

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

**PART A: DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION**

CONSENT NUMBER: WCRC: RC-2023-0046, GDC: LUN3154/23

APPLICANT: 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: Annalis Johnson

Postal address: [REDACTED]

I am the owner of the following property: [REDACTED]

Primary contact person/s: Lisa Johnson

Email address: [REDACTED]

Phone numbers:

Home:

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Business:

Signature of the submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of the submitter): Annalis Johnson



Date: 13 October 2023

Name (BLOCK CAPITALS): ANNALIS JOHNSON

I/we oppose the application

"I/we do not wish to be heard in support of my/our submission"

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

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

**Yes**

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

I 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.

### **Important information from Councils – 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.

West Coast Regional Council 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

[info@wcrc.govt.nz](mailto:info@wcrc.govt.nz) Website [www.wcrc.govt.nz](http://www.wcrc.govt.nz)

Grey District Council 105 Tainui Street PO Box 382 Greymouth, 7840, [planning@greydc.govt.nz](mailto:planning@greydc.govt.nz) 03 769 8600

#### **Note to submitter**

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**

### **I oppose the application due to:**

1. **Adverse effects on the wellbeing of the people, the community and the environment.** This is a beautiful and unique populated rural environment and people who live here enjoy the peace and tranquility it offers. Raw, wild and rugged nature. The scale of the proposed industrial mining will have significant negative effects on people, the community and the environment. This will completely contradict New Zealand's clean and green picture that promotes tourism to the area. This is my family home that I return to in the holidays from University. To see the local beauty destroyed in exchange for overseas economic benefits devastates myself and my family.
2. **The impact of a significant number of large, heavy, double truck unit movements on SH6.** Trucking impacts are major and will significantly affect those who live here. Sleep deprivation from regular truck movements and their vibration and sound will have impacts on individuals in the community beyond a bad night's sleep. Long hours of this noise, from 5am to 10pm every day of the week including public holidays means there will be no respite.
3. **Adverse effects on cycling safety.** The trucks will cause significant danger to cyclists and pedestrians. The road has tight bends and blind corners where cyclists and pedestrians sometimes can not be seen until the last moment. This proposal is at a time when our tourist industry is growing with more cyclists and camper vans on SH6. We want to encourage this. If the proposal does go ahead TiGA could be requested to first create a cycle path between Greymouth and Charleston, connecting to the Kawatiri Trail in the north and the Wilderness Trail in the south.
4. **The potential for greater cost, travel delays and problems in maintaining SH6.** Keeping traffic flowing well and SH6 in good condition for all users, including those that commute daily for work. It is our critical link to all amenities. The already fragile SH6 will be at risk of constant repair from such regular heavy trucking movements. The economical cost of this would be high. This is no regular highway and it seems amiss that the taxpayer would fund this extra burden.
5. **Industrial mining on the scale proposed contradicting the West Coast Regional Council's own "Untamed Natural Wilderness" strategy.** This strategy promotes the West Coast's most valuable asset: the natural environment. Local nature tourism operators and accommodation providers are likely to be adversely affected by the proposal, both by SH6 use as a mine haulage route and by subsequent damage to its reputation.
6. **Adverse effects on my property and amenity values.** We personally would not have chosen to move to the Coast and buy and renovate a house in this area had we known what was coming. My family have invested heavily in renovating our home over the last 2 years. Current amenity values are high and draw many visitors and residents to the area. The proposal would degrade the natural character of the coastal environment, social fabric of the community, and recreational values.
7. **My concern for the natural environment and biodiversity.** The potential for increased danger and deaths of the Westland petrel / Tāiko in itself should be enough to put a stop to this proposal. I am really concerned for the hydrology and potential for leaking heavy metals. Not to mention climate change and rising sea levels. If the

proposal goes ahead I would like to see TiGA enforced to close operations immediately if readings and data taken is questionable until the issue is proven to be rectified. I do not want to see them paying their way out of their problems while business continues as per normal.

8. **The economic benefits predominantly going offshore.** The wellbeing of the community should be prioritised above the unknown economic benefits to a company that, although a NZ company, is I believe predominantly owned by international share holders. The resource is finite - once it is gone that is it. Ilmenite is not urgently needed by the planet right now. Keep it there.
9. **The proposal involving the heavy use of fossil fuelled mine machinery and trucking.** It would generate significant new carbon emissions and contribute to the myriad of adverse effects from global warming. It goes against the Zero Carbon Act requirement to decarbonise and transition to a low emission economy.
10. **The potential adverse effects of radiation and the lack of a New Zealand code of practice for managing radiation safety in the mining industry.**
11. **The proposal is contrary to the Resource Management Act, and many national, regional and district level objectives and policies designed to protect the environment.**

I seek the following decision from the Local Authority: that the application be declined in its entirety.