

## **ANNEXURE A**

### **OBJECTION TO PROPOSED MINING OF DOLOMITE, LIMESTONE, SAND (GENERAL), STONE AGGREGATE, GRAVEL and BUILDING SAND ON PORTIONS OF PORTION 17 AND THE REMAINDER OF FARM LOMBARD'S POST, 289, BATHURST, EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE**

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

This objection to the proposed mining as stated above is submitted on behalf of the Diocese of Grahamstown of the Anglican Church of Southern Africa hereinafter referred to as. The Diocese is represented by Brenda Amsterdam in her capacity as Registrar of the Diocese and attorney to the Diocese and Bishop of Grahamstown in his capacity as head of the Diocese.

#### **2. PROPERTY**

The property in respect of which this property is submitted is described as Portion 1 of Farm No. 289, Bathurst. A deeds search confirming the Diocese' ownership of the land is attached.

#### **3. LAND USE**

In a document generated by or on behalf of S.A. Lime Eastern Cape (Pty) Ltd and titled Mining Right Scoping Report: Southwell Limestone, it is indicated on page 9 at clause 4.6 that the land in question is currently occupied by farming activities of Mr Colin Stirk. A copy of the relevant page is attached, marked annexure C.

The document fails to indicate that the land as well as portion 4 of farm 289 of which the Diocese is also the owner, has on it a complex of buildings known as Southwell<sup>1</sup>, consisting of the following:-

1. Southwell Mission School (1844);
2. St James Church (1851);
3. Mission Church (1868);
4. St James Church Cemetery (c 1870s, possibly prior);
5. More recent teachers accommodation (in wattle and daub technique);
6. Contemporary school buildings
7. Graves presumed to be related to farm labourers – these are undated.

The writer of the source document comments on the buildings as follows:-

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Heritage Survey by Umlando: Archaeological Tourism and Resource Management dd 27 November 1979, compiled by Gavin Anderson

“The series of buildings are integral to the history of the area, as the land was set up in Trust for members of the community. Most of the members of the surrounding farms are buries in the cemetery and the St James (an Anglican Church), appears to be central to the farming religion of the area. The earliest grave with visible writing dates to 1855.

Significance: The buildings are significant in terms of their age, historical reference to the area and mostly well preserved features.”

Photographs of the buildings marked Annexure D is attached.

#### **4. CONSULTATION PROCESS**

We refer to a meeting held with land owners on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2012. A copy of page 1 of the minute of that meeting is attached, marked Annexure E.

It is noted in the minute that Ms B Amsterdam, representing the Diocese tendered an apology and at point 3 it is indicated that “they(presumably the Diocese) supports the project, provided that the value of the land will not be negatively affected by the mining operation.”

The above is blatantly untrue as the Diocese has never received notice of a meeting, an apology was never tendered and nor was any person or persons delegated to express an opinion on behalf of the Diocese at such a meeting.

The source of the information is not indicated and one can only surmise that the statement alleging the cooperation of the Diocese has been used to mislead.

#### **5. OBJECTIONS TO THE PROJECT**

The Diocese objects to the proposed mining in the strongest terms, for the following reasons:-

- (a) The potential damage to historical buildings cannot be quantified. In our considered opinion there is a real threat damage to the buildings and priceless stained glass windows as a result of the use of burnt lime and vibrations caused by heavy equipment and blasting. The large volumes of dust will also be potentially damaging to the buildings;
- (b) The serenity of the church grounds and two grave yards will be severely damaged. The graves and gravestones may also potentially be damaged;
- (c) A number of parishioners have indicated that should mining commence they will leave the church. This will affect the income of the church which is utilised to maintain the buildings thus leading to deterioration of buildings that until now have been maintained by the commitment of the parishioners.
- (d) Of gravest concern to the church is the negative impact mining will have on its planned heritage route which will encompass all its churches from Cuylerville to Southwell. The Diocese has established a non – profit company to spearhead the project. Should mining be allowed, not only will the buildings be potentially

compromised, but the Diocese will also be denied a potential source of income that would have funded the preservation of historical buildings and its ministry to the poor.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

In light of the above the Diocese cannot under any circumstances support the proposed mining as the consequences for its property and ministry will be far reaching.

---

**B.R. AMSTERDAM**  
**REGISTRAR: DIOCESE OF GRAHAMSTOWN OF THE**  
**ANGLICAN CHURCH OF SOUTHERN AFRICA**