ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ERF 2833 GREAT BRAK RIVER SOUTHERN CAPE

Prepared for

Sector Five Trading 76 (Pty) Ltd

Att: Mr Francois Klomp PO Box 6353 Uniedal 7612 Email: francois@klompgroup.co.za

By



Jonathan Kaplan Agency for Cultural Resource Management P.O. Box 159 Riebeek West 7306 Ph/Fax: 022 461 2755 Cellular: 082 321 0172 E-mail: acrm@wcaccess.co.za

> NOVEMBER 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sector Five Trading 76 (Pty) Ltd requested that the Agency for Cultural Resource Management conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment for a proposed housing development on Erf 2833 in Great Brak River, in the southern Cape (Western Cape Province).

The proposed Sandhoogte Estate will consist of 26 single residential units and 24 Group Housing units. Associated infrastructure includes internal streets and engineering services. The total area of the property is about 7.0 ha.

More than 70% of the proposed development site is infested with alien Rooikranz vegetation, resulting in very poor archaeological visibility. A large portion of the site comprises steep hill slopes and narrow wooded kloofs.

The aim of the study is to locate and map archaeological heritage sites/remains that may be negatively impacted by the planning, construction and implementation of the proposed project, to assess the significance of the potential impacts and to propose measures to mitigate against the impacts.

A Notice of Intent to Develop (NID) checklist has been completed by the archaeologist and together with supporting documentation, been submitted to Heritage Western Cape (Belcom) for comment.

The following findings were made:

Forty-two Early Stone Age and Middle Stone Age tools were documented during the archaeological impact assessment. All the tools were found in, or just outside the boundary of a large horse paddock alongside Sandhoogte Road. Each of the occurrences has been recorded with a GPS waypoint, and photographed <u>in-situ</u>. The tools comprise mostly flakes and chunks while one (MSA) core and one hammerstone were also found. A small cluster of MSA flakes (n = 8) was also documented. The tools, mainly isolated finds, occur in a disturbed or secondary context and have been rated as having low local significance. Several studies done in the Great Brak River area have documented low density scatters of similar types of tools.

The Archaeological Impact Assessment has identified no significant impacts to precolonial archaeological material that will need to be mitigated prior to proposed construction activities.

Early Stone Age and Middle Stone Age tools may be exposed during earth moving operations, but it is maintained that these impacts are not likely to be significant. The probability of locating important archaeological remains on the steep hill slopes of the site is also considered to be low.

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>
1
3
3
4
7 7 7
8
10
10
11

Appendix

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and brief

Sector Five Trading 76 (Pty) Ltd requested that the Agency for Cultural Resource Management conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) for a proposed housing development of Erf 2833 Great Brak River in the Western Cape. The proposed development falls within the Great Brak River current urban edge.

The proposed Sandhoogte Estate will consist of 26 single residential erven, and 24 Group Housing erven. Associated infrastructure includes internal streets and engineering services (such water, power and sewerage). The total area of the property is about 7.0 ha.

Erf 2833 is currently zoned Undetermined and will be rezoned and sub-divided to accommodate the proposed development activities.

The aim of the study is to locate and map archaeological sites and remains that may be negatively impacted by the planning, construction and implementation of the proposed project, to assess the significance of the potential impacts and to propose measures to mitigate against the impacts.

A Notification of Intent to Develop (NID) checklist has been completed by the archaeologist and submitted to Heritage Western Cape (Belcom) for comment. This includes supporting documentation.

The Great Brak River Museum Association has commented on the proposed development and has given it its approval¹.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference for the archaeological study were:

- to determine whether there are likely to be any archaeological sites of significance within the proposed site;
- to identify and map any sites of archaeological significance within the proposed site;
- to assess the sensitivity and conservation significance of archaeological sites within the proposed site;
- to assess the status and significance of any impacts resulting from the proposed development, and
- to identify mitigatory measures to protect and maintain any valuable archaeological sites that may exist within the proposed site

¹ Great Brak River Museum Association, letter to Mr F. Klomp dated 10 April 2008 (Ref M2008/0313).

3. THE STUDY SITE

A locality map is illustrated in Figure 1.

An aerial photograph of the proposed site is illustrated in Figure 2.

A proposed site development plan is illustrated in the Appendix.

Erf 2833 Great Brak River is situated alongside Sandhoogte Road, in Great Brak River, in the southern Cape. The upper slopes across the eastern portion of the site are extremely steep with several narrow (heavily wooded) kloofs. It is estimated that about 70% of the property is infested with alien (Rooikranz) vegetation (Figures 4-11). Figure 2 does not indicate the true extent of the alien infestation. The slightly flatter slopes alongside Sandhoogte Road has been cleared of vegetation and converted into horse paddocks and are covered in thick Kikuyu grass, some bush and scrub grass. Apart from a small metal structure and wooden paddock fencing, there are no old buildings, structures or features on the property. Surrounding land use comprises residential, small holdings, and vacant land.



Figure 1. Locality map indicating the approximate boundary of the study site





Figure 3. View of the site facing south east



Figure 4. View of the site facing south



Figure 5. View of the site facing north



Figure 6. View of the site facing north



Figure 7. View of the site facing north



Figure 8. View of the site facing north



Figure 9. View of the site facing east



Figure 10. View of the site facing west

4. STUDY APPROACH

4.1 Method

The approach followed in the archaeological study entailed a foot survey of the proposed development site. Access to the site, however, was severely restricted due to the dense impenetrable stands of Rooikranz, particularly in the very steep eastern portion of the site. Where possible, some of the wooded areas across the western half of the site were searched, while the upper western slopes were easier to access due to thinner vegetation (i.e. indigenous) cover The lowermost slopes of the site (the horse paddocks) alongside Sandhoogte Road were searched in detail. The road cutting alongside the western boundary of the property was also searched for <u>in-situ</u> tools.

A GPS track path of the archaeological survey was created. This track path has been saved to a CD and submitted with a digital copy of the report.

All archaeological occurrences were plotted and photographed <u>in situ</u>, using a Garmin Oregon 300 GPS unit, set on map datum wgs 84. A spreadsheet of the waypoints and a description of each of the archaeological occurrences are presented with this report.

The site visit and assessment took place on the 10th November, 2009.

4.2 Constraints and limitations

More than 70% of study site is heavily infested with alien Rooikranz that has formed dense, impenetrable stands, resulting in zero archaeological visibility. Where wooded areas were accessed, thick leaf litter on the ground has also resulted in poor visibility.

4.3 Identification of potential risks

Based on the results of the study, there are no major archaeological risks associated with the proposed project.

Early Stone Age (ESA) and Middle Stone Age (MSA) tools may be exposed during bulk earthworks and earth moving operations, but these impacts are not likely to be significant. The probability of locating important archaeological remains on the steep hill slopes of the site also is considered to be low.

It is highly unlikely given the nature of the (gravel and weathered quartzite) ground deposits, and the steep terrain of the site, but unmarked human burials may be exposed or uncovered during earthmoving operations.

4.4 Results of the desk top study

Several archaeological studies have been conducted in the Great Brak River area, where mostly low density scatters of Early and Middle Stone Age tools have been documented (Kaplan 2003, 2004, 2008). Closer to the coast shell middens and scatters of stone tools, ostrich eggshell and pottery have been documented near the mouth of Great Brak River and along the beach (Kaplan 1993). At Hersham Beach, a small test excavation was also undertaken (Kaplan 1999).

5. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Forty-two Early Stone Age and Middle Stone Age tools were documented during the archaeological impact assessment (Table 1). All the tools were found in, or just outside the boundary of the horse paddock alongside Sandhoogte Road. Each of the occurrences has been recorded with a GPS waypoint, and photographed <u>in-situ</u>. The tools comprise mostly flakes and chunks while one MSA core (GB22) and one hammerstone (GB7) were also found. No formal tools such as ESA handaxes and cleavers, or (MSA) points or retouched pieces were found. A small cluster of finds numbering eight MSA flakes (GB4-GB8) was documented (Figures 11-15). The tools found are all in locally available quartzite. The archaeological occurrences that have been recorded most likely occur in a disturbed or secondary context (as a result of the transformed nature of the receiving environment) and have been rated as having low local significance.

No archaeological occurrences were noted in the road cuttings alongside the western boundary of the property.

Four additional occurrences, including one ESA chunk, one MSA flake and two fragments of <u>Haliotis</u> (perlemoen) were plotted, but these occur on the higher slopes outside the proposed development footprint and are not presented here.



Figure 11. GB6 MSA flakes. Scale in cm



Figure 12. GB7 Hammerstone. Scale in cm



Figure 13. GB8. MSA flakes. Scale in cm



Figure 14. Cluster GB4-GB8. Facing west

Site	Name	Long	Lat	Finds
GB	Erf 2833 Great Brak			
	River			
GB1		S34 03.396	E22 12.185	ESA chunk
GB2		S34 03.393	E22 12.171	MSA flake
GB3		S34 03.393	E22 12.184	Chunk
GB4		S34 03.368	E22 12.160	Chunk
GB5		S34 03.362	E22 12.170	ESA chunk
GB6		S34 03.364	E22 12.168	X 2 MSA flakes
GB7		S34 03.362	E22 12.168	Hammerstone
GB8		S34 03.364	E22 12.165	X 3 MSA flakes
GB9		S34 03.380	E22 12.200	Chunk
GB10		S34 03.370	E22 12.194	MSA flake
GB11		S34 03.358	E22 12.183	X 2 chunks
GB12		S34 03.373	E22 12.204	ESA chunk
GB13		S34 03.371	E22 12.203	MSA flake
GB14		S34 03.349	E22 12.187	Chunk
GB15		S34 03.350	E22 12.190	Chunk
GB16		S34 03.352	E22 12.190	Chunk
GB17		S34 03.380	E22 12.218	Chunk
GB18		S34 03.374	E22 12.212	MSA flake
GB19		S34 03.352	E22 12.197	Chunk
GB20		S34 03.374	E22 12.222	MSA flake
GB21		S34 03.367	E22 12.213	X 2 MSA flakes
GB22		S34 03.343	E22 12.198	MSA Core
GB23		S34 03.360	E22 12.214	MSA flake
GB24		S34 03.371	E22 12.221	Chunk
GB25		S34 03.370	E22 12.256	Chunk
GB26		S34 03.368	E22 12.254	Chunk
GB27		S34 03.361	E22 12.231	Flake
GB28		S34 03.361	E22 12.223	MSA flake
GB29		S34 03.362	E22 12.211	MSA flake
GB30		S34 03.356	E22 12.223	Chunk
GB31		S34 03.352	E22 12.205	Chunk
GB32		S34 03.348	E22 12.181	MSA flake
GB33		S34 03.341	E22 12.185	MSA flake
GB34		S34 03.349	E22 12.181	Chunk
GB35		S34 03.350	E22 12.179	Chunk
GB36		S34 03.355	E22 12.173	MSA flake
GB37		S34 03.352	E22 12.169	MSA flake
GB38		S34 03.357	E22 12.165	Chunk

Table 1. Spreadsheet of site observations

6. IMPACT STATEMENT

The impact of the proposed development on important archaeological remains is likely to be low.

The proposed site is not considered to be archaeologically sensitive, vulnerable or threatened.

7. CONCLUSION

The archaeological impact assessment of the proposed development of Erf 2833 in Great Brak River has identified no significant impacts to pre-colonial archaeological material that will need to mitigated, prior to the proposed development activities.

Early Stone Age and Middle Stone Age tools may be exposed during earth moving operations, but it is maintained that these impacts are not likely to be significant.

The probability of locating important archaeological remains on the steep hill slopes of the site is also considered to be low.

Should any human remains be disturbed, exposed or uncovered during excavations and earthworks for the proposed project, these should immediately be reported Heritage Western Cape (Mr Nic Wiltshire 021 483 9692). Burial remains should not be disturbed or removed until inspected by the archaeologist

8. REFERENCES

Kaplan, J. 2008. Archaeological impact assessment proposed development Heritage Creek Estate (Erf 3933) Great Brak River. Report prepared for Crimson King Properties 88 (Pty) Ltd. Agency for Cultural Resource Management.

Kaplan, J. 2004. Archaeological assessment proposed 132 Kv powerline from Mossel Bay Tee – Klein Brak River – Great Brak River – Blanco. Report prepared for Eskom. Agency for Cultural Resource Management

Kaplan, J. 2003. Archaeological Impact Assessment proposed development Remainder Portion 16 of the Farm Rensburg Estate 137 Great Brak River. Report prepared for Sharples Environmental Services. Agency for Cultural Resource Management.

Kaplan, J. 1998. Archaeological trial excavations, Hersham Beach, Great Brak River. Agency for Cultural Resource Management.

Kaplan, J. 1993. The state of archaeological information in the coastal zone from the Orange River to Ponto do Ouro. Report prepared for the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. Agency for Cultural Resource Management.

Appendix



1:50 000 locality map (3422AA Mossel Bay)

Ν



Proposed site layout