

**FORM 13: SUBMISSION  
ON AN APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT  
UNDER SECTION 96  
OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

Office  
Use Only



**PART A: DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION**

CONSENT NUMBER:

APPLICANT:

WCRC: RC-2023-0046  
GDC: LUN3154/23

TIGA MINERALS AND METALS LTD

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY:

Establish and operate a mineral sands mine, including construction of associated infrastructure.

LOCATION:

Barrytown Flats, west of State Highway 6 (Coast Road), 9km south of Punakaiki township and 36km north of Greymouth.

**PART B: SUBMITTER DETAILS**

Full name/s	SHARON MARIE LANGRIDGE		
Postal address	[REDACTED]		
I am the owner/occupier (delete one) of the following property:	I AM THE OWNER. [REDACTED]		
Primary contact person/s			
Email address	[REDACTED]		
Phone number/s	Home:	[REDACTED]	Business:
	Mobile:	[REDACTED]	Fax:

Signature of the submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of the submitter):	Date:
[REDACTED]	12 OCT 2023
Name (BLOCK CAPITALS):	
SHARON MARIE LANGRIDGE	

*If this is a joint submission by 2 or more individuals, each individual's signature is required. A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.*

I/we **support** the application numbers indicated by a tick on the back of this form

I/we **oppose** the application

I/we **neither support nor oppose** the application

(tick one)




(tick one)

I/we **wish to be heard** in support of my/our submission.

I/we **DO NOT wish to be heard** and hereby make my/our submission in writing only.

If you wish to be heard, and others make a similar submission would you consider making a joint case with them at any hearing

 Yes No

If you indicated you wish to be heard, you will be sent a copy of the S.42A Officer's Report and a copy of the Decision once it is released. Please indicate below which format you would like to receive these documents in:

 Electronic (CD) copy Hard (paper) copy

I/we **have** served a copy of my/our submission on the Applicant as per Section 96(6)(b) of the RMA

 Yes

<p>The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are: <i>(give details)</i></p> <p>I OPPOSE TIGA MINERALS AND METALS LTD APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHED SUBMISSION</p>
<p>My/our submission is that: <i>(include whether you support or oppose the application or specific parts of it; whether you are neutral regarding the application or specific parts of it; and the reasons for your views).</i></p>
<p>I/we seek the following decision from the Local Authority:(give precise details)</p> <p>DECLINE IN FULL</p>

I ~~am~~ am not\* a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.

\*Select one.

\*I am/~~am~~ directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

\*Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor.

†Select one.

I request/~~do not request~~\*, pursuant to section 100A of the Act, that you delegate your functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority.

\*select one.

**Important information – Please read carefully.**

## Public information

The information you provide is public information. It is used to help process a resource consent application and assess the impact of an activity on the environment and other people.

Your information is held and administered by the West Coast Regional Council and Grey District Council in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. This means that your information may be disclosed to other people who request it in accordance with the terms of these Acts. It is therefore important you let us know if your form includes any information you consider should not be disclosed.

<b>West Coast Regional Council</b> 388 Main South Road, Paroa, Greymouth 7805 PO Box 66, Greymouth 7840 Telephone (03) 768 0466 Toll Free 0508 800 118 Facsimile (03) 768 7133 Email <a href="mailto:info@wcrc.govt.nz">info@wcrc.govt.nz</a> Website <a href="http://www.wcrc.govt.nz">www.wcrc.govt.nz</a>	<b>Grey District Council</b> 105 Tainui Street PO Box 382 Greymouth, 7840 <a href="mailto:planning@greydc.govt.nz">planning@greydc.govt.nz</a> 03 769 8600
---	---

## Note to submitter

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B.

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.

If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners. You may not make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to an application for a coastal permit to carry out an activity that a regional coastal plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Submission: Sharon Langridge

RE: Tiga Minerals and Metals Resource Consent Application. WCRC:RC-2023-0046,  
GDC:LUN3154/23

**My Submission is in Opposition** to the proposed Mine at Barrytown.

I am Not Anti Mining, I am not Anti Industry, I am not Anti opportunities for new jobs. I come from a family background of farming and Earthmoving- infrastructure /road construction.

I have lived most of my life next door to the proposed mine site, both on the South & North Boundaries. I feel privileged to have grown up here enjoying the quiet rural lifestyle.

I am not opposing this proposed mine for simply the sake of it. We have literally spent hundreds of hours (as unpaid lay persons) reading Resource Consent Applications, complicated hydrology reports, ecology, mine management, transport etc etc to understand the effects on our land, waterways, our livestock, wildlife/nature, effects of noise, dust & overall amenity, property values, effects on our kids and family. There is also the community to consider. We have already spent a huge amount of our own time and money on this, in addition to spending over 30 hours in Council hearings regarding the first mining application. While taking time off from our jobs (my one in Barrytown), juggling family & running a business (in Barrytown). It also caused a huge amount of stress. We took an informed approach in our opposition last time, as it turned out there was more holes in that application than the average Swiss cheese.

Based on an informed approach many of our concerns that we had right from the beginning of the first Application, remain and have not been addressed. These include:

**Location of the 24/7 processing plant** close to my parents' property boundary on south side of Application site.

**Location of the Clean Water facility/ created wetland** (post mining activity) on my parent's boundary on the Northern side of the application site next to the Rusty Pond, in an area subject to erosion, and in itself create a further coastal hazard.

**Inadequate setbacks from the Boundaries at only 20 metres** with some infrastructure in between the pit & boundary for example. Indicates that there will also be activity in this zone. Leaves little to come & go on in the event of a collapse. Hardly a considerate approach toward neighbours, yet SH6 afforded 200m. 20m is also not acceptable in terms of noise considerations, and impacts on neighbours, livestock & wildlife.

**Landscape assessment of visual effects**— I note that it mentions R Langridge & D Van Den Berg property at [REDACTED] having borrowed views (Pg 53). The same could easily be said about Tiga borrowing our best farm shelter (on my parent's farm north boundary) on the southern boundary of application site to conveniently locate and try to disguise their 15m tall processing plant. There are further points regarding plantings/bunds/mitigation etc that need to be considered.

Continued ... see page 2

**General Noise effects** on ourselves, neighbours, livestock, and wildlife. This has been downplayed by the Tiga. We know that there will be breaches and how this is handled by both the Company & Council is of a concern.

We still want to be able to hear bird song & the sea and enjoy the quiet without the continual grind of industry. It's generally a quiet area, with the expected usual seasonal farming activities. This proposed mine would be a new intrusive & intense addition, the sounds of nature will be lost to mechanical noise.

**Mineral Extraction Zone** – TTP District Plan. This has been supported by Tiga and throws us as residents under the bus. It will be around long after any mining venture, as the plan will not likely be visited again for years. I see this as instant devaluation if this gets approved. In addition, if a Resource consent is granted for a mine– it would feature on neighbouring properties LIM reports.

**Dust** – migrating onto our house, livestock pasture, nursery plant stock, plantings/kahikatea block & water supplies. Contradicting information regarding whether the internal roads will be sealed. No mention of extreme winds that plague the site.

**Water management & discharge issues**, the mine water is going to end up on our property. There is the worry of contamination of our SNA ponds, wetlands, the beach & marine reserve.

**Hydrology** - changes to groundwater remain unclear, and potential impact on our family's freshwater springs, (water supplies), SNA, ponds, wetlands & kahikatea stands.

**Bond-** at \$160,000. Not enough to cover a potential environmentally damaging situation. To be realistic this should be increased.

**Jobs** – the main drawcard of the mine going ahead is jobs, however given the Westport example you would hope this has not been over inflated as PR spin. As stated in my opening statement I am not against jobs for the local community. Let's hope the 58 jobs plus 80 add On's are a reality and not a half-truth for the purpose of getting this mine across the line.

**Area stability** – No matter what the outcome of the consent – clearly, we need to avoid a Boom & Bust situation as experienced and described by a Runanga resident (at the 10 October meeting in the Barrytown Hall organised by Tiga) which seems to be a common feature of the mining industry.

**Transport/logistic/Ports** - recently there has been much talk about how the Greymouth Port will benefit from these new industries. However, in this particular case, Greymouth is not currently in the mix. As stated at the Public Meeting in Barrytown on 10 October. The material will be likely railed to Timaru & sent from there, as Lyttleton is not an option either. If Lyttleton as an established large port doesn't meet the bulk shipping requirements of Tiga, and they must go to Timaru, then Greymouth will obviously not ever be in the running for this business. Timaru will benefit instead.

As a family we have given this proposed mine, much thought. However, have still concluded the potential impacts on residents, amenity values, environmental concerns in terms of flora & fauna, water, hydrology etc and ultimate changes to the area/community override and outweigh any positives. For us as a family, our 115 years of work to maintain our farm & uphold the best possible standards of animal welfare are at stake. We have a vested interest in the area and intend to continue to do so.

This application lacks solid mitigation to many of the self-created problems. For the avoidance of doubt, I seek that it be **declined in full**. Thank you. (Sharon Langridge Pg2)