

Phase 1

Heritage Assessment Report

For site number 46, Rivertide Shareblock Scheme, situate on Portion 4 of the farm Osbosch 707, Kromme River, Humansdorp RD, Kouga Municipality, Cacadu District, Eastern Cape Province.

**FB Silberbauer
23 MAY 2012**

This report is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements under Section 35(4) of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act No. 25 of 1999 and letter SAHRA reference: 9/2/044/0001 dated 02 April 2012, requesting further Heritage investigation in order to assess any previous or future impacts as a result of the proposed development of this site and immediate surrounds.

REFERENCE NUMBER(S):

SAHRA REFERENCE No.	9/2/044/0001
Date issued:	02 April 2012
Validity until;	Not Applicable.
DEA REFERENCE No.	EC08/LN1&3/M/12-09

BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT TITLE (BAR):

DRAFT BAR: The Proposed Extension & Upgrading of a Single Residential Dwelling – Site 46 Rivertide Shareblock, Portion 4 of the farm Osbosch 707, Humansdorp, Kouga Municipality, Eastern Cape (March 2012).

APPLICANT:

Name	Mr PW Talbot			
Contact person:	c/o Miriam Muller			
Postal address:	PO Box 90 Jeffrey's Bay			
Postal code:	6330			
Telephone:	042 296 1913		Cell:	082 929 8314
E-mail:	mariammuller@telkomsa.net		Fax:	088 042 296 1913
APPLICANT:	Peter William Talbot – Shareblock owner of Site 707/4/46			

DETAILS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PRACTITIONER (EAP):

Name	Ms Miriam Muller			
Contact person:	Miriam Muller			
Postal address:	PO Box 90 Jeffrey's Bay			
Postal code:	6330			
Telephone:	042 296 1913		Cell:	082 929 8314
E-mail:	mariammuller@telkomsa.net		Fax:	088 042 296 1913
APPLICANT:	Peter William Talbot – Shareblock owner of Site 707/4/46			

DETAILS OF HERITAGE ASSESSMENT PRACTITIONER (HAP):

Assessment Practitioner Contact person: Postal address: Postal code: Telephone: E-mail: HAP Qualifications Registration/Associations	Francis Bruce Silberbauer		
	Frank Silberbauer		
	P O Box 93 St Francis Bay		
	6312		
	(042) 294 0288		083 225 7484
	<u>infinity@iafrica.com</u>		(088) 042 294 0288
	MA(UCT) 1979		
Professional Member of the Southern African Association of Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA No: 211)			

1. BACKGROUND:

1.1. The applicant Mr PW Talbot, shareholder of site No 46 at Rivertide Shareblock (Pty) Ltd, wishes to upgrade and expand his riverfront holiday home on the Kromme River (the site will be referred to as 707/4/46). The following description of existing and proposed Activities from the draft BAR (EC08/LN1&3/M/12-09) by M Muller dated March 2012 is given below:

- 1.1.1. The existing cottage is small, measuring 64 m². It is a sturdy construction from corrugated iron, resting on a framework of hardwood beams within a sunken area. The cottage is too small and the applicant wishes to add a new separate house on the stand, link it to the old cottage via a wooden deck, and keep the cottage to offer bedrooms 3 & 4 and its one bathroom. No alterations are being contemplated for this existing cottage. The new additions proposed will measure an additional 266 m² in extent and the resultant coverage will be 23.9%.
- 1.1.2. The new house will face the river and all the proposed additions will fall within the building lines of the stand. The living area of the new house will be on the same level as the existing cottage (upper ground level), and a new suspended timber deck will link the new unit with the old. The main entrance to the combined household will be at this new timber deck, on the south side of the stand. A double garage, boat house, store room and open area under the balcony are planned for the lower level of the new house (natural ground level) because the property falls towards the river.
- 1.1.3. A driveway from the street to the double garage is planned on the southern side of the property. The driveway will be paved.
- 1.1.4. Foundations will be cast in solid ground without the presence of fill. Excavations for foundations would come to about 52 m³. Most of the soil will be used on site. The existing embankment of old filling material would need to be excavated to provide space for the new house. This excavation would amount to approximately 36 m³. Brickwork will be clay stock brick, plastered and painted. All plumbing will connect to the existing conservancy tank. The pitched roof will be made up of 6 fibre cement sheets on gang nail trusses.
- 1.1.5. Existing indigenous vegetation along the boundaries of the stand will be maintained as a 2m band of dense vegetation. Some vegetation will have to be cut down to make way for the proposed additions and alterations. Already the bush had to be cut back to an extent because it was encroaching on the cottage. The high-water mark of the Kromme River is approximately 30m from the western boundary of the site. The area between the old boat house and the western boundary of the site is lawn at present and will remain so.
- 1.1.6. The Shareblock property is bordered on the river side by the stand boundaries. In between the stand boundaries and the river lies a band with approximate width of 20 m to 30 m containing the original boat houses and the jetties. It is classified as private open space but the land belongs to the state. The riverfront properties sit on the original higher ground level above the private open space bordering the river.
- 1.1.7. The resort falls under the administration of the Kouga municipality and lies along the eastern bank of the Kromme River (Appendix A; slides: 1 to 3). The Shareblock is zoned as Resort 2, with the Shareblock units (referred to in this report as stands) being owned by sectional title. The Shareblock faces opposite developments on the western bank of the Kromme River. It is divided into 3 sections along the river. Stand No 46 lies in the lower section (most downstream).

- 1.1.8. The provincial road R330 from Humansdorp leads to the first entrance of the Shareblock property, then proceeds further SE by crossing the Kromme river via a long bridge and leading to the coastal towns of St Francis Bay and Cape St Francis. The Kromme River does not experience floods since the building of the Mpofu dam further upstream and the high-water mark of the river remains fairly constant (Appendix A; slide: 3)

2. LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK:

- 2.1. The above proposed development triggers Listed Activities in both Government Notices R544 and R546 of the amended NEMA regulations (2010) and therefore requires a Basic Assessment Report which has been performed by the designated EAP detailed above.
- 2.2. As part of the Basic Assessment Report under Section 6 – Cultural & Historical Features, it is required of the EAP to furnish information as to whether the proposed development will trigger elements as defined in Section 2 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) which broadly includes the following components which must be taken into account in any heritage assessment:
- 2.2.1. Cultural landscapes
 - 2.2.2. Buildings and structures (greater than 60 years of age)
 - 2.2.3. Archaeological sites (greater than 100 years of age)
 - 2.2.4. Paleontological sites and specimens
 - 2.2.5. Shipwrecks and aircraft wrecks
 - 2.2.6. Graves and grave yards.
- 2.3. Although the proposed development does not trigger the defined thresholds under Section 38 of the NHRA thus requiring a full Heritage Impact Assessment, SAHRA has requested that an archaeologist be commissioned to further survey the area in order to identify archaeological resources which may have already been disturbed before any construction activities commence on this site (See appendix B for copy of letter).
- 2.4. This request by SAHRA is interpreted as a request for an Archaeological Heritage Phase 1 Impact Assessment Report.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE:

- 3.1. Correspondence received from SAHRA relating to the proposed development on portion 46 is detailed below (Appendix B):
- 3.1.1. While according to s.38 (1) of the National Heritage Resources Act no, 25 of 1999, an Archaeological Impact Assessment may not be requested for this development, according to s.35 of the same Act, it is an offence to disturb any archaeological sites.
 - 3.1.2. After taking into consideration the proximity of the proposed development to the coastline and acknowledging the high archaeological sensitivity of the area, SAHRA recommends that:
 - 3.1.2.1. An archaeologist be commissioned a survey of the area in order to identify archaeological resources which may have already been disturbed before any construction activities commence;
 - 3.1.2.2. Further recommendations regarding archaeology may be necessary after the survey has been conducted.

4. ASSESSMENT METHOD:

- 4.1. This assessment is primarily a visual assessment of the proposed development footprint and the affected areas within the vicinity of the proposed activities. Tracks and positions are recorded with a GPS and points and areas of interest are photographed for record purposes (Appendix A; slide 9).
- 4.2. The site boundaries are established and the area searched on foot for visual evidence of heritage resources with special attention to the following features which will assist in revealing any buried heritage resources (Appendix A: slides 12 to 18).
 - 4.2.1. The geological and topographical character of the site.
 - 4.2.2. Past and present trenching areas as a result of construction activities.
 - 4.2.3. Erosion cuts as a result of past or recent flooding from the river or excess storm water flow.
 - 4.2.4. Animal burrows or disturbance areas as a result of the removal of vegetation.
 - 4.2.5. Existing buildings on the site.
 - 4.2.6. Stone markers or cairns indicating the possible location of a burial.
 - 4.2.7. If the site 'is' or 'was' inhabited the presence of a waste or midden areas.
- 4.3. The information gathered is collated and interpreted according to the statutory heritage components (see point 2.2 above). This report includes observations only of a 'surface visual nature' and no 'test' pits were excavated in order to determine the presence of sub-surface heritage resources. Conclusions and recommendations are made as to the way forward for the proposed development regarding the immediate site and wider regional context.

5. ASSESSMENT:

5.1. Assessment of Site 46:

- 5.1.1. Area of site: 896 m² (Appendix A; slide 5).
- 5.1.2. Area of existing buildings: 64 m² - Latitude: 34° 8.031'S Longitude: 24° 48.222'E – situated between 7 and 9 meters above the HWM of the Kromme Estuary.
- 5.1.3. Area of proposed additions: 266 m² – Latitude: 34° 8.036'S Longitude: 24° 48.214'E – situated between 5 and 6 meters above the HWM of the Kromme Estuary.
- 5.1.4. Site slope: 1:7.5 to 1:5.0 – decreasing towards Kromme River in a direction of 248° to the SW.
- 5.1.5. Existing boat house: 50 m² – Latitude: 34° 8.037'S Longitude: 24° 48.206'E – situated on Public Open Space 3 meters above the HWM of the Kromme Estuary. This structure will not be removed.
- 5.1.6. Presence of Fresh Water: There is an exit point of an annual stream at a distance of 123 meters at 333° to the NW upstream of Site 46.
- 5.1.7. Distance to the Sea: If one travels down the estuary by boat the sea is approximately 4.8 km downstream of the Kromme Estuary from Site 46.
- 5.1.8. Site Vegetation: 'The lawn on the bottom of the stand and at the boat house consists mainly of coastal buffalo grass (*Stenotaphrum secundatum*) and couch grass (*Cynodon dactylon*). This is a very good mixture of indigenous grass species for the site because the lawn is hardy and provides a stable ground cover. Remnants of the original riverine vegetation (trees and shrubs) occur in dense stands along the N, E, and S boundaries. The following species are common: white milkwood (*Sideroxylon inerme*), cross berry (*Grewia occidentalis*), taaibos species (*Rhus/Searsia* spp), basterperdepis (*Hippobromus pauciflorus*), forest num-num (*Carissa bispinosa*), cherrywood (*Pterocelastrus tricuspidatus*), baboon grape (*Rhoicissus tridentata*), cat thorn (*Scutia myrtina*), and garlic buchu (*Agathosma apiculata*). Although this vegetation has to be pruned back from the dwelling from time to time, it needs to be preserved. Not only does it provide habitat to fauna and other flora but it also acts as a functional

screen. The site is exposed to the cold prevailing SW wind and the bush breaks the wind speed. Many individuals of the bulb *Ledebouria floribunda* grow on the eastern side of the cottage. This bulb and other bulbs in the under storey of the bush should be protected on site. The slope and embankment below the cottage support a sparse selection of trees and shrubs, being mainly *basterperdepis*, *Rhus* spp, and cross berry. The ground cover consists of *Ledebouria* bulbs, grasses and pioneer ground covers. Most of these plants need to be sacrificed to make way for the new deck and house but they are well represented elsewhere on the site. The bulbs should be transplanted in the garden/in pots and dense groupings (sun/shade) will make attractive features' (M Muller 2012). The encroaching bush has now been cleared back to approximately 2 meters from the SSE and NNW boundaries of the site providing a cleared area with disturbed topsoil layer as a result of the removal of stumps which will aid in visibility of any disturbed sub-surface heritage resource.

- 5.1.9. Geology & Topography: The geological classification of the site is black shale, siltstone and sandstone from the undifferentiated Ceres sub-group with evidence of alluvium consisting of silt sand and conglomerate towards the lower areas of the site along the banks of the Kromme Estuary (Council for Geoscience report 2008-0222, 2008).

There is visual (Appendix A; slide: 17) evidence of a river terrace midway from the shore to the front boundary possibly representing past erosion from the estuary during times of flooding. The topsoil has a brown clay texture indisposed with flakes of brown siltstone (Appendix A; slide: 16). It is important to note that the soils present on this site will be generally not as alkaline as the aeolian soils prevalent in the vicinity of the Oyster Bay dune bypass system approximately 2 km south of this site thus decreasing the preservation of paleontological bone specimens which could have occurred on this site.

- 5.1.10. Ground Truthing: The survey was done on foot and the following observations made:

- 5.1.10.1. Cultural Landscape: the Rivertide development is situated on the east bank of the Kromme Estuary and representative of a typical South African river holiday resort. Surveyor General Records indicate that the Rivertide development area originally was a portion called 'Bosch-Hof' of the Quitrent Farm Osbosch 707, granted (Act 9, 1879) to Johanna du Toit and Hermanus du Toit in August 1907. Subsequently in 1988 15.8919Ha was further subdivided off Osbosch 707 as portion 4 and further subdivided into 69 sites which form the current Rivertide development (Appendix A; Slides: 4&5). It is evident that river side holiday homes were built prior to the formation of the Rivertide Shareblock as oral tradition indicates that the first houses were built after the Second World War (post 1945) and the number of homes increased until the formalisation of the Shareblock in 1988. This is supported by early aerial photographs of this area where in 1942 no buildings are evident on this property but in 1962 they are well represented (Appendix A; Slides: 6&7). It is further noted that the present day access road to the Rivertide development was the main access routes to Cape St Francis which crossed the Kromme just below this development at what was known as 'the drift' and onto Goedgeloof farm (745) on the south bank (Appendix A; Slide 6).

- 5.1.10.2. Buildings & Structures Older than 60 years: As this development began post 1945 there must be buildings within the Shareblock which were erected before 1952 (over 60 years old) which reveal characteristics of early type river coastal homes which could be of historical value (Appendix A; slides: 1,2 & 17). Immediately on arriving on site 46 the existing dwelling and boat house stood out as they are walled and roofed with corrugated iron and have fine decorative detailing in their hips and barge boards. The age of these existing structures is as yet unknown however just

adjacent to the existing dwelling a piece of porcelain was found detailing a sailboat ship mark from Grindley China which was manufactured from 1936 to 1954 in England (Appendix A; slide 18).

- 5.1.10.3. Archaeological Sites: The site was searched for any visible evidence of archaeological material older than 100 years and no shell fragments, deposits, bone or stone material was noted. As a result of the recent bush clearing if any near surface archaeological materials were present they would be clearly visible – this was not the case in this instance.
- 5.1.10.4. Paleontological sites and specimens: As above no fossil bone was observed.
- 5.1.10.5. Graves: No evidence of stone cairns or any marker objects which could indicate the presence of a burial site was noted on site 46.

5.2. Site 46 in the Wider Context:

5.2.1. Slide 10 in Appendix A shows a summary of the known Heritage sites within close proximity of site 46. The nearest known archaeological site is situated 2km further down the Kromme Estuary on the south bank adjacent a freshwater stream situated on Kromme Properties Shareblock (Pty) Ltd (745/49) and the adjacent Hemsley property (745/176) which reveal shell middens and burnt fractured stone. This site is situated on the edge of the Oyster Bay dune by-pass system characterised by aeolian wind-blown deposits overlying black shale. This site is situated on the northern extremity of the aeolian dune system and these deposits dissipate approximately 100 meters further up the Kromme Estuary where geological conditions similar to site 46 prevail. Appendix A; slide: 11 shows the same summary of known heritage sites overlying the geology of the area and it is noted that the majority of known sites occur within the area covered by the sandy aeolian deposits.

5.2.2. The adjacent Oyster Bay dune field to the south of Site 46 is known for its representation of heritage sites (Binneman 2001, 2005). This heritage record has further been expanded with recent work at St Francis Links adjacent to the dune field (Nilssen 2005; 2011). Further to the west the heritage assessment of the proposed Thyspunt Nuclear site has revealed sites and Hart's (2010) summary provides a clear overview of importance of the heritage sites found in this region:

- 5.2.2.1. 'The Middle Stone Age and Early Stone Age material identified on the fossil dunes is potentially important in scientific terms, especially if it is preserved in an in-situ context on palaeosols deep under shifting dunes in association with fossil bone. The potential exists for incredibly rare human remains of early humans to exist in associated contexts'.
- 5.2.2.2. 'The area is highly significant in terms of Late Stone Age pre-colonial archaeology, in particular the large quantity and variety and size of shell middens. Many of the middens are very well preserved and are an important archive of information about the identity and behaviour of pre-colonial people, as well as the environment in which they lived'.
- 5.2.2.3. 'The Late Stone Age heritage of the area is directly linked to the heritage of South Africans who are alive today. Particularly relevant is the fact that a high proportion of the middens are less than 2000 years old, pottery rich and associated with a time that Khoekhoen herders were the dominant force in the area'.

5.2.3. Although Site 46 at Rivertide visually does not reveal any archaeological resources it is appropriate to understand that any development within a known heritage sensitive area such as the St Francis region must receive attention as 'development' essentially a destructive activity and left unchecked will result in loss of our National Estate. The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of

1999) seeks to protect our national heritage under sections 35-4, 36-3 and 38-1 and it is incumbent upon all citizens of the Republic of South Africa to abide by these provisions. A summarised version of the Act with additional material useful to both the Applicant and Developer is presented in Appendix B.

6. DISCUSSION CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 6.1. Site 46; despite good visibility over the areas cleared for the proposed development failed to reveal any surface heritage resources.
- 6.2. The trenching around the perimeter of the existing dwelling and hole found on site did not reveal any signs of any heritage resource (Appendix A; slide 16).
- 6.3. Geological evidence when compared with sites closer to the dune fields indicates that this particular site was not occupied at all 'or' to the extent as seen at the St Francis sites. Preservation due to soil differences could be a factor and locality in the sense that there is evidence of a flood terrace indicating that if any heritage site existed it would have eroded over time, possibly removing any heritage material as a result of periodic flooding.
- 6.4. The area to be excavated for the foundations of the new development will involve trenching which might expose a heritage resource buried which is not visible during the present site inspection. The sub-surface visibility of heritage resources is important with regard completing the cycle of monitoring the presence of any resources on all sites.
- 6.5. The age of the existing structures on site remains to be determined and to this end the Body Corporate was consulted (Mr N Marais) who will interview the most senior member of the Shareblock who was present during the early 1950's but, due to illness is unable to provide information at this time. Fortunately these structures are to remain and not removed so the issue of structures older than 60 years is not a factor in this instance.
- 6.6. The following recommendations are offered for consideration by SAHRA regarding Site 46 Rivertide:

That the proposed development proceeds subject to the following:

- 6.6.1. That, if an Environmental Control Officer (ECO) is requested by the DEA in their authorisation for this development or failing this appointment, that the Project Manager be informed that...

- 6.6.1.1.1.he/she and all employees and contractors are fully informed on issues and procedures relating to the accidental disturbance of any heritage resource and notifies SAHRA immediately in the event of such and that....

- 6.6.1.1.2.on discovery of any heritage resource the affected area is cordoned off and all works must cease in this area until such time that SAHRA is satisfied that any resources located on site are mitigated satisfactorily and

- 6.6.1.1.3.when the local Municipal Building Inspector performs the statutory inspection of open foundation trenches that a representative from SAHRA be present to inspect report to SAHRA on the heritage status of these areas and

- 6.6.1.1.4.if structures older than the statutory limit (60 years) exist within the Rivertide Shareblock that a process be initiated between SAHRA and the Directors of this Shareblock to determine the importance and conservation status of these and other structures on site so as to prevent any unintended loss of the National Estate through future development on this property.

- 6.6.1.1.5. That this report is circulated to all 'Interested & Affected Parties' (I&AP's) and Stakeholders for comment.

- 6.6.1.1.6. That the contents of Appendix B be made known to all contractors, sub-contractors, employees and applicant so as to ensure

that all parties are aware of current legislation relating to our National Heritage.

7. References:

- Hart, T. 2010. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed nuclear power station (“Nuclear 1”) and associated infrastructure. Unpublished report for Arcus Gibb (Pty) Ltd.
- Nilssen, P. 2011. Phase 2 Archaeological mitigation at the St. Francis Links Golf Estate. Unpublished report prepared for St. Francis Links (SAHRA permit No. 80/04/08/032/51).
- Nilssen, P. 2005. a, b & c. Phase 2 – Mitigation of Archaeological Heritage Resources in Zones 1, 2 and 3. Progress/Interim Reports submitted to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA permit No. 80/04/08/032/51).
- Binneman, J. 2005. Archaeological research along the south-eastern Cape coast – Part 1: Open-air shell middens; South African Field Archaeology 13 & 14: 49 – 77.
- Muller, M. 2012. The proposed extension and upgrading of a single residential dwelling at No 46 at Rivertide Shareblock, Kromme River, Kouga municipality, Eastern Cape. Unpublished draft BAR for DEDEA Cacadu District Eastern Cape.