

## HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ARCHAEOLOGY, PALAEOLOGY AND METEORITES COMMITTEE HELD AT 10:00 AM ON 4 OCTOBER 2011, AT THE OFFICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS AND SPORT, 3rd FLOOR, PROTEA ASSURANCE BUILDING, GREENMARKET SQUARE, CAPE TOWN**

NO	SUBJECT	APPLICANT	DISCUSSION	DECISION	REF NO
<b>A.</b>	<b>OPENING AND WELCOME</b>		The Chairperson welcomed all members present.		
<b>B.</b>	<b>ATTENDANCE</b>		<p>The following members of the Committee attended the meeting:</p> <p>Mrs M. Leslie (Chairperson)                      Dr J. Deacon                      Dr J. Almond                      Mr D. Halkett                      Dr S. Chirikure                      Mr J. Pether</p> <p>The following members of the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport were present:</p> <p>Mr A. Hall                      Miss J. Lavin                      Mr. J. Bradfield                      Mrs C. Jikelo                      Mr C. van Wijk</p>		
<b>C.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>		Mrs N. Ndobochani Prof J. Sealy		
<b>D.</b>	<b>APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF 6 SEPTEMBER 2011</b>			The minutes were approved	<b>A</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS</b>				
<b>F</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES</b>				
F.1	WEST COAST ONE WIND ENERGY FACILITY: DEA AUTHORISATION	<b>JENNA LAVIN</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1. Miss Lavin has not yet drafted the letter to the Department of Environmental Affairs</p>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1. Miss Lavin must draft the letter to the Department of Environmental Affairs as per the previous minutes</p>	<b>1152</b>

NO	SUBJECT	APPLICANT	DISCUSSION	DECISION	REF NO
F.2	APM COMMITTEE MATTERS AND SECTION 38 OF THE NHRA	<b>CHAIRPERSON</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The draft S.38 Phase II template was circulated to committee members via email</li> <li>2. A report on the Phase II work will be required and it must comply with HWCs minimum standards for archaeological and palaeontological reports</li> <li>3. S. 38(10) indicates that if S.38 is complied with, then no other protections in this part apply. This has implications for ownership of heritage resources.</li> <li>4. AMAFA and SAHRA still follow the procedure for permits in terms of S. 35 for S. 38 applications.</li> </ol>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The committee will send comment on the template via email by Friday, 7 October</li> </ol>	
F.3	PALAEO-WORKSHOP	<b>CHAIRPERSON</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The professional staff of HWC will be attending a palaeontology workshop at the WCFP on the 14<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> October</li> </ol>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dr Almond, Dr Pether and Mrs Leslie will talk at the workshop.</li> </ol>	
F.4	LIST OF HWC APPROVED ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRACTITIONERS	<b>CHAIRPERSON</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This list must be updated</li> </ol>	<p>It was agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Miss Lavin must find the old list, the ASAPA list, the PSSA list and criteria to discuss at the next meeting</li> </ol>	
F.5	COPYRIGHT ISSUES	<b>CHAIRPERSON</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A decision has been taken by the legal advisors to the minister that no submissions made to HWC can be distributed without a PAIA application</li> <li>2. The PAIA procedure must be</li> </ol>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This matter will remain on the agenda</li> </ol>	

NO	SUBJECT	APPLICANT	DISCUSSION	DECISION	REF NO
			followed to access reports		
<b>1</b>	<b>SECTION 35 PERMIT APPLICATIONS (RESEARCH) APPLICATIONS</b>				
1.1	CAPE WEST COAST ANCIENT DNA PROJECT	<b>ANDREW SMITH</b>	It was noted that: 1. This is a worthwhile project	It was agreed that: 1. The application is approved	
1.2	PERMIT EXTENSION: EXCAVATIONS AT DIEPKLOOF	<b>JOHN PARKINGTON</b>	It was noted that: 1. This application is for a permit extension 2. The source for non-archaeological sediments to be used for backfilling is unclear. It must be clarified whether this is sieved material.	It was agreed that: 1. The application is approved subject to clarification	
1.3	EXCAVATION PERMIT: DISTRICT 6 MUSEUM	<b>HARRIET CLIFT</b>	It was noted that: 1. As the application was urgent, it was distributed to APM members by email	It was agreed that: 1. The permit was approved	
1.4	AMELIORATION PROJECT: REMOVAL OF FAKE ROCK ART	<b>JANETTE DEACON</b>	It was noted that: 1. The owner has requested that fake rock art be removed	It was agreed that: 1. The permit is approved	
	<b>PERMIT REPORTS</b>				
1.5	MSC THESIS: AN INVESTIGATION OF SULPHUR ISOTOPES AS A PALAEODIETARY INDICATOR IN SOUTHERN AFRICA	<b>MALIA JOHNSON</b>	It was noted that: 1. The committee read the report	It was agreed that: 1. The report was accepted	
1.6	MONITORING REPORT: 2 <sup>ND</sup> PHASE REPORT ON BULK EARTHWORKS ON DROOGFONTEIN FARM 245, MOSSEL BAY	<b>PETER NILSSEN</b>	It was noted that: 1. The committee read the report	It was agreed that: 1. The report was accepted	
<b>2</b>	<b>SECTION 35 (RESEARCH) REFUSAL</b>				

NO	SUBJECT	APPLICANT	DISCUSSION	DECISION	REF NO
<b>3</b>	<b>SECTION 35 PERMIT ARISING FROM SECTION 38 APPLICATION</b>				
3.1	PERMIT APPLICATION AND SAMPLING STRATEGY: PROPOSED BUFFELJAGS ABELONE FARM, BREDASDORP	<b>PRO-ACTIVE ARCHAEOLOGY</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 3 phases of work have been proposed</li> <li>2. In Phase 1 it would appear that the intake pipeline is situated above ground and supported by concrete bases. Archaeological test pits should be limited to the positions of the concrete support bases as necessary. Test pit depth should not exceed the impact zone.</li> <li>3. An initial test pit at the site of the intake pumphouse must determine if the area is disturbed or not. Further testing here to be at the discretion of the archaeologist.</li> <li>4. Clarification is required regarding the number and distribution of radiocarbon dates during the testing</li> <li>5. If there have been modifications to the layout of the proposed development since the Kaplan report, these should be indicated. Clarification is therefore required with respect to the location of proposed test holes in relation to later phases of development (Phases 2&amp;3), as differences seem to exist between the Kaplan report and the Pro-Active proposal.</li> <li>6. The Phase 1 part of the proposal seems consistent apart from the position of the outfall pipe which must be clearly indicated</li> <li>7. The committee noted that it would</li> </ol>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The permit is approved for the Phase 1 work and a monitoring report is required</li> <li>2. HWC requires the final development plan so that HWC is in a position to determine if and what other Phase 2 work is still required</li> <li>3. A map is required to spatialise the sampling strategy with respect to the proposed development layout</li> <li>4. Amendments to the "Minimum Standards" document is required to promote the idea that mitigation by the same practitioner who did the initial assessment is desirable.</li> <li>5. The matter highlighted in point 4 above should be discussed at the ASAPA CRM workshop in January</li> </ol>	

NO	SUBJECT	APPLICANT	DISCUSSION	DECISION	REF NO
			<p>be preferable in future if mitigation were carried out by the same practitioner who did the initial assessment to avoid inconsistencies</p> <p>8. The committee cannot adjudicate the costs of the proposed mitigation action, as that is a matter between the practitioner and client. Clarification of certain issues may however result in a reduction of the overall mitigation requirements</p>		
<b>4</b>	<b>ADVICE TO IARCOM RELATING TO SECTION 38 APPLICATIONS</b>				
4.1	REVIEW AND COMMENT ON IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SECTION 38 IMPACT ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING: 5 OCTOBER 2011	<b>TEAM EAST</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <p>1. Comments made by the Committee will be minuted at the IACom meeting on 5 OCTOBER 2011</p>		<b>B</b>
4.2	REVIEW AND COMMENT ON IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SECTION 38 IMPACT ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING: 5 OCTOBER 2011	<b>TEAM WEST</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <p>1. Comments made by the Committee will be minuted at the IACom meeting on 5 OCTOBER 2011</p>		<b>C</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>REQUEST FOR OPINION/ADVICE</b>				
<b>6.1</b>	<b>OTHER MATTERS</b>				
6.1.1	WORLD HERITAGE SITE NOMINATION: ORIGINS OF MODERN HUMANS	<b>JENNA LAVIN</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <p>1. Miss Lavin updated the APM committee on the meeting held on 24 September 2011</p>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <p>1. Members of the APM committee members should be given the option of attending meetings such as these</p>	

NO	SUBJECT	APPLICANT	DISCUSSION	DECISION	REF NO
6.1.2	EMP: CAPE WEST COAST BIOSPHERE RESERVE TRAILS PROJECT	<b>JOHN PARKINGTON</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although the area is a national park, the PHRA is the relevant authority</li> </ol>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Management of Geelbek Site is required</li> <li>2. A Monitoring Report of archaeological heritage is required to be submitted to HWC after 1 year and every 5 years thereafter</li> <li>3. An assessment of palaeontological sites that may be impacted by the trails is required</li> </ol>	
6.1.3	LIST OF REPOSITORIES FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIAL	<b>JENNA LAVIN</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dr Ouzman of Iziko requested a list of approved repositories for archaeological material</li> <li>2. A list compiled in the past could not be located at HWC</li> <li>3. SAHRA has a list of repositories</li> </ol>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HWC requires an updated list of approved repositories</li> <li>2. The repositories must have a person with archaeological or curatorial experience on staff</li> </ol>	
6.1.4	OUDEPOST	<b>JANETTE DEACON</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The archaeological site must be backfilled, but difficulty is being experienced with regard to the transport of clean river sand to the site for that purpose. A local house owner has objected to use of the road for that purpose</li> <li>2. Permission for access to the site could not be obtained from the landowner</li> </ol>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mrs Leslie and Dr Deacon will draft a letter and circulate it to the committee for approval before it is forwarded to Mr Hall to sign</li> </ol>	
<b>6.2</b>	<b>SECTION 27 APPLICATIONS: NATIONAL AND PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES</b>				
6.2.1	KASTEELBERG: NOMINATION AS A PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITE	<b>MARY LESLIE</b>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HWC is in the process of nominating Kasteelberg as a PHS</li> </ol>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The APM endorses that the nomination go to the DRC.</li> </ol>	

NO	SUBJECT	APPLICANT	DISCUSSION	DECISION	REF NO
			2. The nomination must go to the DRC at the end of October 3. The boundary co-ordinates must be aligned with the National Grid format 4. The owner must be reminded to send a letter of support to go to the DRC	2. The boundary of the proposed PHS must be as accurate as possible 3. The Surveyor General must be requested for advice on the acceptability of the provided GPS determined co-ordinates for use in the official diagram	
7	<b>FORMAL ADOPTION OF DECISIONS</b>				
8	<b>CLOSURE:</b> The meeting adjourned at 1.40 pm				
9	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>		1 NOVEMBER 2011		

.....  
CHAIRPERSON

.....  
DATE

.....  
SECRETARY

.....  
DATE