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A PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED RESIDENTIAL VILLAGE ON PORTION 1 OF ERF 319, FAIRVIEW FARM, FAIREWOOD ESTATE, GRAHAMSTOWN, MAKANA MUNICIPALITY, CACADU DISTRICT, EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE.

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to conduct a phase 1 archaeological impact assessment (AIA) for the proposed mixed residential village on portion 1 of Erf 319 Fairview Farm, Fairewood Estate, Grahamstown, Makana Municipality, Cacadu District, Eastern Cape Province. The survey was conducted to establish the range and importance of the exposed and in situ archaeological heritage materials and features, the potential impact of the development, and to make recommendations to minimize possible damage to these sites.

Brief Summary of Findings

Dry stone walling remains of the original farmhouse and adjacent dry stone walling kraal were recorded to the south-east, outside of the proposed development area. Dry stone walling features, including a stand-alone wall, and packed stone that resembled water flow control / anti-erosion channels, were encountered below the modern homestead in the centre of the proposed area for development. Historical ceramic sherds were also encountered within this area. No other pre-colonial archaeological heritage materials were encountered within the area proposed for development.

Recommendations

The area is of a medium-low cultural sensitivity and development may proceed as planned, although the following recommendations must be considered (see page 15 for full recommendations):

1. The original dry stone walling farmhouse and kraal must be cordoned off and protected during all phases of development.

2. The remaining stone walling features and ceramics sherds must be appropriately protected.
3. If concentrations of archaeological heritage material and human remains are uncovered during construction, all work must cease immediately and be reported to the Albany Museum (046 622 2312) and/or the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) (021 642 4502) so that systematic and professional investigation/excavation can be undertaken.

4. Construction managers/foremen must be informed before construction starts on the possible types of heritage sites and cultural material they may encounter and the procedures to follow when they find sites.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The phase 1 archaeological impact assessment (AIA) report is required for the environmental impact assessment (EIA).

Consultant:

Scherman Colloty and Associates
Contact person: Dr Brian Colloty
Postnet Suite #25
Private Bag X1672
Grahamstown
6140
Cell: 083 498 3299
email: brian@itsnet.co.za

Terms of Reference

To conduct a survey of possible archaeological heritage sites within the area for the proposed mixed residential village on portion 1 of Erf 319 Fairview Farm, Fairewood Estate, Grahamstown, Makana Municipality, Cacadu District, Eastern Cape Province. The survey was conducted to establish the range and importance of the exposed and in situ archaeological heritage materials and features, the potential impact of the development, and to make recommendations to minimize possible damage to these sites.
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 5000m$^2$ 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 000m$^2$ 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.

BRIEF ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Literature review

The pre-colonial archaeological record of the Grahamstown region and immediate  
surrounds includes traces of the Early Stone Age (ESA) (1.5 million – 250 000 years  
ago), Middle Stone Age (MSA) (250 000 – 30 000 years ago), Later Stone Age (LSA) (30  
000 – recent), Khoekhoen pastoralists and the Later Iron Age farming communities  
within the last 2000 years. The historical archaeological record is relatively extensive  
owing to the area being settled by the 1820 British Settlers and the subsequent features  
established in relation to the British – Xhosa Wars. The literature and research within  
this area is limited and incomplete, although a few sites (pre-colonial and historical)  
have been excavated in the surrounding Grahamstown areas.

According to S.L. Hall (1985), classic Early Stone Age handaxes and cleavers had been  
found near the Grahamstown golf course that probably dates between 1 million and 200  
000 years ago in comparison to similar artefacts documented throughout southern  
Africa. The site of Howieson’s Poort is situated about ten kilometres south-west of  
Grahamstown and is the archetype site for a distinctive type of Middle Stone Age stone  
tool with similar specimens having been documented at the Kasouga River-mouth and at  
Bell in the Peddie District (van Riet Lowe et al. 1929). The Middle Stone Age in the  
region has been dated to between 125 000-75 000 years ago as it coincides with the last  
interglacial period when climatic and environmental conditions were similar to those of  
the present interglacial. It is possible, although lacking in evidence, that seasonal  
movement between the Cape folded mountains behind Grahamstown and the coast took  
place (Hall 1985).
Between 75 000 and 15 000 years ago there seems to have been no human occupation within the Grahamstown region owing to the worsening climatic conditions. From about 15 000 years ago populations of hunter-gatherers re-established themselves within the region as is evidenced in the preserved Later Stone Age occupational deposits of the few caves and rock shelters that have been excavated, namely Melkhoutboom in the Suurberg (Deacon 1976), Wilton near Alicedale, Uniondale about 20km north-east of Grahamstown (Leslie-Brooker 1987), Springs Rock Shelter and Glen Craig situated immediately north and north-east of Grahamstown, and Edgehill and Welgeluk located on the Koonap River some 40km to the north of Grahamstown (Hall 1985). In addition, most of these sites and many more caves and shelters in the surrounding Grahamstown area contain rock art.

References:


DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY

Area Surveyed

Location data

The proposed area for the mixed residential development is approximately 16 hectares in extent and is situated within the Fairewood Estate Nature Reserve on portion 1 of Erf 319 Fairview Farm. Fairewood Estate is located about 6km to the east of Grahamstown and is bordered by the R72 road to Port Alfred to the south, and the N2 to King William’s Town to the north.

Map

1:50 000: 3226 BC Grahamstown
Map 1. 1:50 000 map indicating the area proposed for the mixed residential development on portion 1 of Erf 319 Fairview Farm, Fairewood Estate.
Map 2. Wide aerial view showing the location of the proposed mixed residential development of portion 1 of Erf 319 Fairview Farm, Fairewood Estate.
Map 3. Close-up aerial view of the proposed mixed residential development on portion 1 of Erf 319 on Fairview Farm, Fairewood Estate showing the sites encountered during the survey.
ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION

Methodology

The survey was conducted on foot. GPS readings were taken using a Garmin Oregon 550 (Table 1). The GPS readings have been plotted on Map 2 and Map 3. Most of the area was covered in dense grass and bush vegetation making archaeological visibility difficult over the majority of the proposed area. However, the exposed, eroded, and disturbed areas, as well as rocky outcrops were investigated for possible archaeological material remains. Most of the area has been disturbed by general farming activities and associated construction such as fences, dams, farm roads, and electricity pylons, as well as modern accommodation situated in the centre of the proposed area for development.

Figs 1-4. Views of the landscape, some disturbances, and areas investigated.

The original dry stone walling farmhouse and the adjacent dry stone walling kraal were recorded at the area marked FW Hist1 (kraal) and FW Hist2 (farmhouse) (Map 3). However, these features are situated on municipal land and fall outside of the area proposed for the mixed residential development. A few broken glass sherds were observed within the farmhouse structure (Figs 5-8).
Mainly two packed stone and one dry stone walling features as well as broken ceramic sherds were encountered within the north central area at the bottom of the slope, adjacent to the modern buildings at the areas marked FW Hist3 – FW Hist5 and FW BE1. The extent of the area is approximately 20m x 20m in extent. The packed stones have been placed in a rectangular shape approximately 3m x 2m and vertically down slope approximately 3m in extent. The packed stone resemble water flow channels packed for anti-erosion measures (Figs 9-10).
The dry stone wall seems to stand alone, no further stone walling in the form of wall, foundations, or rubble were encountered towards the sloped area, however, the area has been overgrown by bush which made visibility relatively difficult. The dry stone wall may also be included as a measure to avert water erosion (Fig 11-12).

Figs 11 – 12. Views of the stand alone dry stone wall (measuring stick = 1.2m).

The historical broken ceramic sherds comprised both porcelain and stoneware vessels probably dating to the late 19th century and early 20th century. The broken sherds occurred between the packed stones and slightly upslope towards the stand-alone dry stone walling (Figs 13-14).

Figs 13 – 14. The distribution of broken ceramic sherds (measuring stick = 1.2m) (left) and examples of the broken pottery sherds documented (right).

A concrete block about 2.5m by 2.5m that contained several glass bottles, seems to be a later addition to the area owing to the relatively modern building materials used. It is possible that the concrete block was used as a dump. However, the area has been overgrown by thick dense impenetrable bush, making visibility difficult (Figs 15-16).
No pre-colonial archaeological remains were encountered within the area proposed for development. An original dry stone walling farmhouse and associated dry stone walling kraal were documented to the south-east outside the proposed development area. One area, approximately 20m x 20 m in extent, containing packed stones, dry stone walling and broken historical ceramic sherds was documented within the area proposed for development.

SURVEY/DESCRIPTION OF SITES

Three dry stone walling structures were documented (FW Hist1, FW Hist2, and FW Hist5). Packed stones resembling anti-erosion channels were documented (FW Hist3). One concrete block, possibly established more recently, with several glass bottles dumped inside (FW BE Feat1). One scatter of broken historical ceramic sherds was documented (FW Hist4).

It is unlikely that the development activities would impact the original dry stone walling farmhouse and adjacent kraal (FW Hist1 and FW Hist2) as these features are situated to the south east, outside of the area proposed for development. However, mitigation measures have been included in the recommendations for the protection and preservation of these historical structures.

The area situated in the north central area of the proposed area for development, incorporating the various packed stones and dry stone walling features and the historical ceramic sherd scatter (FW Hist3, FW Hist4, FW Hist5, and FW BE Feat1) is zoned to be used as open space.
Table 1. GPS co-ordinates and sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GPS Co-ordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FW Hist1</td>
<td>Original dry stone walling farmhouse</td>
<td>33°19'44.60&quot;S; 26°33'19.30&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW Hist2</td>
<td>Dry stone walling kraal</td>
<td>33°19'45.50&quot;S; 26°33'20.10&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW Hist3</td>
<td>Packed stones</td>
<td>33°19'29.60&quot;S; 26°33'20.50&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW Hist4</td>
<td>Historical ceramic scatter</td>
<td>33°19'29.70&quot;S; 26°33'20.30&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW Hist5</td>
<td>Dry stone walling</td>
<td>33°19'30.10&quot;S; 26°33'20.00&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW BE FEAT1</td>
<td>Concrete block with glass bottles dumped inside</td>
<td>33°19'30.10&quot;S; 26°33'20.30&quot;E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CULTURAL LANDSCAPE**

There is no material evidence of a pre-colonial archaeological landscape within the area proposed for development. However, evidence from the wider region stipulates that the activities on the pre-colonial landscape ranged from the Early Stone Age, Middle Stone Age, and Later Stone Age. Evidence points to a predominantly historical archaeological landscape colonized during the early 1800’s and settled from the 1820’s. Remains of historical dry stone walling farmhouses, kraals, and walls, as well as packed stone and broken ceramic sherds show such evidence of historical settlement on the landscape.

Currently the proposed area for development is a nature reserve, and therefore encourages conservation by retaining some of the wild game that may have roamed the region and attempts to eradicate alien vegetation brought in by the activities of the historical settlement. The natural quality of the cultural landscape has been obscured by the construction of the N2 national road to the north and the R72 regional road to Port Alfred. The view from the proposed area of development is directly onto the N2 national road and across on to one of Grahamstown’s township settlements.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The area is of a medium-low cultural sensitivity and development may proceed as planned, although the following recommendations must be considered (see end of report for full recommendations):

1. A professional archaeologist (with an already authorised collection permit) must be appointed during the various phases of development including vegetation clearing and the excavation activities to monitor and identify possible archaeological material remains and features and further make appropriate recommendations on removing and / or protecting the archaeological material remains and features.

2. If it is expected that the original dry stone walling farmhouse and kraal will be negatively affected during the development phases, the area must be cordoned off and protected during all phases of development.

3. The remaining stone walling features and ceramics sherds must be monitored during vegetation clearing and systematically documented and plotted during and after vegetation clearing. The appropriate mitigation measures can then be assessed.

4. If concentrations of archaeological heritage material and human remains are uncovered during construction, all work must cease immediately and be reported to the Albany Museum (046 622 2312) and/or the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) (021 642 4502) so that systematic and professional investigation/ excavation can be undertaken.

5. Construction managers/foremen must be informed before construction starts on the possible types of heritage sites and cultural material they may encounter and the procedures to follow when they find sites.
GENERAL REMARKS AND CONDITIONS

Note: This report is a phase 1 archaeological heritage 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) 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, (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 (AIAs) will be assessed by the relevant heritage resources authority. The final decision rests with the heritage resources authority, which should give a permit or a formal letter of permission for the destruction of any cultural sites.
APPENDIX A: IDENTIFICATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEATURES AND MATERIAL FROM INLAND AREAS: guidelines and procedures for developers

1. **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 the remains are buried in a flexed position on their sides, but are also found buried in a sitting position with a flat stone capping and developers are requested to be on the alert for this.

2. **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.

3. **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.

4. **Fossil bone**

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

5. **Large stone features**

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.

6. **Historical artefacts or features**

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