

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE (HWC),
ARCHAEOLOGY, PALAEOLOGY AND METEORITES COMMITTEE (APM)
Held on Wednesday, 1 June 2018 in the Boardroom, 1st Floor Protea Assurance
Building, Greenmarket Square, Cape Town at 09:00 AM**

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

The Chairperson, Dr Antonia Malan, officially opened the meeting at 09:10 and welcomed everyone present.

2. ATTENDANCE

Members

Dr Antonia Malan (AMa)
Dr Wendy Black (WB)
Dr Jayson Orton (JO)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Mr John Gribble (JG)
Dr Lita Webley (LW)
Dr Ragna Redelstorff (RR)
Dr Abigail Moffett (AMo)

Members of Staff

Mr Jonathan Windvogel (JW)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Stephanie-Anne Barnardt (SB)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Mr Thando Zingange (TZ)
Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB)

Visitors

Mr Tim Hart (TH)

Mr Stan Evans (SE)

Observers

None

3. APOLOGIES

Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Mr Andrew September (AS)

Dr Mariagrazia Galimberti

Absent

None

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

4.1 Dated 1 June 2018.

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda with additional items.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

5.1 Dated 2 May 2018.

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes.

6. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

- JG: item 13.1 and
- LW: item 12.2

7. CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS

7.1 None

8. APPOINTMENTS

8.1 None

9. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

9.1 Registration of Repositories

The Committee noted that the draft form has been circulated for comment.

DECISION

AS and SB to prepare a brief status report for next APM meeting.

AS/SB

9.2 Outstanding Mitigation and Workplan Reports

See below.

AS

9.2.1 Mitigation Workplan for Proposed Sand Mine on Farm Welverdiend, Matzikama

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Due to late submission (Wednesday) some members of Committee did not have an opportunity to read the documentation.
- The sample collection is the most important product of this project, together with a discussion of its context on the ground and in relation to other studies in the region.
- It would be helpful if the description of work already carried out and what is still proposed to be done are more clearly differentiated in the Workplan.
- The proposed collection of further samples is not adequately described in terms of strategy and methodology.
- It is noted that, as there are time constraints due to his new job, the Principal Investigator (PI) can consider partnering with another suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist to do the field work, analysis and interpretation towards a draft report.
- The Committee further noted that mining operations cannot commence until the final Workplan Report has been approved by APM, and expressed concern that the company may not be fully cogniscent of current delays in processing the Workplan.

DECISION

A revised Workplan addressing the following points to be submitted before the next APM meeting:

- Previous work and proposed work to be clearly and separately addressed.
- Strategy and methodology for proposed sample collection to be clarified.

AS

9.2.2 Proposed Development of Gateway Precinct: Dock Road (Erven 149, 294 and 9588) V&A Waterfront (Amsterdam Battery Park): Status Report

Mr Tim Hart was present and took part in the discussion.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- All the archaeological mitigation work was supposed to have taken place before construction commenced, and was intended to inform a Conservation Management Plan and the proposed landscaping plans for the precinct. For various reasons this did not happen, and resulted in archaeological investigation of only the southern portion of the site before its closure in order to serve as a lay-down area for the construction of a parking garage in front of the battery.
- It has been pointed out during site inspections that the principle of the primacy of the heritage resource – the Amsterdam Battery – was thereby compromised.
- HWC undertook to conduct regular site inspections but this was not implemented.
- The mitigation approach taken by the archaeological consultant is conservative (post-1850 material is exposed, and lower, earlier levels remain unexcavated), while endorsing the proposed protection and adaptive reuse of the site as a landscaped feature and interpretive resource for the public.
- Recent archaeological work on the northern half of the site has exposed extensive remnants of the battery at the level of the planned landscaping, and has revealed how a proposed ramp entrance onto the southern end of the surviving battery wall will impact *in situ* fabric.
- A landscape plan was prepared based on what was known at the time of the first excavations. New information is now available. The landscape plan is therefore being revised, but ad hoc decisions taken on site are not an appropriate strategy for dealing with such a significant heritage resource.
- Copies of approved and proposed landscape plans must be assessed by HWC to ascertain whether archaeological concerns have been addressed.
- It was noted that there are time constraints and considerable pressure to complete the mitigation due to a general overrun on the precinct construction project. An efficient and effective mechanism to expedite the matter is required.

DECISION

An audit of HWC approvals (IACom/APM) to be prepared, especially in terms of the exposed archaeological features and iterative amendments to the landscape plans.

HWC must urgently consider whether it is advisable to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to liaise with the archaeologist, relevant consultants / practitioners and the developer and to conduct frequent site inspections.

AS

9.2.3 Battery Crescent Gun Emplacement, Sea Point

See Item 13.1.

AS

9.3 Comment on Framework for the Draft Western Cape Heritage Management Bill

LW presented a verbal report on the well-attended Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport (DCAS) workshop held on the 31 May 2018, which was noted. LW to

collate comments from APM Committee members which will be forwarded to Mr Guy Redman, Chief Director of Cultural Affairs, DCAS.

10 STANDING ITEMS

10.1 Site Visit Reports

- Proposed Langebaanweg Aquifer Infrastructure Project Farm 176, 175, 139, 304 and Erf 1749. See Item 16.1.
- Erf 1825, 54 Vasco Da Gama Drive, Britannia Heights, St Helena Bay. See Item 20.1.
- Erf 271, Wilderness, Possible Shell Midden. See Item 20.2.

10.2 Report Back on ExCo and Council

Nothing to report.

AM/CSc

11. POLICY AND PROCEDURES

11.1 South African Police Services (SAPS) Protocol

Standard protocols, emergency protocols, information leaflets and training programmes are being prepared in relation to the discovery of human remains.

MATTERS DISCUSSED

12. PERMIT APPLICATIONS

12.1 Proposed Ruins Rehabilitation and Stabilisation as Part of the Skuifraam Archaeological Interpretation Site, Farm Skuifraam 11149 and 1629, Berg River Dam, Franschoek: NM HM/FRANSCHHOEK/ERVEN 11149 AND 1629

Case No: 18021318AS0215M

S.35 permit application and associated documents including previous approvals were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The S.35 permit application is for various interventions into the fabric of the archaeological ruins in order to stabilise the remains and protect the site under a shelter. The applicant requested approval of the permit and asked for comment on the design of the proposed shelter and interpretive display.
- The Committee is in principle fully supportive of the proposed Interpretive Site and proposed structure, and notes that the Franschoek Conservation Body supports the project.
- The site lies within a "Conservation Area" owned by the Department of Water & Sanitation, managed in terms of a Resource Management Plan (2015). There is no approved Conservation Management Plan in terms of the NHRA, as recommended in the Permit Report submitted in 2015, though the covering letter from Cape Archaeological Survey cc dated 3 March 2018 refers to a "long-term Phase 3 Management Plan to protect the Skuifraam Ruins".

- It was further noted that a Notification of Intent to Develop has not yet been tabled at HOMS.

FURTER REQUIREMENTS

The Resource Management Plan of 2015, and any other conservation management plans, to be submitted for consideration at the next APM meeting. It is recommended that the applicant (and/or a representative of the interpretive project) attends that meeting.

AS

12.2 Proposed Cleaning of Ruins of Church at Oude Werf Hotel, Portion of Erf 1243 and 16044, 30 Church Street, Stellenbosch: MA HM/STELLENBOSCH/ERVEN 16044 AND 1243

Case No: 18050809AS0575E

LW recused herself and left the room.

S.35 permit application and associated documents were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee expressed support for the proposed cleaning, improved display and reinterpretation of the structural remains, to the benefit of the custodian and the public.

RECORD OF DECISION

The permit application to clean and rehabilitate the ruins was approved.

AS

13 PERMIT REPORTS

13.1 Proposed Mitigation and Redesign of Development in response to Battery Remnants on Erven 1075, 1080 and 1081, Battery Crescent, Sea Point: MA HM/SEA POINT/ERF 1075, 1080 & 1081

Case No: 18032204AS0329E

JG recused himself and left the room.

Mitigation Report and Draft Conservation Management Plan were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr Tim Hart and Mr Stan Evans were present and took part in the discussion.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- A Status Report including a comprehensive updated description of the site in response to the Committee's request was noted, together with a draft Conservation Plan that provided, inter alia, detailed guidelines for metal conservation and future management responsibilities of the Body Corporate.

- Consultation with experts in the field has taken place and considerable publicity has been garnered through the news media and social media. The site is significant and has attracted international interest.
- The site is currently graded Grade IIIA, but a Grade II (or even Grade I) status has been proposed in the Status Report.
- The option for adaptive reuse of the gun emplacement and adjoining vaults was presented in the form of a revised building plan and as an artist's impression. This is supported by the archaeological consultant.
- All the material can be accommodated in situ or on site, including the dismantled pieces of the blast shield.

DECISION

The Committee recommended that the site should be considered for Grade II status and further recommended that it is nominated for declaration as a Provincial Heritage Site.

The option presented for adaptive reuse, with accompanying revised building plan, is supported. The remains of the blast shield to be retained on the property in an appropriate manner.

The draft Conservation Management Plan is supported, and HWC will inform relevant I&APs.

AS

14 SECTION 38 WORKPLAN APPLICATIONS

14.1 S38 Mitigation Report for Clanwilliam Dam Mitigation Project, Cederberg: MA HM/WEST COAST/CEDERBERG/CLANWILLIAM/RAISING OF CLANWILLIAM DAM

Case No: 14061920GT0814M

Mitigation Reports for Grave Relocation, Socio-Historical Research and Excavation Work were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee was very pleased to received the multi-volume report, tabled at APM in May 2018, and has given the extensive documentation lengthy attention. It is recognized that it is a major and important Cultural Resources Management project for the Western Cape. The documents are professionally produced and well designed for readability and graphic quality.
- The Committee looks forward to receiving a final and complete report in due course. In this regard, it was noted that the HWC letter dated 15 July 2015 states that: "A preliminary report on the mitigation is required for approval by HWC before the development impacts on the sites and a final report within three years from commencement of the work". However, it is also noted that final mitigation funding and construction work on the dam was frozen.
- It was noted, therefore, that the rock art panel relocation and approved storage issue is still in abeyance. It is understood that funding is now available for the dam wall construction project to proceed and the Committee strongly recommends that the necessary resources to complete the rock art mitigation plan are urgently acquired from the Department of Water & Sanitation.

- The mitigation report for grave relocations was very well handled and unanimously approved.
- The oral socio-spatial history and community participation projects are a rich and significant resource, but not very focused, and it is hoped that the interviews can in future be systematically analysed and reported as contributions to the archaeological record (e.g. plants, built environment, cultural landscape).
- Members of the Committee had high expectations and expressed some disappointment and concern that there was a lack of adequate, relevant archaeological information and detail due to the manner in which the results of mitigation were presented. Basic reporting requires basic information; however, artefact typologies / tabulations, some academic input and discussion were thin, inaccurate or missing. The data behind the interpretations is not available, such as tables of artefacts (rather than histograms), the use of artefact terminology recognized in the Western Cape, and the position of sites in the overall stratigraphic sequence. These aspects can be addressed in the final report.
- In order to offer assistance, the Committee requested the case officer to send the Approved and Draft HWC Minimum Standards for Reports and Phase 2 Mitigation to the PGS Heritage team.
- In order to make informed decisions as to whether any of the sites should be further investigated before inundation, the Committee requires further information.
- Specific concerns are listed in the Interim Comment below.

INTERIM COMMENT

- The Department of Water & Sanitation to be informed that there are outstanding heritage commitments to be funded and completed, in particular the rock art relocation project.
- The Final Report from PGS must address the following further requirements and clarifications:
 - The typology of artefacts (in particular lithics) must either be reclassified in Western Cape terms, or the terminology used in the report must be clearly defined in the report.
 - Site reports, tables and data to be included in the report that adequately represent the full archaeological record, and provide sufficient information for researchers to assess it as a resource for further research. (Such information (complete metadata) is also required by the designated repository.)
 - Stratigraphic drawings of excavations to indicate the position of samples used in radiocarbon dating.
 - Images and/or discussion of all artefacts to be included, such as pottery, ostrich eggshell and fauna. Illustrations of historical archaeological material obtained from collections around, and in excavations of ruined structures (i.e. ceramics, glass, etc).
 - Comparative context or references for the built environment, such as vernacular architecture studies.
 - A Conclusion to the report, with recommendations for further studies, such as faunal analysis and analyses of historical archaeological material and oral history related to archaeology.

AS

15. SECTION 38 WORKPLAN REPORTS

15.1 None

16 SECTION 38 (8) TO OTHER AUTHORITIES

16.1 Proposed Langebaanweg Aquifer Infrastructure Project Farm 176, 175, 139, 304 and Erf 1749: NM HM/HOPEFIELD/SALDANHA BAY

Case No: 18042403SB0426E & 18050403SB0504E

Site inspection report and NID application were tabled.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- In order to supplement their water supply, the Saldanha Bay Municipality intends to access the Langebaan Aquifer. This requires the excavation of trenches for connecting pipelines as well as the drilling of boreholes into the Langebaan Aquifer.
- Boreholes and pipeline trenches have already been constructed in a known palaeontologically and archaeologically highly sensitive area under an emergency situation (a notice was gazetted in terms of s.38(9) for drought relief) and without any heritage consultation or assessment.
- There are two portions of infrastructure, north of the road (already completed) and south of the road (proposed). Officials at Saldanha Bay Municipality expressed their concerns to HWC, which conducted a site inspection and requested an emergency Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to be conducted in the south portion. An HIA was submitted for approval, which includes the Workplan for the survey of the Aquifer project within the Hopefield Private Nature Reserve.
- It was noted that the significant fossil beds probably lie beneath the level of the pipeline trenches but the boreholes would impact them. See Palaeontological Impact Assessment (HIA Appendix 5). Stone tools were observed during the site inspection of the areas already subject to construction.
- The HIA recommends that full-time monitoring of all excavations and borehole drilling by a competent practitioner with the ability to identify archaeological resources as well as significant fossil material is required.

RECORD OF DECISION

The Workplan was approved and the Recommendations in Section 6 of the Heritage Impact Assessment (pages 14-15) were supported. In summary, full-time monitoring of all excavations and borehole drilling by a practitioner with the necessary palaeontological and archaeological expertise is required.

SB

17 SECTION 27: PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITE

17.1 None

18 REQUEST FOR EXCEPTION / OPINION / ADVICE

18.1 None

19 REPORT BACK FROM OTHER MEETINGS WHEN RELEVANT

19.1 None

20 OTHER MATTERS

20.1 Erf 1825, 54 Vasco Da Gama Drive, Britannia Heights, St Helena Bay: MA HM/ST HELENA BAY/ERF 1825

Report back from site inspection.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- LW accompanied AS and SB on a site inspection of the 'waterbak' site and surroundings previously reported. Pottery and stone tools were observed in the area, as expected, but the bones removed from the 'waterbak' are still to be assessed.
- The Municipality is now alerted to the fact that the area is archaeologically sensitive and ongoing developments are likely to impact these and other heritage resources. Farmers are also collecting artefacts as curiosities.
- It was suggested that HWC should prepare information leaflets, and submit articles to widely read media, such as *Farmers Weekly* and the local newspaper. LW and PM to explore departmental support and funding for preparation and printing of material.

DECISION

A letter to be written to the property owner and copied to Municipal Officials regarding the archaeological significance and sensitivity of the area and the need for compliance with statutory protections in order to ensure proper assessment and conservation of archaeological heritage.

SB

20.2 Erf 271, Wilderness, Possible Shell Midden

Report back from site inspection by SB.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- A proposed driveway construction on the steep slope above the road is likely to impact archaeological material. The site inspection was to determine whether the site was of significance and to recommend whether the proposed work may proceed or whether further archaeological mitigation must take place.
- There were traces of archaeological material and the presence of a rock overhang in a portion of what is assumed to be the driveway route, but there is no actual plan of the exact location of the proposed driveway.
- The Heritage Officer recommended that a s.35 permit application for archaeological monitoring be submitted to HWC before any earthworks take place.

RECORD OF DECISION

A S.35 Permit Application must be submitted to HWC for an Archaeologist to conduct further testing and make recommendations for mitigation before the commencement of earthworks associated with the construction of the driveway and associated landscaping.

SB

21. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

The Committee adopted the resolutions and decisions and the minutes will be circulated for editing.

22 CLOSURE

The meeting adjourned at: 14:00

23 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY 4 July 2018

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____

Approved