sensitive

archaeological remains will be exposed during the development, there is always a possibility that human remains and/or other archaeological and historical material may be uncovered during the development. It is recommended that;

1. No solar panels must be constructed within 20 metres of the concentration of Later Stone Age stone tools (GPS reading: 32.36.019S; 25.06.379E). The area must be fenced-off during the construction phase to prevent any accidental disturbance of the site.
2. If any concentrations of material are uncovered during development, it should be reported to the Albany Museum and/or the South African Heritage Resources Agency immediately so that systematic and professional investigation/excavations can be undertaken. Sufficient time should be allowed to remove/collect such material (See appendix B for a list of possible archaeological sites that may be found in the area).
3. Construction managers/foremen should be informed, before construction starts, on the possible types of heritage sites which may be encountered during construction.

GENERAL REMARKS AND CONDITIONS

Note: This report is a phase 1 archaeological impact assessment/investigation only and does not include or exempt other required heritage impact assessments (see below).

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999, section 35) (see Appendix A) requires a full Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in order that all heritage resources, that is, all places or objects of aesthetics, architectural, historic, scientific, social, spiritual linguistic or technological value or significance are protected. Thus any assessment should make provision for the protection of all these heritage components, including archaeology, shipwrecks, battlefields, graves, and structures older than 60 years, living heritage, historical settlements, landscapes, geological sites, palaeontological sites and objects.

It must be emphasised that the conclusions and recommendations expressed in this archaeological heritage sensitivity investigation are based on the visibility of archaeological sites/features and may not therefore, reflect the true state of affairs. Many sites/features may be covered by soil and vegetation and will only be located once this has been removed. In the event of such finds being uncovered, (such as during any phase of construction work), archaeologists must be informed immediately so that they can investigate the importance of the sites and excavate or collect material before it is destroyed. The onus is on the developer to ensure that this agreement is honoured in accordance with the National Heritage Act No. 25 of 1999.

It must also be clear that Archaeological Specialist Reports (AIA's) will be assessed by the relevant heritage resources authority. The final decision rests with the heritage resources authority, which should grant a permit or a formal letter of permission for the destruction of any cultural sites.

APPENDIX A: brief legislative requirements

Parts of sections 35(4), 36(3) and 38(1) (8) of the National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999 apply:

Archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites

35 (4) *No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority—*

- (a) destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;*
- (b) destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological material or object or any meteorite;*
- (d) bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.*

Burial grounds and graves

36. (3) (a) *No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority—*

- (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.*

Heritage resources management

38. (1) *Subject to the provisions of subsections (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development categorized as –*

- (a) the construction of a road, wall, powerline, 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 50m in length;*
- (c) any development or other activity which will change the character of the site –*
 - (i) exceeding 5000m² in extent, or*
 - (ii) involving three or more 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 resources authority;*
- (d) the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000m² in extent; or*
- (e) any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority, must as the very earliest stages of initiating such a development, notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.*

APPENDIX A: IDENTIFICATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES AND MATERIAL FROM INLAND AREAS: guidelines and procedures for developers

Human Skeletal material

Human remains, whether the complete remains of an individual buried during the past, or scattered human remains resulting from disturbance of the grave, should be reported. In general human remains are buried in a flexed position on their side, but are also found buried in a sitting position with a flat stone capping. Developers are requested to be on alert for the possibility of uncovering such remains.

Freshwater mussel middens

Freshwater mussels are found in the muddy banks of rivers and streams and were collected by people in the past as a food resource. Freshwater mussel shell middens are accumulations of mussel shell and are usually found close to rivers and streams. These shell middens frequently contain stone tools, pottery, bone, and occasionally human remains. Shell middens may be of various sizes and depths, but an accumulation which exceeds 1 m² in extent, should be reported to an archaeologist.

Large stone cairns

They come in different forms and sizes, but are easy to identify. The most common are roughly circular stone walls (mostly collapsed) and may represent stock enclosures, remains of wind breaks or cooking shelters. Others consist of large piles of stones of different sizes and heights and are known as *isisivane*. They are usually near river and mountain crossings. Their purpose and meaning is not fully understood, however, some are thought to represent burial cairns while others may have symbolic value.

Stone artefacts


These are difficult for the layman to identify. However, large accumulations of flaked stones which do not appear to have been distributed naturally should be reported. If the stone tools are associated with bone remains, development should be halted immediately and archaeologists notified.

Fossil bone


Fossil bones may be found embedded in geological deposits. Any concentrations of bones, whether fossilized or not, should be reported.

Historical artefacts or features

These are easy to identify and include foundations of buildings or other construction features and items from domestic and military activities.



Map 1. 1:50 000 Maps indicating the location of the proposed development of a 55 megawatt solar farm. The red squares mark the approximate size of the site.



Map 2. Aerial images indicating the location of the proposed development of a 55 megawatt solar farm. The yellow peg marks the Later Stone Age stone tool concentration and the white lines mark the approximate size of the site (insert map courtesy CEN Integrated Environmental Management Unit).