

**Approved Minutes of the meeting of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) Archaeology,
Palaeontology and Meteorites Committee (APM)
Held on 3rd August 2022, Monday on Microsoft Teams at 09:00 am**

1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Dr Lita Webley officially opened the meeting at 9:00 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Dr Lita Webley (LW)
Dr Romala Govender (RG)
Mr John Gribble (JG)
Prof Simon Lee Hall (SLB)
Ms Emmylou Bailey (EB)
Dr Jayson Orton (JO)

Members of Staff

Mr Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CS)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport (SBD)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Zikhona Sigonya (ZS)
Ms Ayanda Mdludlu (AM)
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJ)
Ms Natalie Kendrick (NK)
Mr Robin George (RG)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)

Visitors

Ms Wilhelmina Seconna
Mr Richard Myburgh
Prof John Pakington
Ms Adel Groenewald
Mr Doug Jeffrey
Ms Jenna Lavin

Ms Tessa Davids
Ms Janine van Wyk

Observers

None

3. Apologies

Dr Wendy Black

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 3rd August 2022

The Committee approved the agenda dated 3rd August 2022 with additions and amendments. JG approved and RG seconded.

5. Approval of Minutes and Matters Arising from Previous Meeting

5.1 APM Minutes dated 6 July 2022.

The minutes dated 6 July 2022 were approved with a minor correction.

6. Disclosure of Interest

26.1 JG

26.3, 26.4-9 JO

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None

8. Appointments

8.1 None

9. Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of Appeals

Feedback was provided on the following items:

9.1.1 Erven 2455 and 2456 corner Japan St and Merriman Ave, Stellenbosch.

The proposal was accepted in principle, with further requirements.

In order to undertake a final assessment of the plans, the following information is required:

1. A set of measured drawings that include plans, sections and elevations for both 38 and 40 Merriman Avenue. Note that all dimensions, including heights, are required. This is in order to ensure that the height of the proposed development is possible within the envelope of the existing buildings.
2. A photographic record with no more than 2 images per A4 sheet and annotation of each image is required, particularly orthogonal views of each elevation of each building as well as views, where possible, of the building and its adjacent buildings.

9.1.2. Erven 10712-RE, 10713, 10715 and 14932-RE, Corner Albert Road, 1 Rail Street, Woodstock.

The matter was held over in order for the Committee to conduct a site inspection on 3 August 2022 at 13 h 00. (KD, SH, AvG, NB)

9.1.3 Farm 585 Mountain Rose from Hemel and Aarde Valley, Caledon.
The appeal was dismissed. An HIA including an AIA and cultural landscape analysis is required.

9.1.4 Erf 28173, 10 Dixton Observatory.
The item was also held over for a site inspection.

9.1.5 S38(4) NID: Erven 842, 843, 2780 and 4563, 93 Voortrek Street, Swellendam.
The item was held over also for a site inspection

PM

9.2 **Clarity on Notice 6 of 2022**

JO requested clarity on the implementation of this notice. HWC staff noted that the intention was not to prolong the process but to establish a proper procedure. There may be some delays initially.

9.3 **Over-ruling of archaeological recommendations in IACom**

EB commented that archaeologists, assigned by the APM Committee to IACom, were being overruled in IACom meetings by non-archaeologists on archaeological matters. PM stated that the issue at the IACom was that it was requested that an item be referred back to APM and that the reason that there were archaeologists on IACom was in order for the archaeological input to be given at IACom.

9.4 **Renewable Energy Projects not seen by APM**

EB noted that there were also five renewable energy applications, which were seen at the last IACom meeting, which had not come to APM. Tight time frames for renewable energy projects meant that sometimes they could not be assessed at APM. LW was requested to raise this matter at Council.

9.5 **New Guidelines for Renewable Energy Projects**

JO commented that new guidelines would shortly be implemented by the Department Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment to fast track the process of new energy projects. This might have implications for heritage practitioners, and he requested that the new regulations should be circulated as soon as they were available.

10. **Standing Items**

10.1 **Clanwilliam Dam – Rock Art panels.**

Prof John Pakington (UCT), Ms Tessa Davis (Iziko Museum) and Ms Wilhelmina Seconna were present and took part in the discussion.

SB presented the item.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee had been in discussions around the future of the rock art panels for some time and LW circulated extracts from APM Minutes going back to 2017 outlining the discussions about the future of the panels.
- HWC staff were in final discussions with the Department of Water Affairs and Sanitation (DWS) about moving the panels when they were informed of a burglary at 16 Park Street (the Living Landscape building).
- A site inspection was conducted by staff from HWC, the conservators from Iziko Museums, LW and Prof Parkington on the 27 July 2022. They were met on site by staff from DWS.
- Fortunately, the rock art was not damaged, but it was clear that immediate action was needed. Staff from the DWS undertook the process of moving the panels to the Ou Tronk Museum, Clanwilliam where they are now in temporary storage, in a shed, under tarpaulin.
- DWS had submitted a document prior to the burglary (July 2022) with five (5) alternative locations for the rock art panels. They proposed that the smaller panel (CDW10) should remain at the Ou Tronk Museum but that the larger panel (CDE2) be transported to Iziko Museum in Cape Town.
- Prof Parkington motivated strongly that both panels (CDE02) and CDW10) should remain at the Ou Tronk Museum.
- Unfortunately, neither the DWS staff nor the curator of the Ou Tronk Museum were present to take part in the discussions on a way forward.
- LW noted that the Curator had indicated that the larger panel would be exhibited in an inside court, with no roof. Measures would be needed to protect the panel from the elements and from any public vandalism.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee noted the content of the report submitted by Department of Water Affairs (July 2022) with proposals for the display of the two small panels (CDW10) in Clanwilliam and the transport of the larger panel (CDE2) to Iziko in Cape town. The Committee was in support of retaining the panels in Clanwilliam and the need for DWS to ensure that this happens as per the original EA.

SB

10.2 Accidental Finds of Skeletal Remains
None

10.3 Sayers Lane Reburial
Arrangements had been prepared to have a memorial service for the reburial of the human remains from Sayers Lane and this was taking place on the 23 August 2022.

11. **Site Inspection**
None

12. **Proposed Site Inspection(s)**
None

13. **Site Inspection Report**
13.1 None

14. **Report back on Council**
None

15. Policy and Procedures

15.1 Updating HWC Accidental Finds Protocol

15.2 National Policy on Human Remains

MATTERS DISCUSSED

16. SECTION 35 PERMIT APPLICATION

16.1 None

17. SECTION 36 PERMIT APPLICATION

17.1 None

18. SECTION 36 PERMIT REPORT

18.1 None

19. SECTION 38 WORKPLAN APPLICATIONS

19.1 None

20. SECTION 38 WORKPLAN REPORT

20.1 None

21. SECTION 38 (4) HIA

21.1 None

22. Section 34 - ALTERATIONS/ADDITIONS/DEMOLITION

22.1 None

23. SECTION 38 (1) NID

23.1 None

24. REQUEST FOR EXCEPTION/OPINION/ADVICE

24.1 None

25. SECTION 27: PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITE

25.1 None

26. SECTION 38 (8) TO OTHER AUTHORITIES

**26.1 Proposed the rezoning, subdivision and development of part of the Remainder of Erf 460 in St Helena Bay. NM
HM/WEST COAST / SALDANABAY / ST HELENA BAY/ ERF 460**

Case No: 16101404AS1017E

Mr John Gribble was present for some of the discussion before recusing himself from the meeting.

HIA prepared by ACO Associates dated June 2022

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the item.

Ms Adel Groenewald and Mr Doug Jeffrey, (Doug Jeffrey Environmental Consultants),

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee took note of the objection of the Cochoqua Family Tribe. They expressed concern with the proposal, stating that there should not be any development without consultation with the First Nations, but no specific concerns or recommendations were made related to the site in terms of the NHRA. The EAP is in consultation with them on this matter.
- According to the PIA, the proposed rezoning subdivision and development will take place on the raised beaches of the Velddrif Formation which is of low palaeontological sensitivity. Due to the abundance of fossil shell in the deposits the proposed palaeontological mitigation is uncomplicated. The inspection of the shell bed sections during earthworks is recommended.
- The AIA states that a survey showed that portion G is archaeologically sensitive (Grade 3A) and this portion has subsequently been excluded from the development, whereas portions A&B were found to be of lower archaeological sensitivity. Committee members were of the opinion that random shovel testing in this area should be undertaken as a precautionary measure given the proximity of the site to the coast.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The Committee endorsed the archaeological and palaeontological recommendations on pg.'s 36 & 37 of the HIA by ACO Associates (July 2022) as follows:

1. In terms of palaeontological heritage, the site is deemed to be of low to medium significance. With respect to palaeontological heritage there are no fatal flaws or predetermined NO-GO areas.
 - a. During the construction phase a practical monitoring and mitigation programme must be implemented and be included in the EMPr for the development. The main recommendation is that representative shell bed sections exposed in earthworks be inspected, documented and sampled by a specialist. If any particularly deep excavations are to be made, such as for a sewerage pump station, it must be inspected, sampled and recorded. As it is not feasible for a specialist monitor to be continuously present the earth works personnel must be involved in mitigation by watching for fossil bones.
 - b. The Fossil Finds Procedure in place must be put in place (Appendix B) and the Environmental Control Officer (ECO) and construction supervisor must inform staff of the need to watch for potential fossil bone occurrences.
 - c. If a significant occurrence of fossil bones is discovered a professional palaeontologist must be appointed to collect them with a Workplan issued by

Heritage Western Cape, to record their stratigraphic context and to compile the report to Heritage Western Cape and the IZIKO S.A. Museum.

2. The Committee also recommended that shovel testing with a workplan be carried out across the development footprint prior to construction as a precautionary measure regarding underground archaeology.
3. The Committee requires consideration of conservation measures for the midden in area G (outside the development footprint). The report to be attached to the workplan report.

AM

**26.2 Prospecting mining rights application.MM
HM/WEST COAST / MATZIKAMA / VANRHYNSDORP / FARM 309
Case No: 21092903AM0103E**

Revised HIA dated June 2022 prepared by Sativa Travel and Environmental Consultants.

Mr Richard Myburgh was present

DISCUSSION:

- The revised (July 2022) report had not been uploaded in time for the meeting.

COMMENT

To be discussed via email before the next APM meeting.

AM

**26.3 Proposed Kwagga Wind Energy Grid section 1 to 7. NM
HM/ CENTRAL KAROO / BEAUFORT WEST / VARIOUS FARMS / KWAGGA
Case No: 20220518SB0519E**

JO recused himself and left the meeting after the discussion.

HIA prepared by ASHA Consulting (June 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Seven separate gridlines and associated corridors being proposed to connect the wind farms to the grid and substations. Archaeology was found widely dispersed on the landscape, within and close to the corridors. The project layout was designed to avoid most sensitive features, and all sites on the corridor are graded as not conservation worthy.
- The paleontological impacts are considered to be low. It was noted that once excavations for the pylons are deeper than 1m, the holes need to be monitored by the ECO

COMMENT to IACOM

The Committee endorsed the HIA for the Kwagga EGI 1-7 in the HIA by ASHA Consulting (June 2022) pg.'s 34&35:

- A palaeontologist must conduct a preconstruction survey of the final authorised alignment well in advance of construction to determine whether any areas require avoidance or mitigation;
- An archaeologist must conduct a preconstruction survey of the final authorised alignment well in advance of construction to determine whether any areas require avoidance or mitigation;
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development, then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

**26.4 Proposed Hoogland 1 Wind, Beaufort West.MM
HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 1
Case No: 21060101SB0818E**

JO recused himself and left the meeting after the discussion.

HIA prepared by ASHA Consulting (June 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- With respect to the Northern cluster, a large number of resources was recorded within the area, with the majority being historic sites, rock engravings and scatters of stone tools.
- The committee has seen earlier versions of this report during the feasibility process. An attempt was made to avoid heritage resources during the design process.
- For this reason, the overall impact of the development on heritage resources is considered to be low.
- A number of areas of high Palaeo sensitivity can be identified in the southern portion and these have been declared no-go areas.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The Committee endorsed the report by ASHA Consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg.'s 95-96

- The archaeological site at waypoint 1703 that will be crossed by a proposed wind farm road must be excavated prior to construction. Excavation should at least cover the area to be disturbed;
- The archaeological site at waypoints 1978 and 1979 that will be overlapped by a turbine footing must be excavated prior to construction. Excavation must target the densest part(s) of the scatter within or close to the impact zone;
- The two graves at waypoint 1696 must be fenced with a regular farm-style fence with a

pedestrian entrance gate so as to ensure that they are easily identifiable on site. The fence must be placed at least 5 m from the graves and the electrical cable must be placed a minimum of 5 m away from the fence, but preferably further if possible;

- Trenching within 30 m of waypoint 1696 must be monitored by relevant project staff and/or the ECO;
- Road construction work around the Slangfontein farm werf must be monitored by relevant project staff and/or the ECO to ensure that the walls remain unharmed;
- A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
- The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously surveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
- If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

26.5 Proposed Hoogland 2 Wind Farm, Beaufort West.MM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 2 Case No: 21060102SB0818E

JO recused himself and left the meeting after the discussion.

HIA prepared by ASHA Consulting (June 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- With respect the Northern cluster, a large number of resources was recorded within the area, with the majority being historic sites, rock engravings and scatters of stone tools.
- The committee have seen earlier versions of this report during the feasibility process. An attempt was made to avoid heritage resources during the design process.
- For this reason, the overall impact of the development on heritage resources is considered Low.
- A number of areas of high Palaeo sensitivity can be identified in the southern portion and these have been declared no go areas.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The Committee endorsed the report by ASHA Consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg.'s 96-98

- The archaeological site at waypoint 1703 that will be crossed by a proposed wind farm road must be excavated prior to construction. Excavation should at least cover the area to be

disturbed;

- The two graves at waypoint 702 must be fenced with a regular farm-style fence with a pedestrian entrance gate so as to ensure that they are easily identifiable on site;
- The cable trench proposed through the historic farm complex of Bulskolk (in the vicinity of waypoint 113) must be sure to avoid impacting any ruined structures or other features in the vicinity;
- Roadworks within 30 m of the graves at waypoint 702 must be monitored by relevant project staff and/or the ECO;
- Trenching within the historic werf at Bulskolk (in the vicinity of waypoint 113) must be monitored by relevant project staff and/or the ECO to ensure that the various features remain unharmed;
- A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
- The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously surveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
- If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

**26.6 Proposed Hoogland 3 Wind Farm, Beaufort West.MM
HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 3
Case No: 21060103SB0818E**

JO recused himself and left the meeting after the discussion.

HIA prepared by ASHA Consulting (dated June 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- With respect the Northern cluster, a large number of resources was recorded within the area, with the majority being historic sites, rock engravings and scatters of stone tools.
- The majority of rock engravings were concentrated on one hill in the Hoogland 3 facility and the Committee emphasised the need to avoid them.
- The committee has seen earlier versions of this report during the feasibility process. An attempt was made to avoid heritage resources during the design process.
- For this reason, the overall impact of the development on heritage resources is considered to be low.

- A number of areas of high Palaeo sensitivity can be identified in the southern portion and these have been declared no go areas.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The Committee endorsed the report by ASHA Consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg.'s 95-96

- The various sites that will be directly impacted must be considered for protection through micrositing or else, if unavoidable, archaeological mitigation (recording, tracing and photography of engravings; excavation and sampling of artefacts) must be implemented. This affects waypoints 123-124, 131, 132, 150, 151, 168, 173 & 1854;
- If during the pre-construction survey it is decided that some engravings that can be protected *in situ* are too important to risk, then mitigation should be affected there too;
- Micrositing is strongly advised to avoid the ruins at waypoints 1563 and 1564;
- The various sites the buffers of which will be intersected and where the activity will be quite close to the site should be marked on the ground with No-Go signage. This affects waypoints 128, 1660, 1827 & 1835;
- A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible). This will include a re-evaluation of the four sites listed above for on-site protection;
- The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously surveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
- If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

26.7 Proposed Hoogland 4 Wind Farm, Beaufort West.MM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 4 Case No: 21060103SB0818E

HIA prepared by ASHA Consulting (June 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- With respect the Northern cluster, a large number of resources was recorded within the area, with the majority being historic sites, rock engravings and scatters of stone tools .
- The committee have seen earlier versions of this report during the feasibility process. An attempt was made to avoid heritage resources during the design process.

- For this reason, the overall impact of the development on heritage resources is considered Low.
- A number of areas of high Palaeo sensitivity can be identified in the southern portion and these have been declared no go areas.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The Committee endorsed the report by ASHA Consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg.'s 96-97

- The farm road to be reused adjacent to waypoint 1807 may not be widened towards the north;
- Where the buffers of sites will be intersected, and where the activity will be quite close to the site, the ground should be with No-Go signage. This affects waypoints 1780,1801, 1806, 1807, 1588-1598 and 1781-1791;
- The complexes at waypoints 1588-1598 and 1781-1791 must be monitored by the ECO during road construction;
- A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micro-siting (if possible);
- The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously surveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
- If necessary, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

26.8 Hoogland Grid north

JO recused himself and left the meeting after the discussion.

HIA prepared by ASHA Consulting (June 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- With respect the Northern grid connection, a large number of resources was recorded within the area, with the majority being historic sites, a few rock engravings and scatters of stone tools.
- An attempt was made to avoid heritage resources during the design process.
- For this reason, the overall impact of the development on heritage resources is considered Low.
- A number of areas of high Palaeo sensitivity can be identified in the southern portion and this have been declared no go areas.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The Committee endorsed the report by ASHA Consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg.'s 60-61

- A pre-construction survey of the entire final alignment (powerline and service tracks) must be undertaken in order to determine whether any archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
- The final alignment (powerline and service tracks) must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously surveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
- If necessary, a Workplan application should be submitted to Heritage Western Cape prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- All heritage structures must be avoided by the powerline by at least 50 m whether occupied or not;
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

26.9 Hoogland grid south

JO recused himself and left the meeting after the discussion.

HIA prepared by ASHA Consulting (June 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- With respect the Southern grid connection, a large number of resources was recorded within the area, with the majority being historic sites, rock engravings and scatters of stone tools.
- An attempt was made to avoid heritage resources during the design process.
- For this reason, the overall impact of the development on heritage resources is considered Low.
- A number of areas of high Palaeo sensitivity can be identified in the southern portion and these have been declared no go areas.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The Committee endorsed the report by ASHA Consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg. 64

- A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised alignment (powerline and service tracks) must be undertaken in order to determine whether any archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
- The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially

sensitive areas;

- If necessary a Workplan application should be submitted to Heritage Western Cape prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- All heritage structures must be avoided by the powerline by at least 50 m whether occupied or not;
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

**26.10 Pienaarspoort WEF External Grid Connection 1. NM
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / WITZENBERG / MATJIESFONTEIN/ VARIOUS FARMS
Case No: 22070415SB0705E**

HIA prepared by CTS Heritage (July 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

Ms Jenna Lavin was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted the generally low significance of stone tool scatters in the area
- The Committee noted the value of consulting an MPhil thesis by R Regensberg on her stone kraal database when undertaking surveys in this general area.
- All excavations greater than 1m needs to be monitored by the ECO for fossil remains
- The archaeologist motivated that a pre-construction survey was not necessary.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The Committee endorsed the report by CTS Heritage (June 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg. 38

1. A no development area of 50m is implemented around sites PP2_EGL_21, 26 and 27
2. The Environmental Site Ocer (ESO) should be made aware of the possibility of

important fossil remains (bones, teeth, fish, petrified wood, plant-rich horizons etc) being found or unearthed during the construction phase of the development.

The ESO must monitor for fossil material of all major surface clearance and deeper (> 1m) excavations on an on-going basis during the construction phase.

The HWC Chance Fossil Finds Procedure must be used in this regard.

3. Should any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g. remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils or other categories of heritage resources be found during the proposed development, work must cease, and HWC must be contacted immediately regarding an appropriate way forward.
4. If unmarked human burials are uncovered, work must cease, and HWC must be contacted immediately regarding an appropriate way forward as per section 36(6) of the NHRA.

SB

**26.11 Pienaarspoort WEF External Grid Connection 2. NM
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / WITZENBERG / MATJIESFONTEIN/ VARIOUS FARMS
Case No: 22070416SB0705E**

HIA prepared by CTS Heritage (June 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

Ms Jenna Lavin was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted the generally low significance of stone tool scatters in the area
- The Committee noted the value of consulting an MPhil thesis by R Regensberg on her stone kraal database when undertaking surveys in this general area.
- All excavations greater than 1m needs to be monitored by the ECO for fossil remains.
- The archaeologist motivated that a pre-construction survey was not necessary.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The Committee endorsed the report by CTS Heritage (June 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg. 30

1. A no development area of 50m is implemented around sites PP2_EGI_21, 26 and 27
2. The Environmental Site Officer (ESO) should be made aware of the possibility of important fossil remains (bones, teeth, fish, petrified wood, plant-rich horizons etc) being found or unearthed during the construction phase of the development.
The ESO must monitor for fossil material of all major surface clearance and deeper (> 1m) excavations on an on-going basis during the construction phase.
The HWC Chance Fossil Finds Procedure must be used in this regard.
3. Should any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g. remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils or other categories of heritage resources be found during the proposed development, work must cease, and HWC must be contacted immediately regarding an appropriate way forward.
4. If unmarked human burials are uncovered, work must cease, and HWC must be contacted immediately regarding an appropriate way forward as per section 36(6) of the NHRA.

SB

**26.12 Pienaarspoort WEF External Grid Connection 3. NM
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / WITZENBERG / MATJIESFONTEIN/ VARIOUS FARMS
Case No: 22070417SB0705E**

HIA prepared by CTS Heritage (July 2022)

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

Ms Jenna Lavin was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted the generally low significance of stone tool scatters in the area
- The Committee noted the value of consulting an MPhil thesis by R Regensberg on her stone kraal database when undertaking surveys in this general area.
- All excavations greater than 1m needs to be monitored by the ECO for fossil remains.
- The archaeologist motivated that a pre-construction survey was not necessary.

COMMENT TO IACOM

The committee endorsed the report by CTS Heritage (June 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg. 30

