

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: Nina Margaret Carpenter

Postal address:

I am the owner of the following property:

Primary contact person/s:

As above

Email address:

Phone numbers:

Home

Business:

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

Nina Carpenter

Date: 13.10.2023

Name (BLOCK CAPITALS): NINA CARPENTER

I/we oppose the application

I/we 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. *Yes*

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 or 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 *State Yes, or that you will serve on the applicant as soon as possible after sending it to the Council*

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@wcr.govt.nz Website www.wcrc.govt.nz

Grey District Council 105 Tainui Street PO Box 382 Greymouth, 7840, 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. Industrial mining of the scale proposed in a populated rural area would have significant and widely distributed adverse effects on people, the community and the environment.
2. The economic benefits of the proposal are uncertain. Community wellbeing and other environmental values should not be compromised in the pursuit of speculative economics.
3. Adverse effects on community and individual wellbeing. SH6 is likely to become much more dangerous. Trucking noise & vibration would create stress and potential sleep loss for all living within earshot of SH6 – from early hours, all day and after dark, 7 days a week, and without respite on weekends and public holidays.
4. Trucking impacts are more than minor. The risk of damage and cost of repair to the already fragile SH6 from the significant increase in trucking is high. Heavy truck movements at the scale proposed would add significant added risk to: navigating residential driveway entrances and exits, school bus runs, cyclists, pedestrians, and motorists, including tourists in the busy peak holiday times.
5. Adverse effects on amenity values. 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.
6. There is the potential for unacceptable cumulative effects on the Westland petrel / Tāiko population. The notably slow reproductive rate means even a few Tāiko deaths can have a significant effect on the breeding potential of this already threatened species. The proposed mining and trucking during the hours of darkness present light distraction threats.
7. The proposal involves 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.
8. Industrial mining on the scale proposed would both contradict, and jeopardize, the West Coast Regional Council's own "Untamed Natural Wilderness" strategy, which 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 reputational damage.
9. The potential adverse effects of radiation and the lack of a New Zealand code of practice for managing radiation safety in the mining industry.
10. The proposal is contrary to the Resource Management Act, and many national, regional and district level objectives and policies designed to protect the environment.
11. I have lived at Fox River since 1988. At that time, there was a proposal to mine a remote part of the Paparoas, called Pike River. I put in a submission opposing that proposal, nevertheless it went ahead, and we all know how it panned out. Mining is a dangerous occupation, and people get hurt, and killed. The environment just suffers in silence because it has no voice.

12. People who care about the Earth and its wild creatures must be the voice for them Why are they seen as having no value? It is not always about company profits and bottom lines. There are some things that are more valuable. The beauty and unspoiled wildness of the Coast Road has inestimable value.
13. Speaking of value, if there are valuable minerals in the Barrytown flats, why must a foreign owned company come here and take them? Surely it would be far better if Aotearoa New Zealand were to take over this proposal, keeping the jobs and profits here. Local people would be more likely to treat the environment with care, since we live here.

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