

The development of a Dolomite Risk Management Strategy for the Tlokwe City Council

A.S. POTGIETER

22665900

Dissertation in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science
in Environmental Management at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North West University

Supervisor: Prof. I.J. van der Walt

Co-supervisor: Mr. P.W. van Deventer

November 2012

Abstract

Development on dolomite poses a risk due to the possible formation of instability features such as sinkholes. Most of these features are however man-induced, and the risk associated with development on dolomitic areas can be mitigated through correct management. Therefore, since the Tlokwe City Council is accountable for safe development within its jurisdiction, a Dolomite Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) should be put in place.

There are several factors that contribute to the risk for development on dolomite. These factors can be categorised into two groups that should be considered during the hazard identification process, namely physical factors that consists of geology, geohydrology and geotechnical, and anthropogenic factors that consists of existing infrastructure and development, land use planning, as well as social structure and awareness.

These factors are assessed by means of a risk assessment in order to obtain a disaster risk score for different areas within the study area. Based on this score, priority focus areas can be identified, mainly for critically important further research before any development can be allowed or mitigation measures implemented.

Once these research activities are completed, a DRMS can be compiled based on the guidelines set by SANS 1936, which will promote the safety of people and property when further development on dolomite takes place. Urgent and interim mitigation measures are proposed to manage the risk during further research activities.

Opsomming

Daar is ‘n risiko wanneer enige ontwikkeling op dolomiet gedoen word omdat onstabiliteit soos bv. sinkgate kan ontstaan. Die natuurlike onstabiliteit van dolomitiese gesteentes word bykans deurgaans vererger deur menslike aktiwiteite en die korrekte bestuur van sodanige aktiwiteite is daarom noodsaaklik. Omdat die Tlokwe Stadsraad verantwoordelik is vir veilige stedelike ontwikkeling binne hulle munisipale area, moet daar ‘n Dolomiet Risiko Bestuurstrategie (DRBS) opgestel word.

Daar is ‘n aantal faktore wat bydra tot die risiko van stedelike ontwikkeling op dolomitise areas. Hierdie faktore kan in twee groepe ingedeel word wat oorweeg moet word gedurende die identifiseringsproses. Die een groep is fisiese fakture, wat geologie, gehidrologie en geotegnies insluit. Die ander groep is mensgemaakte faktore soos bestaande ontwikkeling en infrastruktuur, grondgebruikbeplanning, asook sosiale strukture en bewusmaking.

Hierdie ondersoek handel verder oor die kwantifisering van die faktore wat bydra tot die risiko, gevvolg deur ‘n risiko analyse van die spesifieke studiegebied. Dit behels verder die afbakening van prioriteitsfokusareas wat verdere ondersoek verg voordat daar met enige ontwikkeling of voorsorgmaatreëls voortgegaan sal kan word en kulmineer in die ontwikkeling van ‘n DRBS (gebasseer op die riglyne soos vervat in SANS 1936) vir die stadsraad van Tlokwe waarmee alle toekomstige ontwikkeling op dolomitiese gebiede effektief bestuur sal kan word. ‘n Aantal interne maatreëls word ten slotte voorgestel wat gevvolg moet word totdat alle navorsing oor die studiegebied voltooi is.

Keywords

Dolomite risk management strategy, dolomite stability, dolomite hazard, dolomite risk management process, dolomite stability assessment, physical factors, anthropogenic factors.

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the following key role players:

- My teachers and lecturers who laid the foundation for my interest in geology and related sciences, especially Mr Peet Pienaar of Laerskool Skuilkrans, who lectured geography with such enthusiasm, Mrs Donna-Mari Oost of Hoërskool die Wilgers with her infectious passion for mathematics, and Prof Louis van Rooy of the University of Pretoria, who gave life to engineering geology through his practical experience. My supervisor, Prof Kobus van der Walt, and co-supervisor, Mr Piet van Deventer, who deserve special thanks for their guidance in the completion of this dissertation.
- My family, who created the environment for me to develop: my parents, Johan and Alet, who guided, supported and encouraged me to explore my interests, Oom Ampie Potgieter of Sasol who introduced me to the field of geology, my brothers Coenie and Johannes who accompanied me on many memorable field trips, my dear wife Jeanette for serving me with all her heart and my son Matthys for continuously shifting the goalposts of happiness.
- My colleagues at AGES, the multi-disciplinary team that is indispensable for carrying out the project forming the basis for this study: Fred Calitz, who kindled my interest in dolomite and gave guidance throughout the project, the members of the North West office, each in his or her field of specialisation, who are working and contributing to the outcome of the project, and Stephan Pretorius for his visionary and strategic insight as well as practical guidance throughout the process.
- The team of officials at the Tlokwe City Council who accepted responsibility for this project despite a very busy schedule: Bernhard Bautsch, acting chief town- and regional planner, for his dedication to the project and continuous practical input, Laws Mohlomi, manager, housing and planning, for placing his trust in AGES to perform the duties at hand and for ably handling the many, often contradictory, challenges at the political level, and Desiree Loate and Daan van Rooyen for their vital inputs and support.
- My Lord of Lords for generously giving me the energy to do His will. All the glory to God.

Table of contents

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Abstract..... | ii |
| Opsomming..... | iii |
| Keywords | iv |
| Acknowledgements | v |
| Table of contents | vi |
| List of figures | viii |
| List of tables..... | ix |
| | |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Problem statement | 3 |
| 1.3 Research objectives | 3 |
| 1.4 Risk associated with urban development on dolomite | 3 |
| 2 Literature review | 5 |
| 2.1 Dolomite Risk Management..... | 5 |
| 2.2 Dolomite Risk Management: case studies..... | 8 |
| 2.2.1 Case studies of sinkholes..... | 8 |
| 3 Legislative framework | 11 |
| 3.1 Constitutional and Inter Governmental Framework..... | 12 |
| 3.1.1 Constitution..... | 12 |
| 3.1.2 The Disaster Management Act (57 of 2002) (DMA) | 14 |
| 3.1.3 The Promotion of Access to Information Act (2 of 2000) (PAIA) with reference to the Development Facilitation Act (32 of 2000) | 15 |
| 3.2 Geotechnical Framework | 17 |
| 3.2.1 The Geoscience Amendment Act (16 of 2010) | 17 |
| 3.2.2 Geotechnical requirement from the Transvaal Provincial Ordinance 15 of 1986 | 19 |
| 3.2.3 The Development Facilitation Act (67 of 1995) (DFA) with policy reference to geotechnical research..... | 20 |
| 3.3 Environmental Framework..... | 21 |
| 3.3.1 The National Water Act (36 of 1998) (NWA) | 21 |
| 3.3.2 The National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998 (NEMA) | 23 |
| 3.3.3 The National Environmental Management: Waste Act (59 of 2008) | 26 |
| 3.4 Spatial Planning Framework | 27 |
| 3.4.1 The current Spatial Planning Land Use Management Bill (SPLUMB) 2012 on environmental sustainability | 27 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 3.5 Building Standards and Regulations | 27 |
| 3.5.1 National Home Builders Registration Council (NHBRC) | 27 |
| 3.5.2 The Housing Development Agency Act (23 of 2008) | 28 |
| 4 Study area | 30 |
| 4.1 Historical background..... | 30 |
| 4.2 Area under investigation | 31 |
| 4.3 Factors to be researched..... | 35 |
| 5 Hazard identification..... | 36 |
| 5.1 Physical factors | 36 |
| 5.1.1 Geological assessment | 36 |
| 5.1.2 Geohydrological assessment | 47 |
| 5.1.3 Geotechnical assessment | 56 |
| 5.1.4 Physical assessment | 69 |
| 5.2 Anthropogenic factors | 69 |
| 5.2.1 Existing infrastructure and development | 69 |
| 5.2.2 Land use planning | 75 |
| 5.2.3 Social structure and awareness | 81 |
| 5.2.4 Anthropogenic assessment | 88 |
| 6 Risk assessment..... | 90 |
| 6.1 Introduction and Context..... | 90 |
| 6.2 Defining Disaster Risk | 91 |
| 6.3 Methodology | 92 |
| 6.4 Vulnerability and its application to Tlokwe Local Municipality | 93 |
| 6.5 Assessment..... | 96 |
| 6.6 Prioritisation..... | 106 |
| 7 The development of a Dolomite Risk Management Strategy | 110 |
| 7.1 Process towards a Dolomite Risk Management Strategy | 110 |
| 7.2 Important further research | 114 |
| 7.3 Immediate and urgent interim mitigation measures | 115 |
| 7.4 Towards a Dolomite Risk Management Strategy | 116 |
| 8 Synthesis..... | 117 |
| 8.1 Conclusions | 117 |
| 8.2 Recommendations..... | 120 |
| Reference list | 121 |
| Appendix I..... | 132 |

List of figures

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 2-1: Dolomite risk management | 7 |
| Figure 3-1: Legislative framework hierarchy..... | 11 |
| Figure 3-2: Public participation cycle | 17 |
| Figure 3-3: Geoscience Amendment Act requirements for development on dolomitic land | 18 |
| Figure 4-1: Regional locality map indicating the occurrence of dolomite in the Potchefstroom local municipality..... | 33 |
| Figure 4-2: Locality map indicating the occurrence of dolomite in the project study area | 34 |
| Figure 5-1: Multi-ring regional geological structure and Malmani Subgroup in the Gauteng and Northwest Province in relation to the project study area..... | 37 |
| Figure 5-2: Simplified geological map according to Bisschoff (1992) indicating the study area for illustrative purposes..... | 41 |
| Figure 5-3: All available geotechnical reports within the study area | 42 |
| Figure 5-4: Classification of drilling results according to this study | 45 |
| Figure 5-5: Geological mapping and public interaction | 46 |
| Figure 5-6: The following groundwater management areas and groundwater management units are indicated on the West rand geological map 2626 (Wilkensohn, 1996) | 51 |
| Figure 5-7: Groundwater level fluctuations in borehole 2626DD00261 show fluctuations exceeding 15 m. Borehole location 5 km SW of focus area..... | 53 |
| Figure 5-8: Subsoil erosion of dolomite grounds | 59 |
| Figure 5-9: Borehole log | 61 |
| Figure 5-10: Various schematic presentations of the development of instability on dolomite..... | 63 |
| Figure 5-11: Position of new boreholes used in this study and the depth of dolomite encountered | 67 |
| Figure 5-12: Measured risk based on proven occurrence of dolomite | 68 |
| Figure 5-13: Infrastructure zones in the study area as described in Table 5-3. | 73 |
| Figure 5-14: Preliminary infrastructure categories, based on age and type, indicating the risk associated with dolomitic land | 74 |
| Figure 5-15: Tlokwe urban land use map and the underlying dolomite risk zones | 80 |
| Figure 5-16: Social awareness boundary | 83 |
| Figure 6-1: Combination of geo-framework and socio-urban framework | 100 |
| Figure 6-2: Process of prioritisation..... | 104 |
| Figure 6-3: Disaster risk score map..... | 105 |
| Figure 6-4: Priority focus area | 107 |
| Figure 6-5: Priority focus area with indicated and measured risk | 108 |
| Figure 6-6: Effect of development on physical sub-surface instability. | 109 |
| Figure 7-1: Schematic illustration of the Dolomite Risk Management Strategy. | 114 |

List of tables

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 5-1: Stratigraphic units in the study area (Wagener, 1984)..... | 38 |
| Table 5-2: Aquifer types (Parsons, 1995; DWA, 1998a) | 50 |
| Table 5-3: Infrastructure zones (1-16) in the study area. | 72 |
| Table 6-1: Dolomite percentages per ward (adapted from Potchefstroom basic socio survey, 2004)..... | 94 |
| Table 6-2: Risk rating for areas with an indicated risk based on the probable occurrence of dolomite | 97 |
| Table 6-3: Risk rating for areas with a measured risk based on the proven occurrence of dolomite | 97 |
| Table 6-4: Hazard ratings for different levels of risk associated with dolomite | 98 |
| Table 6-5: Range of water infrastructure | 99 |
| Table 6-6: Calculated Disaster Risk Scores | 103 |
| Table 6-7: Prioritisation based on disaster risk scores..... | 106 |
| Table 7-1: DRMS implementation. | 112 |

| List of Abbreviations | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Abbreviation | Description |
| AGES | Africa Geo-Environmental Engineering and Science |
| CGS | Council for Geoscience |
| DFA | Development Facilitation Act |
| DMA | Disaster Management Act |
| DRBS | Dolomiet Risiko Bestuurstrategie |
| DRMS | Dolomite Risk Management Strategy |
| DWA | Department of Water Affairs |
| EC | Electrical Conductivity |
| EIA | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| GMA | Groundwater Management Area |
| IDP | Integrated Development Plan |
| mbgl | Meters below ground level |
| NEMA | The National Environmental Management Act |
| NEM: WA | National Environmental: Management Waste Act |
| NGA | National Groundwater Archive |
| NHBRC | National Home Builders Registration Council |
| NWA | National Water Act |
| OMV | Oranje Mynbou en Vervoer |
| PAIA | The Promotion of Access to Information Act |
| SABS | South Africa Bureau of Standards |
| SANS | South African National Standards |
| SDF | Spatial Development Framework |
| SPLUMB | The Spatial Planning Land Use Management Bill |
| TCC | Tlokwe City Council |
| UNISDR | United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction |
| WCED | World Commission on Environment and Development |
| WULA | Water Use License Applications |
| ZAR | Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek |