**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<br>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** | Deborah Langridge | | |
| **Postal address** | [redacted] | | |
| **I am the owner/occupier (delete one) of the following property:** | | | |
| **Primary contact person/s** | | | |
| **Email address** | | | |
| **Phone number/s** | Home: | Business: | |
| | Mobile: [redacted] | Fax: | |

| **Signature of the submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of the submitter):** | **Date:** |
|---|---|
| | 10 · 10 23 |
| **Name (BLOCK CAPITALS):** | |
| DEBORAH 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.***

| | *(tick one)* |
|---|---|
| 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~~ | ☐ |

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

| |
|---|
| The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are: *(give details)*<br>See attached document |
| My/our submission is that: *(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/we seek the following decision from the Local Authority:(give precise details)<br>Decline application in its entirety. |

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

~~*I am/am not† 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.

| | |
|---|---|
| **West Coast Regional Council**<br>388 Main South Road, Paroa, Greymouth 7805<br>PO Box 66, Greymouth 7840<br>Telephone (03) 768 0466<br>Toll Free 0508 800 118<br>Facsimile (03) 768 7133<br>Email info@wcrc.govt.nz<br>Website www.wcrc.govt.nz | **Grey District Council**<br>105 Tainui Street<br>PO Box 382<br>Greymouth, 7840<br>planning@greydc.govt.nz<br>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 OPPOSE Tiga Mineral and Metals Ltd application RCRC -2023-0046/GDC LUN3154/23**
**Oct 10/10/23 D Langridge**

*I strongly OPPOSE the resource consents Tiga has applied for on Coates Collins Creek land.
*The MAJORITY of the Coast Road community OPPOSE this mine.
*The many NEGATIVE impacts out weigh any positives. Our family has hopes of a more sustainable, restorative future vision than the one Tiga is selling.

As a family member of the closest neighbouring properties to Tigas proposal, I am very frustrated that neighbours and community have to go through all this again. In the last hearing, the neighbours and fantastic supporters toiled to point out the misgivings of this mine project and it was sensibly declined. The hearing process was a stressful time-consuming costly process in our lives as we faced everything we love about this place to be ruined for predominantly offshore shareholder economic benefit. It should have been publicly notified last time, as the burden was overwhelming on the few, yet effects are clearly wide ranging for the community and environment.
The mine was sensibly declined last time, it is still a flawed irresponsible proposition.

The application for a mine is inappropriate in this location and should be DECLINED.
I have major concerns including but not limited to..

**a. Industrial scale**

This is not an appropriate place for industrial scale mining. The proposed mine site is surrounded by families, a sensitive biodiversity rich wetland (SNA), lowland forest, scenic reserve and pristine coastal environment.

**b. Noise**

Life quality for neighbours and community will be significantly negatively impacted. People intentionally live here and appreciate the peace, slow pace and natural environment. Mine site and operations would be excessively intrusive in this settlement of families- significantly above current levels- more than minor. There is not a commitment shown to adequately address neighbours concerns for noise.
Vehicles leaving site noise, road noise of heavy vehicles which is a significant increase, early and late and no respite show lack of commitment to neighbours or community wellbeing. 24/7 separator plant noise is quite unnecessary and unacceptable.
Tiga fails to understand the joy and wellbeing locals get from hearing the sea and birdlife.

Noise affects wildlife but seems unmitigated adequately, noise for stock not considered at all.
House plan at Rusty Lagoon thwarted, as at 70m to machinery, the constant noise would be unlivable.

**c. Hydrology**

Water quality and water management impacts on adjoining properties and wetlands - 9m holes create a high risk effect to surrounding properties including affecting drinking water/springs and potentially erosion. Risk of biodiversity-rich SNA being irreversibly polluted.
Tiga trial and error approach could lead to permanent adverse impacts to coastal environment, neighbouring properties and SNA. There is doubt, from people who know, about Tigas water management methods.

**d. Dust**

Potential for dust issues underestimated in this environment -scale of open dust producing areas vast. This is a big concern for health of the workers and families living close.

**e. Radiation**

Radiation effects are deadly serious, especially for children of which there are many around this site. A conservative approach for NZ conditions is not evident.

**f. Ecological impacts**

Impact on indigenous fauna from noise, lighting and disturbance not avoided.
Monitoring quality questionable.

**g. Visual and landscape effects**

Contrary to what Tiga believe, for neighbours the mine area and associated buildings and roads and stockpiles are numerous and vast. Lack of consideration for closest neighbours.
Loss of natural character of Canoe Creek lagoons affects locals and business operators.

**h. Lighting**

Dark sky is valued here by locals and wildlife. Site security and machinery lighting will be unwelcome and are unnecessary. Risk to Taiko.

**i. Transport/road use**

The iconic Coast Road geography is spectacular but fragile, clearly not suited for a high volume heavy trucking road.
Early morning and late trucking will impact the sleep of neighbours and roadside homes all the way along the coast, including tourist businesses. It will increase hazard significantly for local and visitor cyclists and pedestrians which rely on it.

**j. Climate crisis and environmental obligation**

NZ and Australian governments have declared we are all in a climate crisis, however Tiga does not show concern for this even though they claim to be a modern ethical mine with obligations. Any responsibility for high carbon emissions not evident from application.
There are questions around the actual final products use.

**k. Natural hazards and fire**

A conservative approach to natural hazard possibility is not evident. Bond inadequate.

**l. Coastal effects**

The risk of permanent poor water quality, erosion, salt water intrusion are all increased. A conservative approach to managing this is not evident. Increased risk to the Langridge properties by directed increased water flow to ponds on the NW boundary next to a 9m deep pond. A coastal breach here would become more likely due to their proposal.

**m. Economic loss**

The economic benefits spouted by Tiga are unlikely and mostly support offshore shareholders (70%+).
Opportunities lost ie nature based activities on neighbouring properties thwarted.
Damaging to cycle tourism and established nature based economy brand.
Economic loss to coast road community- the community has a new visitor experience and cycle tracks- this mine goes against the vision and 'quarry route' harms potential and existing business. There is hardly justification for this project for employment reasons as

unemployment is low. However the loss for businesses from noisy trucks at accommodation, cafes, tours ect is real.

I am left feeling that any proposal by this company would be high risk to our environment and community.

**I ask that the application be DECLINED in its entirety.**

Please acknowledge the receipt of this submission forms and attachment 3 page submission to

Thank you.