

**From:** madeleine [mailto:maddon@intekom.co.za]  
**Sent:** 25 June 2013 20:25  
**To:** Justin and Karen Stirk  
**Subject:** southwell lime

Dear Sirs,

I am an interest and affected party, to the proposed lime mining in the Southwell area.

I STRONGLY OBJECT to this proposal, on numerous grounds.

The company (the company that has applied for the mining rights), has stated numerous, and various points in an email that was sent to me.

1. Maintenance of roads....the wording of this was very clever. They stated that the "road will need to be maintained"...of course it will, but they were very clever not to say that they will maintain it, at the same time as giving the impression that they would. The state of the road will become a major issue, and it is grossly unfair, that this company, which hails from Pretoria I believe, and who has never had to drive on this appalling road on a day to day basis, like all the farmers have had to , can further add to the ruin of this road, and in so doing , take away the only means that the farmers have to transport their goods (and therefore their livelihoods).

2.Rehabilitation:...how many years will it take to rehabilitate the land...please dont treat us like fools.

3.Fossils:...your report states that there are no significant fossils in the area...a recent report, done for a similar issue, in the same area, states that there are a large number of important fossils. So where do you get your information...Oh, I know, you just pick and choose whatever information will suit you, and if it doesnt suit you, then you lie about it.

4. Historical church building...this would be affected by the mining, so conveniently, you have stated that the church has given you permission. The church has since been contacted, and it turns out that is a blatant lie...the church actually stated that it disagreed with the mining completely. If a person has said NO, how can you say that the person said YES?

5.Heritage sites: there are numerous very important heritage sites, and buildings, all of them in very close proximity to the areas you want to mine. Historically these buildings were built in a particular way, which did not include foundations, or cement in the walls. Blasting of mines would severely compromise these buildings, which in turn would severely compromise the tourism in the area, and also the historical significance of the area. Would you be happy if some arbitrary company 1000 miles from you, just decided to come and blast away all your heritage. That is morally and ethically wrong, to say nothing of greed from a few, to the detriment of many.

5. Unconstitutional:...is it not unconstitutional, that you can take away from the farmer, his right to be able to make a living in his place of residence? You seem to be making your rights more important than those of the people who actually have lived in the area for many generations.

6. Creation of Jobs....You have stated that you will offer 3 (THREE) permanent jobs!!!! To the detriment of how many????? You will be taking away many more jobs than you can create – you will be depriving the local populace the opportunity to work on the farms, as there wont be any workable land for approximately 15 years, before the land is rehabilitated. You are TAKING AWAY land from the farmers, who will be forced to lay off people, so please dont be so shortsighted as to use that argument.

7. There is a strong belief, that if this does go through, the original applicants for the mining rights, will just sell off these mining rights to someone else, and in doing so, will walk away from any obligations that were orginally written into the agreement.

The arrogance which you have shown has been deplorable. You appear to believe that these farmers are stupid, and gullible, which is very far from the truth. The different lies that have been told to different stakeholders , just demonstrate the level to which you will sink, and doesnt bode well for the future of this project.

M. Murray

---

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

Version: 2013.0.3345 / Virus Database: 3199/6439 - Release Date: 06/25/13