FOR ATTENTION: SAHRA Limpopo Office

SOUTH AFRICAN HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY
111 HARRINGTON STREET, CAPE TOWN, 8001
PO BOX 4637, CAPE TOWN, 8000
TEL: 021 462 4502 FAX: 021 462 4509

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:
File No.: **9/2/253/000**
Date received: .....
Date of comment: 16 November 2005.....
Sent to peer review: .....
Date to Peer Rev.: .....
SAHRA Contact Person.: Dr S Wurz

ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

BY ARCHAEOLOGIST OF HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY

REVIEW COMMENT ON

South Africa has a unique and non-renewable archaeological heritage. Archaeological sites are protected in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999) and may not be disturbed without a permit. Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIAs) identify and assess the significance of the sites, assess the potential impact of developments upon such sites, and make recommendations concerning mitigation and management of these sites. On the basis of satisfactory specialist reports SAHRA or the relevant heritage resources agency can assess whether or not it has objection to a development and indicate the conditions upon which such development might proceed and assess whether or not to issue permission to destroy such sites.
AIAs often form part of the heritage component of an Environmental Impact Assessment or Environmental Management Plan. They may also form part of a Heritage Impact Assessment called for in terms of section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act No. 25, 1999. They may have other origins. In any event they should comply with basic minimum standards of reporting as indicated in SAHRA Regulations and Guidelines.
This form provides review comment from the Archaeologist of the relevant heritage resources authority for use by Heritage Managers, for example, when informing authorities that have applied to SAHRA for comment and for inclusion in documentation sent to environmental authorities. It may be used in conjunction with Form B, which provides relevant peer review comment.

A. PROVINCE: *LIMPOPO*.....

B. REGIONAL MANAGER : *Mr Victor Netshiavha* .....

C. **AUTHOR(S) OF REPORT:** *Dr J van Schalkwyk, National Cultural History Museum, PO Box 28088, 0132, Sunnyside, johnny@nfi.org.za*.....

.....

D. **DATE OF REPORT:** *July 2005*.....

E. **TITLE OF REPORT:** *Heritage Impact Scoping report for the proposed new Matimba power station, Lephalale district, Limpopo province*.....

.....

F. Please circle as relevant: Archaeological component of EIA / EMP / HIA / CMP Other (Specify) *Draft Environmental Scoping Report*.....

G. REPORT COMMISSIONED BY (CONSULTANT): *Bohlweki Environmental (Pty) Ltd*.....

H. CONTACT DETAILS: *Ashlea Strong, PO Box 11784, Vorna Valley, Midrand, 1686, Gauteng, 011 466 3841 (tel), 011 466 3849 (fax), matimba-b@bohlweki.co.za; ashleas@bohlweki.co.za;*

I. COMMENTS: (Please find comment on separate sheet(s) attached. .....

Please see comment on next page.....

REVIEW COMMENT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

J van Schalkwyk
July 2005

Heritage Impact Scoping report for the proposed new Matimba power station, Lephalale district, Limpopo province

This report assesses the heritage on the farms Appelvlakte, Nelsonskop, Naauwontkomen, Eenzaamheid, Droogeheuwel, Zongezien, Kuipersbult and Kromdraai in the Lephalale district of Limpopo. The following heritage sites are identified.

1. Vergulde Helm 316 LQ:
An informal cemetery with four graves, two of which date to the 1930's, occur. The site is very close to the border of the farm Eenzaambeid. The report notes that if relocation of this site is necessary, a SAHRA permit and relevant local government permits will need to be obtained.

SAHRA would further like to point out that standard procedures for relocation of burials include that the laws, provincial regulations and administrative procedures that regulate this activity should be adhered to. Relocation has to be done by a qualified archaeologist who will acquire all the necessary permits from SAHRA. If the burial ground is to be left intact a mini conservation plan must be drawn up and submitted to SAHRA by the specialist to indicate what conservation and maintenance measures will be needed and who will be responsible.

2. Kuipersbult 511LQ
A single grave with inscription MS Moloantao 25/5/1848 occur.

The abovementioned conditions and stipulations apply here as well.

3. Kuipersbult 511 LQ
This is a small outcrop of non-diagnostic Iron Age pottery and is of low significance.

4. Nelsonskop 464 LQ
A small hill with interesting engravings of animal spoors, cupules and cut marks occur on the southern face of the outcrop. On top of the hill a number of small stone walled enclosures, probably a site of importance for the San and later Sotho-Tswana speaking people of the area. The report notes that the site is of high significance and development should not be allowed. It is recommended that it should be classified as a no-go area and development of the surrounding properties should be avoided due to their close proximity to Nelsonskop.

SAHRA would further recommend that a rock art specialist survey and record the rock engraving hill site.

The site preference rating for the power station and ancillary infrastructure sites is discussed in the report. The farms Naauwontkomen 509 LQ and Eenzaamheid 678 LQ are considered 'ideal' for the construction of the proposed power station. The farms Naauwontkomen, Eenzaamheid and Kromdraai are considered the preferred sites for the establishment of ancillary infrastructure. Even if no sites with heritage value were identified on the farms Appelvlake 448 LQ, Droogeheuvel 447 LQ and Zongezien 467 LZ, a low preference rating is given for the construction of the power station and the establishment of ancillary infrastructure to reduce the impact on Nelsonskop.

The SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite unit supports the recommendations of the specialist that development may only take place on either Naauwontkomen 509 LQ or Eenzaamheid 678 LQ. Should sites or features be found during construction an archaeologist should be alerted

immediately. If any further development is to occur on Appelvlake 448 LQ, Droogeheuvel 447 LQ and Zongezien 467 LZ, SAHRA must receive full details of exactly what this development will comprise and SAHRA must have the opportunity to comment on this. SAHRA would further like a report from the developer on the decision that has been taken with regards to the development.

NAME OF ARCHAEOLOGIST: pp. *Mary Leslie*

SIGNATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGIST: .....

EMAIL: *mleslie@sahra.org.za*

NAME OF HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY: *SAHRA*

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE COMMENT (ABOVE OR APPENDED) CONSTITUTES THE COMMENT OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGIST AND THAT ANY DEVELOPMENT THAT INVOLVES DESTRUCTION OF ANY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE IS STILL SUBJECT TO A PERMIT/PERMISSION FOR DESTRUCTION OF SUCH SITE GIVEN TO THE DEVELOPER BY THE RELEVANT HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERMIT COMMITTEE (THIS WILL BE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE PHASE 2 OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION AS NECESSARY). THIS REPORT MAY BE TAKEN ONLY AS APPROVAL, IN PRINCIPLE, IN TERMS OF SECTION 35 OF THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT. THE PROVINCIAL MANAGER OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY MUST ADVISE AS TO APPROVAL IN TERMS OF HERITAGE ISSUES ENCOMPASSED BY OTHER ASPECTS OF THE LEGISLATION, SUCH AS ISSUES OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (STRUCTURES (E.G. FARM HOUSES), OVER 60 YEARS), INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS OR OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES AS THIS IS NOT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGIST.

PLEASE NOTE THAT SAHRA IS NOW RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE I HERITAGE RESOURCES (AND EXPORT) AND THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR GRADE II AND GRADE III HERITAGE RESOURCES, EXCEPT WHERE THERE IS AN AGENCY ARRANGEMENT WITH THE PROVINCIAL HERITAGE RESOURCES AUTHORITY.