

No.	Submitter	Support or Oppose	Relief Sought	Summary of Submission
1	Lewis, E	Oppose	Decline	<p>The proposal will adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affect amenity values. • Community wellbeing. • Indigenous flora and fauna (particularly Tāiko). • Tourism. • SH6 • Hydrology. • Waterways. • Cycling safety.
2	Cochrane, E	Oppose	Decline	<p>The proposal will adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic. • Landscape. • Society. • Tourism. • Views from the Paparoa tracks. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will generate adverse climate emissions coastal erosion, seawater incursions and noise effects.
3	Gibbs, A	Oppose	Decline	<p>The proposal will adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environment. • Traffic. • Traffic safety <p>and will create carbon emissions.</p>

4	Hudson, G	Oppose	Oppose the consent	<p>The proposal will adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic safety. • The carriageway of SH6. • Tourism. <p>Also states the proposal will generate adverse traffic noise, traffic emissions, coastal erosion effects.</p>
5	Caygill, J	Oppose	Not stated	<p>The proposal will adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values. • Community wellbeing. • Tourism. • Traffic including effects on cyclists doing a round trip from the Paparoa Great Walk. • Climate through carbon emissions. • The land from increased vulnerability to coastal erosion and sea water incursion. • Waterways from leaching of contaminants. • Taiko. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests further sampling of radioactive elements. • That hypothetical approval of the further application becomes more likely if the subject application is granted. • That there will be multiple harmful effects of allowing the activity and that there are long term benefits of keeping the minerals in the ground.
6	Von Kanel Fyfe, G	Oppose	Decline	<p>The proposal will adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environment and community wellbeing from trucking. • Indigenous flora and fauna.
7	Wells, J	Oppose	Refer to summary of submission	<p>The proposal will adversely affect Taiko. Urges the Councils to preserve, protect and restore the biodiversity of the area and help enrich the area through nature tourism.</p>

8	Wuest, B	Oppose	Decline	<p>The proposal will adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environment and community wellbeing from trucking. • Indigenous flora and fauna. • Tourism.
9	Hall, S	Oppose	Decline	<p>The proposal will adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon emissions. • Indigenous biodiversity, including the Australasian Bittern, Tāiko and wetlands. • Landscape values. • Community wellbeing, including effects from dust, noise, light pollution, heavy traffic, vibrations. • Tourism. <p>Other comments include the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will increase the vulnerability of the site to coastal erosion and sea water incursion into groundwater. • is inconsistent with Policy 11 NZCPS. • inconsistent with the west coast tourism strategy (untamed natural wilderness). • adverse costs outweigh economic benefits.
10	Forbes, J Dr	Oppose	Not stated	<p>The adverse effects of trucking will affect the local roads, community wellbeing and the untamed natural wilderness promoted by the Council.</p>

11	Harris, L	Oppose	Decline	<p>The proposal will adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tāiko. • The landscape. • The Untamed wilderness tourism brand. <p>Other comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will not benefit the coast. • The economics do not make sense. • There is no explanation how emissions will be offset. • Bunding will be inadequate to shield local homes from noise. • Trucks will cause cumulative noise, dust, vibrations, and road damage effects. • Questions what mitigation for natural hazard disaster is proposed and what guarantees are there to ensure clean up in the event of a natural disaster.
----	-----------	--------	---------	---

12	Narayan, R	Support	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will have district/regional economic and community benefits. • Supports the application's economic assessment. • Mining activities are a common and anticipated part of the rural environment, recognised by planning documents. • Supports the growth of the mineral sand industry on the West Coast. • States the proposal will not have unacceptable effects. • Agrees with the conditions and expert reports. • Impacts of mining are well known and can be managed by conditions. • The proposal is small scale in nature and similar effects can occur without resource consent. • The land will be returned to productive farm land. • The short-term mining activity is an efficient use of this agricultural land that will not compromise its long-term agricultural.
13	Pillay, P	Support	Grant	Same as submission no. 12.
14	Kemp, T			
15	Monachan, N			
16	Bruhn, M			
17	Kumar, D			
18	Ravnesch			

19	Mackett, D			
20	Pitama, K			
21	Bryers, T			
22	Taylor, C			
23	Hyde, N			
24	Parkinson, B			
25	Mackinnon, B			
26	Strentiford, M			
27	Bromley, R			
28	Kidd, Y			
29	Stevenson, S			
30	Hocking, K			
31	Paul, A			
32	Knipe, R			
33	Birchfield, A			
34	Hutt, J			

35	Morris, J			
36	Beaumont, A	Oppose	Decline	The proposal will have significant effects on the environment, will damage the road and the tourism industry.
37	Trevelyan, P	Oppose	No more mining, cease current mining	States the Coast's true taonga is its incredible landscape and wildlife. Asks why destroy our most precious resource.
38	Alford, A	Oppose	Decline	Suggests the transport assessment is inadequate and other parts of the application lack balance and accuracy. Requests the consideration of the implications of a development that depends on a road network that might be compromised by an earthquake. Questions the analysis of likely effects on the integrity of the mining site.
39	Ransom, R	Oppose	Decline	Issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon emissions. • Sea water incursion. • Adverse effects on indigenous flora and fauna (including the Tāiko) from effects associated with waterway pollution, sedimentation, alteration to hydrology, lighting, air pollution and dust. • The proposal is contrary to Policy 11 NZCPS. • Adverse effects on amenity values, including effects from noise, dust, traffic. • Adverse effects on cycle safety. • Adverse effects from noise pollution. Questions several aspects of the noise assessment. • Also requests no truck movements before 7am or after 8pm, and that no machinery be permitted to operate at the mine site before 7am or after 8pm.
40	Playter, J	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.

41	Macarthy, R and Sheehan, M	Oppose	Limit the truck movements	<p>Concerned about the heavy traffic, as there is already heavy traffic from the Strongman Mine. Particularly concerned about traffic at the corner of Holland Street, where there is no footpath and is used by children and adults to get to the beach. Trucks come down the road at speed.</p>
42	Seligman, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Reasons include adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic safety, including cycling. • The local community, including mental health. • Wildlife, including effects from noise, light, dust, vibration, truck movements, sedimentation, excavation, altered hydrology. • Nature tourism, including the West Coast's 'untamed natural wilderness' strategy. <p>States the proposal is inconsistent with Policy 11 NZCPS.</p>

43	Cannan, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and the environment. • Community and individual wellbeing. • Amenity values. • Tāiko. • Westcoast's untamed natural wilderness brand. <p>Also concerned about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse effects from trucking. • Use of fossil fuels. • Speculative economic benefits. • Radiation effects. • Being counter to NZ's future direction as set out by the RMA.
44	Sheppard, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about the adverse effects on amenity values, community well-being; cycling safety and cycling tourism; and road suitability.</p>
45	Zukowski, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about the adverse effects on the lagoons and the Tāiko, Spoonbill and White Heron. Also concerned about the contamination of waterbodies, heavy traffic effects on road. Suggests the economic benefits will not materialise.</p>
46	Campbell, N	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about the adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural beauty. • State Highway. • Untamed Natural Wilderness. • Climate change. <p>States adverse effects outweigh any short-term economic benefits. Foreign owned business will not return profits to NZ.</p>

47	Reid, J	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
Support	Grant	Support	Grant	
Support	Grant			
51	Aitken, B			
52	Aitken, J			
53	McClellan, J			
54	McClellan, M			
55	Hoskin, T			
56	Klempel, L			
57	Mahuika, K			
58	Serban, S			Oppose

59	Bradely, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flora and fauna of the area, including the Tāiko. • The local community and economy and other social and community costs from diminishing wellbeing. • Amenity and recreational opportunities. • SH6 carriageway. • The submitter's mental health. • Tourism. <p>Also concerned about carbon emissions and subsequently climate change.</p>
60	Spruce, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about the significant risks involving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business/investment. • Operator methodology and track record. • Community costs. • Effects on key species (Tāiko). • Consenting process. • Monitoring of compliance and enforcement.
61	West Coast Penguin Trust	Oppose	Conditions to protect penguins	<p>Concerned about the effects on the Tāiko and Little Penguins (Kororā). Several recommendations are suggested, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance from people working with the relevant species and DoC. • No operation (including truck movements) during darkness and lighting and noise controls to reduce the risk for Tāiko. • The Avian Management Plan (AMP) must consider Kororā. • That DoC reviews any proposed amendments and then approves any changes to the AMP. • No mining activity between 8pm and 6.30am in November, or between 8.30pm and 6am during December and January. • Amendments to the AMP to reduce the effects on Kororā.

62	Frazer, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerns raised include adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, the community and the environment, including effects on the submitter's artist business. • People from noise, vibration and trucking movements on SH6. • Amenity values, the natural character of the coastal environment, recreational values. • Tāiko. • West Coast Untamed Natural Wilderness strategy. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would generate significant new carbon emissions. • It would create effects from radiation. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents. • The economic benefits of the proposal are uncertain. Community wellbeing and other environmental values should not be compromised in the pursuit of speculative economics.
63	Evision, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and community health and wellbeing from noise, vibration and safety effects associated with transport movements. • Amenity values, natural character and environmental features of the area. • Local tourism operators and accommodation providers. • SH6. • Tāiko. • West Coast Regional Councils own "Untamed Wilderness" strategy. <p>Also suggest the proposal will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create unsustainable carbon emissions. • The proposal is contrary to the relevant statutory planning documents.

64	Serban, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light and noise effects from trucks. • Residents and tourists. • SH6 carriageway. <p>Also suggest the proposal will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hasten sea level rise. • Have adverse dust effects. • Create adverse traffic effects. • Be contrary to the West Coast 'Untamed Natural Wilderness' strategy.
65	Becker, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape values. • People from noise, environmental and visual pollution from trucking. • Residents, accommodation providers, tourism providers. • People from radiation. • Tāiko. • The NZ 100% pure NZ marketing branding.
66	Taylor, M	Oppose	Not stated	Not stated.

68	Grace, L	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerns raised include adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, the community and the environment, including effects on the submitter’s artist business. • People from noise, vibration and trucking movements on SH6. • Amenity values, the natural character of the coastal environment, recreational values. • Tāiko. • West Coast Untamed Natural Wilderness strategy. <p>Suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would generate significant new carbon emissions. • It would create effects from radiation. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents. <p>The economic benefits of the proposal are uncertain. Community wellbeing and other environmental values should not be compromised in pursuit of speculative economics.</p>
69	Harris, M	Support	Grant Application	<p>This submission is the same as submission no. 12. It also states: “As long as the standard of driving of the trucks is monitored.”</p>
70	Harris, S	Support	Grant	<p>Same as submission no. 12.</p>
71	Taylor, B	Oppose	Not stated	<p>Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National and global implications. • Landscape effects. • Coastal defence against rising sea levels. • Abandonment of beaches for the short-term profit of individuals. • The future of our precious heritage.

72	Liu, J & Song, E	Oppose	Not clearly stated	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents from noise and vibration effects associated with increased trucking. • SH6. • Pedestrian, cyclist and traffic safety. • Natural beauty and the coastal environment. • Social bonds of the community. • Recreational experiences. • Tāiko. • The West Coast untamed natural wilderness strategy. <p>Also suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would generate significant new carbon emissions. • It would create effects from radiation. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents.
73	Robinson, G	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
74	Park, D			
75	Birchfield, T			
76	Jones, N			
77	Barker, J			
78	Harper, L			

79	Bradley, J	Oppose	Oppose	<p>Concerned about the adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic health and wellbeing of the community. • People from traffic noise, dust, radiation. • Traffic safety. • House prices. • SH6 carriageway. • Wildlife.
80	Hills, S	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic wellbeing. • Climate change from carbon emissions. • Seawater incursion. • Pedestrian and cyclist safety. • People from dust, trucking noise and light effects. • The carriageway of SH6. • Flora and fauna including Tāiko. • Hydrology and waterways. • People from radiation. • Property values. • Amenity values. <p>Also states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal has an opportunity cost of coastal low land restoration. • Contrary to S. 6(a) RMA, Policy 11, 13-15 of the NZCPS, the NES Freshwater Regulations and many other national and regional and district objectives and policies. • The proposal will exacerbate adverse effects following a catastrophic earthquake or coastal-inundation event.
81	Rabe, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People from noise associated with trucks. • Traffic safety. • Landscape effects. • Climate.

82	Morris, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents from noise and vibration effects associated with increased trucking. • SH6 including increased maintenance. • Pedestrian, cyclist and traffic safety. • Natural beauty and the coastal environment. • Social bonds of the community. • Recreational experiences. • Tāiko. • The Coast's untamed natural wilderness strategy. • Papatuaanuku. <p>Also suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would generate significant new carbon emissions. • It would create effects from radiation. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents.
83	Peterson, G	Oppose	Decline	<p>There is a 75% chance of a major earthquake in the next 50 years, but the application does not address earthquake or Tsunamis risks.</p>
84	Conservation Volunteers NZ	Neither support or oppose	Amend application to address transport and environment effects and that processing of mined material should only be allowed during daylight hours	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic safety. • Flora and fauna including the Tāiko and the Little Blue Penguin. • The coastline from earthworks. • Community. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That other species found in the area include the White Heron, Australian Bittern, Hector's dolphin, Albatrosses, Shags, Terns and Garnets. • Concern about an unproven mining method.
85	Fecser, E		Grant	<p>Same as submission no. 12.</p>

86	Carmont, A	Support		
87	Allan, S	Oppose	Oppose	<p>This submission is lengthy and includes several attachments.</p> <p>Concerned about the adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community. • Businesses. • Holiday batches. • Property values. • The submitters business (Golden Sands Horse and Wagon Tours). • Ecological values. • Waterbodies. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local economy is orientated towards tourism and is growing. • There is low unemployment in the area. • Tourism and mining cannot live together. • The submitter's business totally relies on the natural and quiet environment of the lagoons and beach front directly adjacent to the proposed mine site. It is also reliant on the low volume of heavy vehicles on the road as they must travel about 500 meters up the Main Road and then down Burks Rd to the Beach. • Ratepayers will end up subsidizing clean-up of the mine. • The application is missing a job safety analysis, job hazard analysis report and earthquake and Tsunami mitigation plans. • The area is important habitat for several indigenous species of bird.

88	Crick, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic safety. • Tourism, including the Coast's Untamed Natural wilderness strategy. • Community wellbeing. • Environment, waterways and flora and fauna. • Tāiko. • People from radiation. <p>Also comments that the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is speculative. • is carbon intensive. • is contrary to the RMA and relevant statutory planning documents.
89	Leber, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about the adverse effects on the Tāiko. Also stated that proposal is contrary to Policy 11 NZCPS.</p>
90	Mirza, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology. • Hydrology and waterways. • People from radiation. • Amenity values, wellbeing, health and safety. • Road users.
91	Hillerby, S	Oppose	Oppose	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology. • Hydrology and waterways. • People from radiation. • Amenity values, wellbeing, health and safety. • Road users.

92	Reid, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, community and the environment. • People from noise and vibration from trucks. • SH6 carriageway from trucks. • Amenity values, the character of the coastal environment and recreation values. • Tāiko. • West Coast Untamed Natural Wilderness strategy. • Local nature and tourism operators. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The economic benefits are uncertain. Community wellbeing should not be compromised in pursuit of speculative environmental values. • The proposal would generate significant new carbon emissions and is contrary to the Zero Carbon Act. • NZ lacks a code of practice for managing rational safety. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and the relevant statutory planning documents.
93	Haddock, H	Support	Not stated	No reasons stated.

94	Morris, D	Oppose	Oppose	<p>States:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a disparity between the TiGA website information about truck movement (50 max.) and the application (50 min.). • There is a disparity between employment figures. • The local economy is already great and does not need a mine. • The settling ponds are far too close to Canoe creek and the lagoons. • Slime buried back in the pit will become a liquefaction hazard. • The organic flocculant will not work. • Radiation dangers have been played down. Concerned that there is no NZ standard for radiation. • Concerned about misleading information from the TiGA flyer recently circulated to residents.
95	Reid, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People from noise and traffic. • Community health, safety and wellness. • The environment. • SH6, including effects on cyclists, motorists, pedestrians and tourists. • Recreation values. • Tāiko. • The Coast's untamed natural wilderness strategy. • Climate change through carbon emissions. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would deter visitors traveling on SH6. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and the relevant statutory planning documents.

96	Stillie, A	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision makers are urged to consider the effect on tourism revenue and its reputation as an untarnished ecologically friendly destination. • Violating the area of its natural resources will have an extreme effect on the environmental legacy of the area. • If the mine goes ahead, the submitters will cancel their next trip to NZ.
97	Mathieson, L	Support	Not stated	Supports the proposal on the basis of employment generation and that tourism is not the only means of employment generation.
98	Robertson, C	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism operators will lose value from adverse effects on beauty, serenity, lifestyle. • Many of the jobs that will be created will require expertise from overseas. • There are housing shortages in the area and the proposal will exacerbate this. • Road conditions will preclude heavy traffic generated from the proposal. • Concerned also expressed about noise effects on homes adjoining SH6.
99	Ransom, J	Oppose	Decline	Concerned about adverse effects on ambience and aesthetic value based on the proximity of the site to the coast and mountains and the size of the mine.
100	Wyndham-Smith, T	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism, including the West Coast's Untamed Natural Wildner Strategy. • The image of Punkaiki and surrounds as an attractive tourism destination. • Tāiko • SH6 carriageway and users, including the increasing number of cyclists since the advent of the Paparoa Track and marketing of the West Coast as a cycling destination. • Waterbodies from leaching heavy metal concentrate.

101	Waugh, S Dr	Oppose	Conditions to ensure seabirds are protect as amended by DoC or similar organisations	<p>This submitter is a researcher with published research papers on the Tāiko and is concerned about the proposal’s potential adverse effects on Tāiko. The submission states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located between the Tāiko breeding area and the sea and Tāiko have to cross the mine site on a daily basis. • Tāiko are generally present from March to January the following year, but some birds attend colony throughout the year or are absent for only a few weeks. • Tāiko are listed as an endangered species by the IUCN and are under the population level of at risk of extinction. • The species is endemic to NZ and breeds only in the Paparoa ranges between the Fox River to the north and the Grey River to the south, with the largest and best-studied colonies behind the Barrytown flats. • The threats to Westland petrels include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Risk of land development which could entrain further mortalities of adult or fledgling birds due to increased vehicle traffic, increased presence of vertebrate animals such as cats and dogs around work sites, lighting and machinery operating. ○ Fallout (landing on the ground due to various attractants of which light during the night is a principal risk) hence the Westland petrels are subsequently unable to take off due to their wing-structure and mortality results from traffic collisions, predation by vertebrate animals, starvation or dehydration as a result of being grounded. • The proposed mining activity is likely to be undertaken during the day and the night time, and that there will be machinery and
-----	-------------	--------	--	--

				<p>lighting being used during the hours of dusk and darkness at different times through the year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability of the population to withstand additional removals is currently unknown, and research is needed to estimate the effect of any additional removals from sources related to the mining activity. • These very long-lived birds have populations that are very susceptible to adult mortality, and therefore great care should be taken in not negatively influencing their population status by adding deaths of birds to the current mortalities arising from fishing mortality and other human related activities. • The removal of very few individuals can result in the decline of the population. Efforts to understand the impacts of any increased human activity and particularly industrial activity within the zone used by the petrels are necessary and to carefully monitor the impacts of any deaths on the population size, trend and demographic parameters such as adult survivorship, recruitment and productivity.
102	Ransom, M	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that Australia Ilmenite eliminate mining is limited because of other coastal land use priorities and that the restrictions in Australia has led the applicant to target NZ. • Concerned about the proposal's carbon emissions.

103	Thompson, A	Oppose		<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tāiko and lagoons, which support a range of wildlife including the Spoonbill and the White Heron. • SH6 carriageway. • Traffic safety. • Waterways from contamination. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrialisation will bring very little to the area, with outside workers brought in. • The economic benefits will not materialise. • There is a historic track record of this kind of development where the applicant's promise the world but never deliver and vandalise the environment e.g. Westland Minerals Sands Cape FoulWind.
104	Fairhall, D	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
105	Fulford, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tāiko from light pollution. • The adjoining wetlands. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not align with the NZ's Emissions Reduction Plan or clean green image. • The submitter will abstain from visiting NZ if the application is granted.
106	Devine, A	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
107	Devlin, K & M	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
108	Bell, R			

109	Reynolds, I & Houston, C	Support	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area has been mined in the past. • The TTPP recognises the area has been suitable for mining. • The land can be sustainably returned to agriculture land. • The truck movements are safe and sustainable. • The mine will attract people that will revitalise the area, district and region. • The area has limited biodiversity value and the rehabilitation will increase habitats. • The submitters support the mineral sand mining business.
110	Alford, D	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
111	Andrews, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity and community wellbeing. • Climate and coastal erosion. • Indigenous flora and fauna. • Hydrology and waterways. • Tourism and marketing. • Tāiko. • SH6 from heavy trucking. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The social and environment costs outweigh the benefits.
112	Devlin, R	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
113	Hodgson, H			

114	Backes, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community wellbeing and amenity values. • People from noise, lighting, dust, vibration, movements. • Property prices. • Climate from carbon emissions. • Road safety. • Ecology from noise, lighting, dust, vibration and sedimentation. • Tāiko from lighting. • Waterbodies. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The radiation assessment is inadequate. • Social and environmental costs outweigh the economic gain. • The TTPP should not be used to justify the proposal. • It is contrary to s. 7 RMA.
115	Jewell, S	Oppose	Not stated	This submission is illegible.
116	Kueppers, F	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and cyclist safety. • Climate from carbon emissions. • Wildlife including penguins. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents.
117	Tui Hill Contracting Ltd	Oppose	Decline	Road use; industrial operations in a scenic rural area; protection of environment, flora and fauna which are a tourist attraction.

118	Moore, D	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity. • Traffic. • Noise and light pollution. • People from radiation and dusts. • The reputation of the area. • Climate from carbon. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The economics are doubtful.
119	Morgan, M	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mining operation breaches non-rural building coverage, traffic movements, health and safety, wellbeing, property values and lifestyle. • That mining will take on a coastal management area that is against the spirit of the NZCPS.
120	Grove-Hills, A	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States: "I oppose, it's the vibe of things."
121	Alford, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH6 carriageway from trucks. • SH6 as a tourist route. • Pedestrians and cyclists. • The tranquillity, peace and serenity. • Mental health of residents. • Flora and fauna including the wetlands. • Wilderness experience of the beach. • Tourism. • The new visitor centre.

122	Crick, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, community, and the environment. • Natural character. • People from trucking. • Climate from carbon emissions. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The West Coast natural environment is taonga including the Tāiko. • The economic benefits are uncertain. • Community wellbeing and environmental values should not be compromised in pursuit of speculative economics. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA.
123	Hill, R & L	Oppose	Not stated	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape. • Biodiversity. • The environment, local roads and community wellbeing from trucking. • Climate change from carbon emissions.
124	Rodgers, J	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mining companies are notorious for exiting with the profits and leaving toxic waste. • Concerned about burning fossil fuels. • The effects will not stay on private land. • The 24/7 noise will affect humans and birds. • Trucks will make the roads dangerous. • Concerned about the proximity to the sea and the potential for toxic waste to be carried out to sea.
125	Albrett, P	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values and community wellbeing. • SH6 from trucking. • People wellbeing and safety from trucking. • High cliffs and vertical walls from effects on infrastructure.

126	Hill, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People from trucks, including noise, sleep disturbance, and increased risk to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. • Tourism including tourist businesses and tourist amenity values. • Community amenity values. • The West Coasts Untamed Natural Wilderness Strategy. • Natural character. • Recreation values. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The economic benefits are uncertain and reputational damage is real. • The lack of a radiation code of practice needs further investigation.
127	Mason, B	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the peaceful environment. • From carbon emissions from trucks, equipment and pumps. • On the rural lifestyle area. • Tāiko. • On the safety of SH6 for pedestrians, cyclists, other traffic. • On the West Coasts Untamed Wilderness Strategy. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that submitters do not have the technical expertise and resources of the applicant or Council. • It is contrary to the RMA.

128	Walton, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerns raised include adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, the community and the environment, including effects on the submitter's artist business. • People from noise, vibration and trucking movements on SH6. • Amenity values, the natural character of the coastal environment, recreational values. • Tāiko. • West Coast Untamed Natural Wilderness strategy. <p>Suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would generate significant new carbon emissions. • It would create effects from radiation. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents. • The economic benefits of the proposal are uncertain. • Community wellbeing and other environmental values should not be compromised in the pursuit of speculative economics.
129	Leeuwen, S	Support	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is an opportunity for the area to grow economically. • It is an innovative use of pasture in the current climate of potentially expensive changes to rules around the traditional farming of livestock. • The habitat after the rehabilitation is likely to support a more diverse range of species than the current pasture. • The minerals mined are going to be mined somewhere in the world.

130	Kerr, D & Larner, W	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On waterways. • From toxic material leaching. • On coastal erosion from reduce land elevation. • On peat beds that sequester carbon. • On the historic, social, cultural, and ecological importance of the Barrytown coast and the sand plain forests. • On indigenous flora and fauna, particularly the Tāiko. • On adjacent QEII covenant areas. • On neighbours and local residents from noise, dust, haulage, light. • On property values. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not believe the applicant will comply with conditions or will be policed by Councils. • The application states there has been consultation with neighbours but does not mention whether they were supportive or not. • Sand plain forest is also a critical site for native forest restoration as is demonstrated by the government-funded regeneration activities of Conservation Volunteers New Zealand.
-----	---------------------	--------	---------	--

131	Cromey, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the community from transport, noise, light and dust. • On the submitter from noise effects. Noisy vehicles are particularly noticeable and therefore averaging noise levels is not appropriate. • On the visitor's experience. • On the Tāiko. • The submitter and her partner are already stressed from the proposal. • On the carriageway of SH6. • On pedestrian and cyclist safety. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no carbon assessment of the application. • There is no assessment of Alpine Fault 8 (AF8). • Questions whether the mine will succeed operationally in a high rainfall climate. • The rainfall at the site may be 20% higher than what is stated in the application. • It is concerning that there is uncertainty about transport routes. • The dust management plan does not take into account the easterly winds that are strong in the area.
132	Morgan, N	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity and the natural environment. • Natural beauty and isolation of the environment. • The Coast's Untamed Natural Wilderness. • The wellbeing of the community. • Climate from global warming. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents and the Zero Carbon Act.

133	Te Whatu Ora Health New Zealand	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AEE states that Canoe Creek is identified in the Regional Plan as having wāhi taonga, cultural materials and traditional campsite cultural values for Ngāi Tahu. The AEE provides insufficient documentation of consultation with Ngāi Tahu. Requests a Cultural Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the application progressing
134	Michels, H	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter moved to the Coast for Untamed Natural wilderness. Concerned about noise and vibration effects from trucks. Concerned about the investment in the visitor centre and the impact of the development on that. There is no need for the employment.

135	Schwitzer, C	Oppose	As stated in the next column	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bond of only \$160,000 is insufficient for the size of the operation. • The Councils are under-resourced to deal with the extra workload for consenting and compliance monitoring this project has already and will continue to burden them with. • Our government has declared a climate emergency, and this project will only exacerbate negative effects on our natural environment. • Most people living in close proximity to the proposed mine will not benefit from the operation. <p>Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more suitable bond would be 1% (\$3,150,000) of projected export earnings for 5 years of active mining. • An increase in rates for this land to cover the extra cost of compliance and monitoring so there is no financial burden on council or the public. • Seek better technology and mining processes that do not require carbon intensive inputs for mediocre gains.
136	Darwen, F	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environment. • Radioactive material. • Traffic safety. • Pedestrian and cyclist safety. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter has no confidence in the assurances given. • The bond is not meaningful. • Requests no traffic movements between 1800 to 0700.

137	Clark, J	Oppose	Decline. Restrict mining to daylight hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Avian Management Plan (AMP) is inadequate and does not protect Tāiko. • They can only breed in the Punakaiki region. • They have been breeding in this location for more than 10,000 years. Any loss of adults is serious. • Because Tāiko are slow breeders a 90% survival rate is required for adults to avoid the colony going into decline. • A large number of adult birds fly in and out of the colony immediately after dusk to feed chicks. There are times during the breeding season when this time is within the stated mining hours, and adults will be at risk of grounding and death.
138	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Neutral	Conditions as stated in the next column	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Amended conditions to ensure transportation matters are effectively addressed. ○ Clarification on which vehicle crossing will be used to access the site. Only one vehicle crossing location should be provided. ○ To be included as an interested party in the annual bird management report. ○ Assurance that any signage would not be installed within the state highway corridor unless stipulated by Waka Kotahi, and that signage would comply with Grey District Plan rules and Waka Kotahi guidelines.

139	Hewlett, E	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents' wellbeing and amenities. • Socio-economic and cultural life of the community. • Tourism. • Climate change from carbon emissions. • The Coast's Untamed Natural Wilderness Strategy. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Barrytown Flats are a desirable rural/residential area that has attracted a diverse population over the past 50 years; young families, professionals, gardeners, artisans, tourism operators, retirees and environmentalists have added to the small established farming community. An industrial scale mining operation is inappropriate for the area as it would greatly impinge on the wellbeing and quality of life of the people drawn to this treasured location. • A large-scale extractive mining industry would be incongruous amid the small scale sustainable tourism businesses established in the area. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents.
140	Calcott, N	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to all consents. • The impact on the wetlands, lagoons, waters, community, avifauna, and aquatic life should be considered.

141	Innwood, A	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH6 carriageway. • Road users including school kids, cyclists, pedestrians, hikers, motorcyclists, local residents and workers. • People from radiation. • People, community, and wildlife from the 24/7 operational hours. • The ability of the land to respond to natural hazards. • Climate from carbon emissions. • The environment if the 40,000 litres of diesel were to spill. • Tāiko from lighting. • The Coast's Untamed natural wilderness strategy. • The naming of the Coast Road the top 10 coastal drives in the world. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no guarantee the Australian code of practice will be appropriate for NZ. There are no details as to how the HMC will be safe being moved, transported, stored and loaded in other locations. Another authority should have oversight of the radiation risks.
-----	------------	--------	---------	--

142	Barrytown School Board of Trustees	Neither support nor oppose	See summary of submission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about traffic management at school bus times 0800-0900 and 1445-1600. • Requests traffic management during the school bus hours to ensure the safety of children. • Requests assurance from the applicant that no trucking operations will occur on Cargill Road during the duration of the consent and including any subsequent consents. • Concerned that air brakes will be disruptive to children's learning. Requests limitations on the use of air brakes on SH6 near Cargill Road. • Concerned about dust effects on the school swimming pool and outside areas. Requests air monitoring equipment to be installed at the school. • Concerned about noise and vibration effecting student learning. Requests noise and vibration monitoring equipment to be installed at the school. • Concerned about negative aspects associated with the mine negatively affecting the school roll or staff leaving the community. Seeks a strong collaborative relationship between the school board and applicant. • Concerned about destroying the local environment that would subsequently affect student learning.
143	James, M and Finkle, V	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the carriageway of SH6. • From trucks on traffic safety. • Tāiko. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sea level rise will be a big problem if they lower the flats.

144	Barrick, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, community, and the environment. • The safety of SH6 and its carriageway. • The beauty of the coastal environment. • Tāiko. • The Coast's Untamed natural wilderness strategy. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no economic benefit from the proposal as the beneficiaries are overseas. • The Zero Carbon Act should be respected. • Nothing in the proposal will protect the environment in the RMA.
145	Birchfield Coal Ltd	Support	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will bring economic benefits to the district and region. • Mining is a common and anticipated activity. • Supports the growth of the industry. • There are clear benefits to sand mining and it does not have to have adverse effects on the environment. • The application's expert assessment indicates that the effects can be managed appropriately. • The effects of mining are well known and can be managed with conditions. • The mining is small scale and includes the rehabilitation of the site. • Mining is an efficient use of agricultural land. • The applicant has signalled the use of local businesses.

146	Wild Coast Limited - Pancake Rocks Cafe, Rataview Function Centre. Paparoa Park Motel	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Coast's Untamed natural wilderness strategy. • Local and tourists from noise. • Traffic safety and efficiency. • People from truck noise. • Tāiko from lighting and noise. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 0500 start hours are unreasonable. • There is no mention of the sound insulation of the processing plant. • Natural sounds are pleasant and nothing like noise from industrial activities. • Concerns about the noise and economic reports. • Requests independent review of the economic report. • Bait station servicing only 12 times a year is insufficient.
147	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral	Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the ability to respond to a fire. • Requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sufficient water supply be provided in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. ○ The Consent Holder to prepare in consultation with Fire and Emergency New Zealand, a Site Emergency Management Plan (SEMP). This should include procedures to manage the risk from and contingency for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fire ▪ Mining explosion ▪ Forecast Extreme weather events ▪ Flooding.

148	Johnson, L	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerns include adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, the community and the environment, including effects on the submitter's artist business. • People from noise, vibration and trucking movements on SH6. • The safety of cyclists. • Amenity values, the natural character of the coastal environment, recreational values. • Tāiko. • West Coast Untamed Natural Wilderness strategy. • People from radiation. • Climate change from carbon emissions. <p>Suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would generate significant new carbon emissions. • There is a lack of NZ Code of practice for radiation. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents. • The economic benefits will go offshore.
149	Halley, J	Oppose	Oppose	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disruption, noise and destruction of the environment. • Extra traffic on the roads, being rated as one of the 10 top scenic roads in the world. • Flora and fauna, especially the Tāiko. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not believe mining, conservation and tourism can coexist.
150	Morely, M	Support	Oppose	Same as submission 12
151	Leggett, G			
152	Jones, P			

153	Blanchfield, D			
154	Haddock, B			
155	Swinburn, K			
156	Robinson, T			
157	Willman, B			
158	McAulay, J			
159	Smith, R			
160	Stevens, A			
161	Barlow, K			
162	Howe, C			
163	Rubbo, M			
164	Coates, H			
165	Brownlee, M			
166	Swinburn, L			
167	Quartermaine, K			
168	E-Quip Engineering Ltd			

169	Swinburn, C			
170	Brand, W			
171	Rose, C	Neither support nor oppose	See the next column	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests the consideration or plan to address a civil defence emergency such as an Alpine Fault 8 event.
172	Hague, K	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The economic benefits claimed for the project are uncertain but likely to be greatly overstated. • The applicant has not provided a robust, independent and credible economic assessment of the proposal. • The application is inconsistent with the region's economic development strategy. • The project would have significant adverse effects on the tourism industry, individual operators and that industry's benefits for the region. • The project would have unexplored costs on infrastructure and travel times. • The project would have adverse effects on native flora, fauna, habitats and ecosystems that cannot be avoided, mitigated or managed. • The project would have adverse effects on amenity values and road safety.

173	Klempel, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbodies from discharges. • Land from salt inundation. • Disruption of SH6. • The community and environment from hazardous substances. • 24/7 operation. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bond is far too low to mitigate impacts. • Requests all monitoring to be independent. • Adverse effects outweigh short term benefits. • Suggests 25 trucks movements would be more acceptable. • The decision should not be made without the latest census data. • 9-5 operation hours should be imposed.
174	Chapman, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On bird life, including the 10 vulnerable, at risk, or declining species in the area. • On the submitter from noise effects, including effects on her accommodation business. • On Road safety. • From coastal inundation. • On property prices. • The Coast's untamed natural wilderness strategy. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is not consistent with the District Plan, RMA and the Government's no new mine stance. • Requests the consent is declined unless an alternative method of transport can be used that does not use SH6 and that mining not take place during the Tāiko breeding season.

175	Coast Road Resilience Group Inc.	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have significant adverse effects on people, the community, and the environment. • The claimed economic benefits of the proposal are uncertain. Community wellbeing, health and safety, amenity, and other environmental values should not be compromised in the pursuit of speculative economics. • Trucking impacts would be more than minor on SH6 and on its users, on community wellbeing, and on the Westland petrel /Tāiko. • The proposal is contrary to the imperative of rapid decarbonisation and transition to a low emission economy. • There is the potential for unacceptable cumulative effects on the Tāiko population. • The proposal undermines the Coast’s award-winning promotion of “Untamed Natural Wilderness” tourism strategy. Local tourism businesses are likely to be adversely affected by the proposal. • The radiation risks from the proposal are unknown, but potentially could be at levels affecting human and environmental health. New Zealand currently has no code of practice for managing radiation safety in the mining industry.
-----	----------------------------------	--------	---------	--

176	Lister, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH6 carriageway. • Traffic safety. • People from noise on SH6. • On people, the community and the environment. • Adverse effects on amenity values, natural character of the coastal environment, social fabric of the community, and recreational values. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions the independence of the IHC radiation assessment. • The application omits to mention the significant Thorium, Uranium Hafnium and radioactive lanthanides that will be extracted in the process (see myriad international reports on the radioactive components of mineral sands). • Given NZ's ban on the export or use of radioactive ore, it must be assumed that TiGa will be disposing of these concentrated isotopes on site or storing them on site. No consideration of how this will be achieved safely is evident. • There is no mention of treatment of radioactive heavy metal sediments in water discharging onto Canoe Creek. • Environmental impact on wildlife from noise, soil disturbance, pollution and introduction toxic discharge (phosphate, iron, heavy metals and oil) has not been fully appraised. • The economic benefits of the proposal are uncertain. Community wellbeing and other environmental values should not be compromised in the pursuit of speculative economics.
178	Jamieson, K	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12

178	Todd, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tāiko. • Coast's Untamed Natural Wilderness strategy. • People, the community and the environment. • Traffic safety. • People from noise, vibration. • SH6 carriageway. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The economic benefits of the proposal are uncertain. Community wellbeing and other environmental values should not be compromised in the pursuit of speculative economics.
-----	---------	--------	---------	--

179	Rooyen, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents, including their mental health and wellbeing. • Amenity values. • Property values and ability to sell properties. • Natural character of the coastal environment. • Social fabric of the community. • Recreation values. • Indigenous flora and fauna. • Tourism. • The Coast's untamed Natural wilderness strategy. • The safety of road users and local community. • People from radiation. • Climate change. • Coastal erosion and seawater incursion. • Hydrology and waterways. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will have zone benefits to residents. • The adverse social and environmental costs outweigh the short-term economic benefits. • Environmental values, and resident/community wellbeing should not be compromised in the pursuit of speculative economics. • There is uncertainty about job creation and employees will be brought from overseas. • That the radiation assessment seems light. It relies on only two samples, one taken over 20 years ago. There is no chain of custody for the samples. • There is a lack of information about leaching of heavy metals.
-----	-----------	--------	---------	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions remain about dealing with excess water during heavy rain. • There is uncertainty about the depth of excavation. • Self-monitoring is a conflict of interest and should be independent.
180	Gray, M	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
181	Carroll, V	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, the community, and the environment. • Taiko. • Wildlife including the ability to view wildlife on the Barrytown Flats. • SH6 from trucks. • Cyclists and pedestrians, including school children waiting at SH6 for the school bus. • The Coast's untamed natural wilderness strategy. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents. • The proposal has a disregard with the need to decarbonise the economy.

182	Williams, R	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More baseline traffic data is required. • The current heavy truck movement is 7-75 per day. The proposed 50 truck movements will be an increase of 65-75%. Data show this increase would be significant at pinch points in SH6. Statistical data is presented to support this point. • No reference or data has been made regarding effects on cyclists. • The rehabilitation plan is lacking and does not provide the site with any ecological benefits. • Setbacks from the coastal wetland and a neighbouring property is inadequate. • The proposal does not align with s.7.4 of the RPS.
183	Bath, G	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic, pedestrian, and cyclists' safety. • Wildlife from traffic. • Climate. • Tourism operators. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a 36% increase in traffic. • There is no emissions report. • The short-term economic gain will be at the detriment of the community.

184	Johnson, I	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, the community and the environment. • Individual wellbeing. • People from trucking noise and vibration. • SH6. • The safety of traffic, pedestrians and cyclists. • Amenity value. • Social fabric of the community. • Natural character of the coastal environment. • Global warming. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents.
185	Williams, B & Woodhouse, R	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy truck movements. • Sensitive coastal environment. • Bird and aquatic life. • Character of the road. • The application will not have minor or appropriately mitigated effects on the above.
186	Fairhall, T	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
187	Fairhall, C			

188	Langridge, G & G	Oppose	Not stated	<p>Concerned about the following adverse effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise effecting the submitters and their stock. • On hydrology and water management and consequently ecology. • Lighting, include effects on Taiko and the amenity of residents. • Visual and landscape, including amenity effects, effects on the Paparoa range and on the natural character of Canoe Creek lagoons. • Dust. • Radiation. • Transport and road use. • Ecological impacts. • Coastal impacts, natural hazards. • Economic. • Reverse sensitivity will impose future constraints on neighbouring properties. • Climate change. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No alternatives have been considered. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents.
189	Freeman, S	Oppose	Decline	Same as the submission no. 188.
190	Collings, G	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
191	Perkins, I	Oppose	Refer to the right column	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigenous species, particularly the Taiko. • Local community, being a rural lifestyle area with a key tourist route. <p>Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the expert advice from DoC. • Consider and prioritise the views of the local community.

192	Garber, L	Oppose	Refer to the right column	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life quality. • Climate change. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roothing infrastructure is not sufficient to support the proposal. • It relies totally on transport. • The consent will lead to further consents. <p>Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mining is only a small part of the future. • Existing businesses should be supported. • The focus should be on mitigating climate change.
-----	-----------	--------	---------------------------	--

193	Langridge, S & Vandenberg, D	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and wellbeing of people, including themselves who are neighbours. • Wildlife and ecology. • Climate. • Natural resources. • People, environment and farming operations from noise and vibration. • Hydrology. • The community. • Coastal/natural hazards. • Road user safety. • Visual and landscape effects. • People from radiation. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are tenuous economic benefits. • Concern about the actions of the company to date; this type of mining being new; the mining method. • The site has been farmed for over 100 years and has never been mined as suggested by the applicant. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents. • Questions the legal standing of the TTPP.
194	Brugge, B	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values and community wellbeing. • Climate and coastal erosion. • Indigenous fauna. • Hydrology and waterways. • West coast tourism and marketing. • Taiko and the Blue Penguin. • SH6. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and environmental effects outweigh any benefits.

195	Greenhalgh, H	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledges the opinions of the applicant's experts. • Believes the negative aspects of the proposal outweigh the speculative benefits.
196	Ramsay, A & Busck, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taiko. • People and tourists from increase trucking. • Natural character.
197	Langridge, S	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on the submitter's parents from the 24/7 operation. • Effects from the location of the clean water facility close to the submitter's parents' boundary. • Landscape and visual effects. • Noise effects. • Dust effects. • Water management and discharges. • Hydrology. • Bond. • Sufficiency of the bond. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 20m setback is too small to mitigate effects. • Does not support the TTPP mining zone.
198	Squire, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from the Paparoa and Croesus Track. • Biodiversity. • Community. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is inconsistent with Part 2 RMA and the NZCPS.
199	McCabe, P	Oppose	Decline	Same as the submission no. 194

200	Richmond, L & Scholz, H	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scenic value of SH6 listed by Lonely Planet as one of the top 10 roads in the world. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Punakaiki is the jewel of the crown for those visiting the Greymouth area. The proposal will undermine the Government, iwi and private funding in the Pounamu pathway and associated tourism industry.
201	Lewis, K	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not good for West Coast people who live here who want to enjoy our beautiful coastal road.
202	Antonievic, M	Oppose	Oppose	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the scenic values of the road. Native flora and fauna, including Kiwi, Woodpigeon and reptile life.
203	Wildbore, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The western drain and the clean water facility introducing unwanted contaminants into the wetland. Pond 4's discharge into the northern drain and subsequently the SNA. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagrees with the expert opinion on noise and visual disturbance and the effect on truck movements. They don't live in the community and will not be beside the mine 24/7.
204	Saxon, N	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse effect of people, environment and the ecosystems. Emissions of carbon and climate change. Profits going offshore.

205	Westpower Ltd	Support	See right hand column	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supports developments that are sustainable, make use of the natural resources in an environmentally friendly way, and provides economic benefits to the local West Coast economy.
-----	---------------	---------	-----------------------	---

206	Beachstones Partnership	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Coast tourism and marketing. • Accommodation business from truck noise and vibration effects. • Climate change. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section of SH6 is listed by Lonely Planet as No. 2 on its most amazing road trips in 2021. • Everyone will know there is a large-scale mining operation on the other side of the bund which will detract from the green landscape people have come to enjoy. • The applicant has chosen to assess economic values on pre-covid figures which is wildly inaccurate now. • The area is marketed locally as being a quiet and peaceful place which will be disturbed by the development. • Adverse social and environmental costs will outweigh short term economic benefits. • The 57 jobs will not be all filled on site or by locals. • It does not satisfy Regulation 45D(6) of the NESFW. • A huge part of the financial forecast is based on them having a Minerals Separation Plant (MSP). This plant would be to further refine the minerals and would greatly increase the export value, however this plant is not part of this application. • We do not believe that 5 years mining for \$63m is sufficient financial gain to satisfy Reg 45D(6) and that the adverse effects of this would far outweigh the earnings.
-----	-------------------------	--------	---------	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vast majority of money will go offshore and will not be used for the benefit of the local economy. • The area is rich with indigenous flora and fauna and coastal lagoons that support a vast array of birds and other aquatic life. The proposal would certainly worsen their chances of survival and is completely inconsistent with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (Policy 11). • Environmental values should not be compromised by this companies' pursuit of speculative economics.
207	Arbon, R	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bond is too low. There should be an explanation for how the \$161,000 was arrived at. • How can NZTA be expected to fix all the road damage from the trucks.

208	New Zealand Penguin Initiative	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the potential threat to little penguin/kororaā that may inhabit and / or seek to inhabit the proposed mining site and the potential adverse environmental effects from the proposal. • There has been insufficient monitoring to accurately assess the presence and use of the site by kororaā. • There have been historic reports of dead kororaā found within 1 km of the site and recent reports of kororaā pairs occupying the underneath of an inland farmhouse, within 2km of the site. • Kororaā are known to occupy pastoral habitat and utilise it for breeding and moulting. • Requests the decline of the application, but if granted, it should be subject to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Avian Management Plan be reviewed and must take kororaā presence, biology and behaviour into account. Approval should be sought by DOC, alongside experienced penguin professionals and local organisations to ensure management methodology is adequate to reduce risk of harm to kororaā and their habitat. • Confirm presence/absence of kororaā at and/or within the vicinity of the site prior to and during works via species appropriate methods, such as a comprehensive burrow searches, e.g., Conservation Dog surveys, as well as ongoing trail camera surveillance and routine monitoring of any potential kororaā accessways.
-----	--------------------------------	--------	---------	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding a risk reduction section to the Avian Management Plan to reduce the risk of kororaā entering the site, being killed and/or injured on site and appropriate actions are to be taken to ensure the utmost welfare of kororaā is upheld, should they be found. This should also be approved by DOC, local organisations and consultants experienced working with kororaā. • DOC should be notified of any injured or dead kororaā found at or within the vicinity of the proposed site and any dead birds should also undergo necropsy investigation by permitted personnel, to confirm cause of death and results published. • Pest control be undertaken routinely on-site, regardless of site occupancy by avifauna, to provide benefits to biodiversity in the area and regardless of the application outcome.
209	Costello, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environment. • The bird filled lagoon close of the mine. • Community and individual wellbeing. • SH6 carriageway. • SH6 users. • Taiko. <p>Also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests a slurry pipeline to avoid road impacts. • If mining is to proceed, conditions should be placed on vehicles to manage adverse effects.

210	Muir, D,	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
211	Waghorn, D,			
212	Cummings, B.			
213	Groody, E,			
214	Maeiulathis, P,			
215	Lee, K,			
216	Coll, M,			
217	Monk, W,			
218	Kells, E,			

219	McLuskie, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, the community and environment. • SH6 carriageway. • SH6 users safety. • People from noise and vibration from trucks. • Amenity values. • The natural character of the coastal environment. • Native species, including Taiko and penguins. • Climate from carbon emissions. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The economic benefits are uncertain. • Community wellbeing and the environment should not be compromised in pursuit of speculative economics. • Should the application be approved, the submitter requests the avian management plan is reviewed by an independent professional and that on-going audits occur to ensure compliance.
-----	-------------	--------	---------	--

220	Harris, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and property from the proximity of the proposal to surrounding properties and the hours of operation. • Noise. • Property value. • Tourism, including the effect on the Coast road being labelled one of the top 10 ocean roads in the world. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the lack of transparency regarding the size of the project. • Properties will overlook the proposed bunds. • Concern about the potential loss of residents.
221	Barret, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change. • Coastal erosion. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of emissions report means that it cannot be considered against the RMA. • It is contrary to the RMA, relevant statutory planning documents, the Zero Carbon Act and emissions reductions plan.

222	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae	Support	Approve subject to conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The support is based on the mitigation measures proposed in the application and the additional more recent measures proposed on 4 September 2023. • Notes that the Applicant will look to avoid the mixing of waters and is no longer proposing to use water from Canoe Creek to augment flows in Collins Creek and the Northern Drain. • Supports sampling and monitoring of the discharge and the receiving waters and the placement of triggers and limits within consent conditions to demonstrate that adverse impacts on local wai are not occurring throughout the term of the consent.
-----	---------------------------	---------	-------------------------------	--

223	Gamlen-Greene, R, Dr	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter has a PhD in ecology, specialising in freshwater ecology, and has conducted research on Canoe and Devery creeks, and other freshwater bodies along the Coast Road. She has also researched the contribution of Tāiko to nutrients in the adjacent freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems. • Questions the wetland assessment methodology, particularly that not all wetlands were surveyed, and that no wetland fish survey was conducted. There could be threatened or at-risk species present, but we do not know without the survey. • Questions the fish fauna survey method and states that the freshwater survey did not follow the New Zealand Freshwater Fish Sampling Protocols. • States the proposal violates Policy 11a of the NZCPS. • Questions and strongly disagrees with several aspects of the ecological assessment and Avian Management Plan. • Consider the setback from waterbodies is insufficient. • Suggests the augmented water will not have the same chemical profile. • Suggests that increased turbidity will be harmful to native fish. • Requests refusal of the application and if not refused more comprehensive fish and wetland surveying; more comprehensive freshwater mitigation; much larger buffers around the waterbodies; no mining or road transport at night, or dusk or dawn.
-----	-------------------------	--------	---------	--

224	Greene, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taiko, Little blue penguin, fernbirds and the great spotted kiwi. • Traffic safety. • Tourism. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States the proposal breaches Policy 11 of the NZCPS.
225	Allan, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeframe of consent and the intention of Tiga to mine the entire area not just what is applied for this round. • 24/7 operation. • Implications on wildlife (Black Petrels / Blue Penguins / Eels). • Implications on the eco-system, (Wetland protection, drainage of creeks and lagoon pollution). • Increase of traffic on a road that is unsuitable. • Deterioration of SH6. • Coastal Erosion. • Impact on the World top 10 drives and the Untamed Natural Wilderness strategy. • Impact on their lifestyle from noise/dust/vibration/pollution. • Impact on their community whanau and Whare tapa wha (spirit / mental and physical health / whanau).

226	Eddy, A	Oppose	Not stated	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH6 carriageway. • Traffic safety. • Waterways and water systems. • Amenity values. • Community wellbeing. • Climate change. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short term profit should not be at the expensive of opportunities for low impact tourism.
227	Johnston, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taiko and Penguins. • Tourism. • Traffic safety.

228	Gilbert, K	Oppose	Not stated	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • amenity values and community wellbeing. • indigenous flora and fauna and their habitats. • climate change. • Tāiko. • heavy trucking on the State Highway, on its users, on community wellbeing and on the environment. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driving beside an unnatural mound with a slow growing planted barrier, cuts out any view to the horizon, to the surrounding view across the lowland so the broad perspective of mountains to the sea, is lost. This will cause visitors to drive right through and not stop, not explore the beach, not feel as if they are in a natural untamed wilderness. • There is a lack of information to demonstrate that the proposed mining will not result in leaching of heavy metals from the disturbed subsoils, mineral sands and mine waste backfill. Leaching could result in heavy metal contamination of the coastal lagoons, wetlands, and freshwater springs, impacting up flora and fauna. • The applicant makes out that the West Coast region is a low socio-economic region economically poor with high unemployment. There have been periods when this has been true but it is incorrect today. The West Coast has one of NZ's fastest growing economies, and the equal lowest unemployment rate.
-----	------------	--------	------------	--

229	Waugh, D & G	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taiko. • Impact on the tourist industry. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the boom and bust legacy of mining.
230	Johnston, A	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and the environment. • Community and individual wellbeing. • Amenity values. • Tāiko. • Climate change. • Westcoast's untamed natural wilderness brand. <p>Also concerned about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse effects from trucking. • Use of fossil fuels. • Speculative economic benefits. • Profits going offshore. • Radiation effects. • Being contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents.
231	Sole, A	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic safety. • SH6 carriageway. • Taiko. • Tourism.
232	Wheddon, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle emissions. • SH6 carriageway. • People from noise and visual effects from trucks. • Wildlife from lighting.

223	Ward, T	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values and community wellbeing. • Hydrology, waterways, ecology and ecosystems from leaching chemicals. • Tāiko. • Environment. • Business. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the independence of self-monitoring. • The proposal being contrary to policy 11 NZCPS. • A peer review of the radiation report should be requested.
234	Nottingham, T	Support (note the submitter appears to have ticked the wrong box)	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment. • Noise. • Road safety. • Wetlands from contamination.
235	Sandrey, C	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
236	Sandrey, T	Support	Grant	

237	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about adverse effects on indigenous vegetation and habitat for indigenous fauna, on the natural landscape, and on freshwater ecosystems and the coastal marine area, and the native species that live in these environments, and the native species that use the area and its surrounds to breed and feed. • Forest & Bird is the owner of the 27-hectare Dick Jackson Memorial Reserve, located south of Punakaiki. This is a native forested reserve which is home to the Westland Black petrel and ecologically, is connected to a larger reserve that is the world's only breeding area for the Westland Black petrel. This site is of global significance. Considering this site's global significance there is a strong imperative to ensure that it is protected from any and all harmful effects. • Concerned that the positive economic benefits will not outweigh the potential adverse economic and social effects on the local community and the nature-based economic activities. • The activity is inconsistent with range of statutory planning documents, the Te Whanaketanga Te Tai Poutini West Coast Strategy 2050, and is inconsistent with Aotearoa New Zealand's Emissions Reduction Plan as required by the Climate Change Response Act 2002.
-----	--	--------	---------	---

238	Hellyer, J	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic safety. • SH6 carriageway. • Community wellbeing from the effects of heavy traffic. • Taiko. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the deeply embedded connections to the mining industry present on our Councils, and the influence this would appear to have on decision-making such as the inclusion of the Barrytown Flats as a Mineral Extraction Zone in the proposed Te Tai Poutini Plan. • Lacks social licence of the mine to operate.
239	Brugge, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • climate change. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application lacks an emissions report and is opposition to targets and actions of the Emission Reduction Plan.
240	Robertson, L	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and the environment. • Community and individual wellbeing. • Amenity values. • Tāiko. • Climate change. • Westcoast’s untamed natural wilderness brand. <p>Also concerned about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse effects from trucking. • Use of fossil fuels. • Speculative economic benefits. • Profits going offshore. • Radiation effects. • Being contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents.

241	Director General of Conservation (DG)	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Wildlife Act 1953 is likely to apply to the proposal as there is a risk of disturbing protected wildlife. The applicant needs to apply for a Wildlife Authority. • Policy 11 of the NZCPS is to avoid adverse effects on indigenous taxa that are listed as 'Threatened' or 'At-Risk' in the New Zealand Threat Classification System lists, and/or taxa that are listed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources as 'Threatened'. Westland Petrel / Tāiko qualify under both categories. The Westland Petrel ('At Risk') breeding colony is located 3.6km north of the proposal site and are known to breed at only one location in the world. • The site is located immediately adjacent to Canoe Creek Conservation Area (also a marginal strip), and the Langridge Scenic Reserve land. Located to the north is land also managed by DOC known as: Barrytown Flat. The Canoe Creek Lagoon has been identified as a potential SNA. The site and adjacent site are habitat for native freshwater species and terrestrial species, some of which are threatened. • The Barrytown Flat area is a breeding colony for Westland Petrel and is an important habitat under the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS). This is an international agreement that aims to conserve migratory species. Parties to the CMS, which includes New Zealand, should endeavour to provide immediate protection for migratory species which include Westland Petrel.
-----	---------------------------------------	--------	---------	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The onsite mining activity and nighttime vehicle movements from the site will disturb Westland Petrel feeding and breeding on land nearby and cause grounding that risks injury and mortality. The proposal does not adequately avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on Westland Petrel• The AMP relies on non-experts undertaking wildlife management and monitoring. The applicant does not provide any or any adequate information/evidence that mitigation will be effective. The AMP does not adequately mitigate the lighting effects at the pit site and the likely impact of increased vehicle movements on Westland Petrel during nighttime operations.• The proposal is inconsistent with: objective 7.2 and policy 7.2 of the RPS; the Proposed TPP Policy ECO-P6 and Policy LIGHT-P3 (d); that later of which specifically seeks to control the intensity, location and direction of any artificial outdoor lighting to minimise adverse effects on the significant habitats of light sensitive native fauna and the species themselves.• The applicant intends to monitor the presence of other Threatened and At-Risk avifauna on the site and 'discourage nesting' (AMP, 3.1), in addition to implementing other management activities if nests are established. Accordingly, an inherent component of the proposal is the disturbance of Threatened and At-Risk species in the coastal environment.• The proposal has the potential to change surface water hydrology due to
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>groundwater/surface water interactions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fish Surveys conducted in the 1980s-90s found several native freshwater species in the Canoe Creek, Collins Creek, Deverys Creek, Maher Creek and several unnamed tributaries. Seven species - longfin eel, torrentfish, giant kōkopu, kōaro, inanga, bluegill bully and kōura - were ranked as 'At-Risk, declining'. An updated assessment of freshwater fish should be undertaken. Given the potential for adverse hydrological effects, there is a risk of adverse effects on freshwater fauna and values.• The Canoe Creek (or Okiwi Creek) coastal lagoon immediately west and north of the application area is dominated by native plant species and has high ecological values. A potential concern for the vegetation of the Canoe Creek coastal lagoon is that the ground water-take for the activity adversely effects the hydrology and therefore the vegetation.• The applicant's ecologist states that the coastal lagoon adjacent to the proposal on the west is manmade, a result of mining between 1932 and 1947 and therefore is not subject to provision in the National Policy Statement Freshwater Management Regulations 2020. Records dating back to 1881 clearly show the area as coastal lagoon, north and south of Canoe Creek and therefore it is subject to the NPSFM.• Both the excavations and water extraction have the potential to change the hydrology of the lagoon and therefore potentially change the lagoon
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>vegetation. The vegetation is a key feature of shy wetland bird species, particularly raupō for the Threatened-Nationally Critical Matuku/Bittern and therefore the proposal could have adverse effects on habitat and freshwater and terrestrial protected species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nighttime mining and truck movements will have adverse effects on Westland Petrel. <p>The proposal does not accord with ss 6 (a) and 6 (c) RMA or Policy 11(a) of the NZCPS.</p>
242	Lock, S	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and community wellbeing from lack of sleep. Disturbance of sleep is associated with depression and suicide and a number of other health issues. Ample sleep is associated with a number of health benefits. • Visual impacts. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A member of the council has a financial interest in the application. • There is no independent test of the radiation at the site. • The community do not want this proposal and the council should listen. • The proposal is contrary to the District Plan and Local Government Act.
243	Bell, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values, community and individual wellbeing. • Flora and fauna and their habits. • SH6 carriageway. • Road safety. • The Untamed natural wilderness strategy.

244	Carpenter, N	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, community and the environment. • Community and individual wellbeing. • Traffic safety. • Noise and vibration. • SH6 carriageway. • Amenity values. • Tāiko. • Climate change. • Westcoast's untamed natural wilderness brand. • Radiation. <p>Also concerned about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speculative economic benefits. • Use of fossil fuels. • Profits going offshore. • Radiation effects. • Applicant being a foreigner. • Being contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents and the Zero Carbon Act.
245	Paparoa Beach Hideway	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reputation of the area. • Local tourism. • The Coast's Untamed natural wilderness brand. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant should be honest in their future development aspirations.

246	Hawke, D Dr	Oppose	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter has researched the habitat for these birds since the mid-1990s, focusing on soil chemistry, invertebrate biodiversity, and terrestrial and freshwater ecology. This research has been widely published in academic journals, and complements the work done by Kerry-Jayne Wilson and her research students and collaborators. • The night-time operation of the mine poses a significant threat to the Westland petrels. • There are significant ecological consequences if the Taiko colonies were to be lost from these ecosystems. • Taiko are the last (i.e., final) remnant of seabirds inhabiting lowland forest in the South Island. They were once throughout our hill country, and their nutrient runoff into streams was pervasive. Harm these birds, and you remove the source of that forest's distinctiveness and there is no obvious way of getting them back. Furthermore, you remove the opportunity to learn how the South Island functioned historically. An example given is kauri die-back disease sweeping through kauri in the North Island. • There is a suspicion that this disease is proceeding because of the removal of seabirds from these forests. Therefore the Westland petrel site is really important and it needs to be in a fully functioning condition.
247	Bradley, E	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH6. • Conservation and wildlife. • Tourism.

248	Brugge, S	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community wellbeing. • People from noise and light pollution. • Waterways. • Climate change. • Wetlands. • Taiko and the Blue Penguin. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mining is a short-sighted destructive industry.
249	Elder, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values and community wellbeing. • SH6 from trucking. • People from trucking. • Taiko. • Climate change. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are too many conditions to be complied with.
250	Wilkins, T	Support	Not stated	Not stated.

251	QEII National Trust	National	Oppose	Unclear. See summary	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigenous biodiversity and the wildlife that use their covenanted areas (located with 3-4km of the site), particularly Tāiko/Westland petrel. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would only be appropriate for consent to be granted if additional steps are taken to ensure adverse effects on the environment, particularly on Tāiko, are addressed. • The proposal is contrary to Policy 11 of the NZCPS. • The Avian Management plan also presents several protocols and potential management approaches should any grounded Tāiko (alive or dead) be found at the site. Point 4.3.3 of the plan states that should two dead Tāiko be found within a certain timeframe, the company will cease operations and use of external lights at the pit and processing plant between 4am and dawn. If this is the safest possible approach for the wellbeing of Tāiko, it should be adopted from the start of operations for each Tāiko breeding season.
-----	---------------------	----------	--------	----------------------	--

252	Forester, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, community and the environment. • Amenity values. • Climate change. • Natural character of the coastal environment. • Social fabric of the community. • Recreation values. • Tāiko. • Westcoast's untamed natural wilderness brand. <p>Also concerned about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speculative economic benefits. • Adverse effects from trucking. • Use of fossil fuels. • Being contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents.
253	Brugge, B	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The natural environment including Taiko and Little Blue Penguins. • Tourism and the clean green image. <p>Also concerned about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The detrimental effects on the environment and communities outweighs the benefits.

254	Reid, B	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rainwater drinking water supplies from dust. • Marine life. • Neighbours from the proximity of the activity. • Tourism. • People from the hours of operation. • People from noise. • Property valuations. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vegetation bund will not be effective in screening houses located above the site.
255	Hayes, T	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The safety of road users. • People from trucking noise and vibration. • Community and individual wellbeing. • Westcoast's untamed natural wilderness brand. • Tāiko. • Climate change from carbon emissions. • People from the operating hours. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents. • The submissions suggesting that the proposal will contribute to a green transition should be rejected on the basis they are frivolous.

256	Langridge, D	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and wildlife from noise. • The environment from hydrological effects. • People from dust and radiation. • Ecology. • Visual amenity values and the landscape. • Wildlife from light. • SH6 carriageway and road users. • Climate. • Coastal hazard. • Economy. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the coast road oppose the mine. • The negatives outweigh the positives. • The bond is inadequate.
-----	--------------	--------	---------	---

257	Robertson, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special character of homes in Barrytown. • Road safety. • Birdlife, especially Tāiko. • SH carriageway. • Tourism. • Subsidence and the integrity of the Coastal Strip. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has not included any detail of the constituents and ecotoxicology of the tailing which they intend to discharge. • The applicant (TiGa) have provided false and misleading information to the public both in material delivered to households directly in paper form and during 'drop in sessions'. Due to this, submissions may have been made in favour of this proposal which would never have been lodged had the submitter had full disclosure of information of the applicant's intent.
258	Cochrane, J	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12
259	Langdon, J,			
260	Langdon, B			
261	Shepard, B			
262	Newman, R			
263	Hutson, H			
264	Cochrane, A			

265	Stanton, G			
266	Cochrane, J			
267	Wilkins, M			
268	Rae, J			
269	Bridgeman, B			
270	Wallace, M,			
271	Dunn, M			
272	Dunn, T			
273	Wilkins, N			
274	Wallace, J,			
275	Olsen, G,			
276	Kelly, N			
277	Wilkins, P			
278	Shaw, S			
279	Todd, D			
280	Wynn, G,			

281	Todd, A			
282	Todd, K			
283	Rockgas Greymouth,			
284	Coast Welding Supplies,			
285	Thorby, J,			
286	Bosch, M,			
287	Frewin, K,			
288	Frewin, M			
289	McLean, D,			
290	Mclean, A,			
291	Noble, J,			
292	Bosch, N			
293	Reid, R,			
294	Duncan, S			
295	Kidd, J			
296	Bone, G			

297	Fowlds, K,			
298	Rooney, K,			
299	Schroeder, A,			
300	James, D,			
301	Martel, D			
302	Jager-Tautkus			
303	Wolfgang, J			
304	Forest, E			
305	Ewer, R	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter has lived on mining land and seen the destruction left by mines. • Demands financial payment before the start of mining sufficient to cover restoration.

306	Branca, S	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagrees that effects are less than minor. • There are no details that make this project acceptable. • It is an example of poor coastal planning. • There is no economic reason to justify the mine. The materials are not uncommon. • Commodity prices are volatile and will affect the viability of the mine. • It will create relatively few jobs and will damage the cost economically through damaging its natural assets. The coast would be better served by promoting its natural assets. • Benefits are being privatised and the costs are being socialised. • Taiko will be significantly affected by the proposal.
307	Bennett, R	Oppose	Not stated	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism. • Government investment in tourism assets. • Lifestyle potential of the area. • Local business.
308	Young, J	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledges the devastation of local residents re the proposal. • Notes that the submissions in support are largely pro forma, which contrasts to the submissions in opposition that have a strong connection to the area and are deeply concerned about the proposal.

309	McDonald, F	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH6 as the only road to serve this communication. • Taiko. • Little blue penguin from traffic. • The wellbeing of people effected by truck noise. • People and the environment from radiation. • Road safety. • Tourism. • Wetlands, Birds, Tuna (eels) and other aquatic life. • The environment from leaching. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the independence of self-monitoring. • The timing of the transport movements conflicts with movements of the Little blue penguin. • Water as a dust suppressant is not effective.
310	Barltrop, R	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road safety. • Environment. • Amenity values. • Wildlife.
311	Barltrop, J	Oppose	Decline	Same as the above.
312	Van Leeuwen, S	Support	Grant	Same as submission 129. Note the name has been recorded differently.

313	Squires, M & Craven-Carden, D	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic congestion and safety. • SH6 carriageway. • West Coast's untamed natural wilderness strategy. • Climate change. • The scenic values of SH6. • The vehicle crossing to the new visitor centre at Punakaiki. • Amenity values. • Natural character of the coastal environment. • Social fabric of the community. • Taiko.
314	Hewlett, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic outcomes. • Environmental impacts, including land disturbance, birdlife. • Social and community impacts. • Carbon emissions.

315	Development West Coast	Support	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter is the Economic Development Agency and Regional Tourism Organisation for the West Coast Region. • Te Whanaketanga Te Tai Poutini 2050 Strategy is endorsed by the collective Mayors, Chairs and Iwi Group and led by a regional steering group. • The strategy supports the establishment of new industries that deliver value to the region while protecting our natural environment. • DWC believes TiGa's proposed mineral sands mine aligns with the visions of both Te Whanaketanga and the Renewable Energy Strategy for Te Tai Poutini, fostering sustainable development and the advancement of renewable energy. • There is a direct correlation between mining and the GDP of the region. • The lack of mining has a negative influence on population. • Each mining job contributes \$303,023 to the local economy, which is much more than average productivity \$142,565. • Mining remains a key contributor to the west coast economy, contributing 7.7% of GDP, or \$1.83m, and 1,472 jobs in 2022 (3.7%) of total jobs. • Mining creates multiples jobs in other sectors. • Mining salaries are on average 54% higher than other salaries. • Ilmenite and Rare Earth Elements (REE) – are integral to the production of solar and wind power generation components, energy-efficient engines, and electric vehicle batteries. This aligns with the Regional Energy Strategy and
-----	------------------------	---------	------------	---

				<p>will contribute to the green economy and the renewable energy sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal could boost the West Coast and New Zealand's annual GDP by a potential \$28.5 million. • The West Coast economy is not overly diverse, and the challenge is to support all sectors to thrive, rather than concentrating on one at the risk of another. Primary production, mining and tourism need to find ways to co-exist as they do all over the world. Mining provides the high-paying industrial jobs we need, and tourism creates an appealing quality of life for both visitors and residents.
316	Lippiatt, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH6. • Road safety, including cyclists. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the mine is granted, animal control must be required, employee buses allow the public to board, the applicant must pay for the maintenance of the road.
317	Wood, G	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values and pleasantness. • Aesthetic coherence. • Cultural attributes. • Recreation. • Economic and social wellbeing. • Health and safety. • Ecology and ecosystem. • Economy. • Natural tourism. • Tourist safety. • Taiko. • SH6.

318	West Coast Rugby Union	Support	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surges in player numbers and enhanced sporting opportunities historically occur on the back of successful industries. • Supports new industries that provide employment and that support families that participate in rugby. • Support industries that provide economic resilience.
319	Aitken, L Note: There is also an Aitken, L that supports the proposal	Oppose	Not stated	Concerned about adverse effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterways and water systems from leaching and subsequently effecting flora and fauna. • Tourism. • Climate change. Also states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The social and environmental costs outweigh the benefits. • Profits will go overseas. • Compromises long term sustainable tourism. • The application lacks a climate change report.
320	Aitken, N	Oppose	Not stated	Concerned about adverse effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The safety of road users. • SH6 carriageway. • Tourism. • Flora and fauna and their habitats. • Visual amenity. • Community wellbeing. • Waterways and hydrology. • Tourism. • Untamed natural wilderness strategy. • Scenic values of SH6. Also states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Policy 11 NZCPS.

321	Anderson, E	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment. • Traffic safety. • Social. • Tourism. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not possible that such a deep mine will not affect the hydrology.
322	Anderson, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coastal ecosystem. • Taiko. • Environment. • Tourism. • Road users safety. • Coastal inundation. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental effects are uncertain. • The local councils have shown a concerning level of leniency and potential conflicts of interest in approving mining projects in the region. The proposed mining project should not be entrusted to councils that might not act impartially.
323	Angleovska, O	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values, including cultural and recreational values. • Community wellbeing. • People from radiation. • The safety of road users. • SH6 carriageway. • Property values. • Flora and fauna, including Taiko. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and social effects outweigh positive economic effects. • Contrary to Policy 11 NZCPS.

324	Broad, G	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values, including pleasantness, the visual harmony with the surroundings and effects from lighting. • Cultural attributes and recreational opportunities. • The submitters wellbeing and the community wellbeing. • The environment, including effects from radiation. • Road user safety. • People from truck noise. • Flora and fauna including the Taiko and Bittern. • Waterways and hydrology. • Tourism, including accommodation providers, tourism operators, visitors, the Untamed natural wilderness strategy and the listing of the Coast Road in the Lonely Planet's Top 10 coast roads in the world. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and environmental consequences outweigh any immediate economic gains. • The proposal is contrary to Policy 11 NZCPS.
-----	----------	--------	---------	--

325	Chignell, B	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise impacts of trucking will contribute to increased stress levels and negative health outcomes for those living along the trucking routes. (Refers to several pieces of research) • The impacts of heavy trucking on our already over-congested roads unfairly burden those who live there and travel the roads daily for work, medical appointments etc. • Environmental impacts are potentially significant. • Social harm outweighs any economic benefits.
326	Cook, A	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, community and the environment. • Community and individual wellbeing. • Traffic safety. • Noise and vibration. • SH6 carriageway. • Radiation. <p>Also concerned about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speculative economic benefits.
327	Cooper, P & J	Support	Grant	No reasons for their support are provided.
328	Costello, M	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic safety, including effects on cyclists. • Environment (e.g. coastal lagoon, Taiko) <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about exporting material with very little value to the Coast or NZ. • The project cannot be seen as green with so much digging and transporting. • Our children's generation could put these materials to much better effect.

329	Duthie, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment, roads, community and visitors from trucking. • Flora and fauna. • Climate change. • Hydrology and waterways. • Tourism and its marketing. • Taiko.
330	Frazer, M	Oppose	Not stated	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment, especially the Taiko. • SH6 by trucks.
331	Goddard, A	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment, by noise, dust and dirt. • People from noise. • Traffic safety. • SH6 carriageway. • Taiko. • Business and tourists.
332	Grounded Garden Consultancy Ltd	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment, roads, community and visitors from trucking. • Flora and fauna. • Climate change. • Hydrology and waterways. • Tourism and its marketing. • Taiko.

333	Hartnell, S & Fairbairn, H	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerns raised include adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, the community and the environment. • People from noise, vibration and trucking movements on SH6. • Amenity values, the natural character of the coastal environment, recreational values. • Tāiko. • Climate change. • West Coast Untamed Natural Wilderness strategy. • People from radiation. <p>Suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community and the environment should not be compromised by speculative economics. • It would generate significant new carbon emissions. • The proposal is contrary to the RMA and statutory planning documents. • The economic benefits of the proposal are uncertain. Community wellbeing and other environmental values should not be compromised in the pursuit of speculative economics.
334	Hillerby, J	Oppose	Oppose	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment, including waterways, and wildlife. • People from noise.
335	Irving, G	Oppose	Decline	Not stated.

336	Jackon, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise. • Traffic and SH6. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter was former resident of central Australia where they had witnessed firsthand the destruction of the environment by mining. • The proposal does not seem compatible with the environment. • If the application is accepted, the applicant needs to honour their various obligations.
337	Klempel, A	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environment and road from trucking. • Coastal erosion and seawater incursion from lowering the site. • The lagoon from discharges. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental costs outweigh the benefits. • The decision should be made by the Minister for the Environment.
338	Klempel, K	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concern stated about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taxpayers paying for the cost of roading damage. • What happens to the mine if SH6 is closed for long periods of time. • The boom and bust nature of mining. • Future development aspirations of the applicant. • The track record of WCRC. • Coastal erosion. • Requests independent assessment of all the applicant claims.

339	McFall, D	Oppose	Oppose	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, community and the environment. • Community and individual wellbeing. • Traffic safety. • Noise and vibration. • SH6 carriageway. <p>Also concerned about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speculative economic benefits.
340	Nolan, J	Oppose	Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventing inundation and salination is a core Council function. • Concerned about high tides. • Concerned about Council's past record issuing consents. • No one has successfully rehabilitated a mine in the world.
341	Straight, E	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road user safety. • People from noise. • Climate from pollution.
342	Rossiter, D	Oppose	Not stated	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regional economy. • Climate change. • Biodiversity. • The natural environment. • Local community wellbeing. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about profits going offshore. • Concern about the boom-and-bust cycle of mining and the associated destabilising effect to the economy. • There is no carbon offset plan proposed.
343	Schramn, P	Support	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is sufficient wider community and global long term benefits to offset the perceived negatives. • The negative effects are for a lot shorter period than the benefits.

344	Lister, C	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife and the environment from pollution.
345	Nuttridge, M (late)	Oppose	Decline	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taiko. Beach and surrounding ecosystem.
346	Skelton, D (Late)	Support	Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mine has already benefited the local community through accommodating people who have carried out assessments. The mine will economically benefit the local community. Mines are an anticipated part of the rural environment. The site has been contoured for farming and does not include any significant flora or fauna. The application includes the relevant assessments and effects can be managed. The land will be restored back to farm land. The proposal includes native planting. The mine is set well back from the coast, avoiding inundation. SH6 is already used by heavy traffic.
347	Gray, E (Late)	Support	Grant	Same as submission 12.
348	Panther, A (Late)			
349	Emery, D (Late)			

350	Houston, L (Late)	Support	Not stated	No reasons stated.
351	Thompson, S (Late)			
352	Smith W, (Late)			
353	Fairhall, J, (Late)			
354	Niven, Z, (Late)			
355	Kearns, B (Late)	Oppose	Note stated	<p>Concerned about adverse effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural habitats. • National Park. • Tourism. • Traffic safety. <p>Also states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about excessive truck movements. • Short term financial gain long term loss for the integrity of the land the people and the native species that reside here. • He Tangata He Tangata He Tangata.
356	Robinson, G	Oppose	Decline	Requests a time extension.

357	Golden Sands Horse and Wagon Tours	Oppose	Oppose	<p>This submission includes links and is similar to submission 87.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The submitter's business runs wagon tours on the beach adjacent to the site.• The submitter's business relies on the natural and quiet environment of the lagoons and beach front directly adjacent to the proposed mine site. It is also reliant on the low volume of heavy vehicles on the road.• Considers the proposal will affect the amenity of their beach tours.• Does not believe the Councils will monitor and enforce consent conditions.
-----	--	--------	--------	--