

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

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:

I wish to speak at any relevant hearing/meeting/session.

Please contact me with any proposal to make a joint submission in the event of others making similar submission I may or may not wish to consent to this depending on the details of the proposal.

Please send a copy of the 5.42A Officer's Report a copy of the decision once it is reached via email - Please send this to [REDACTED]

I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the RMA 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 hearing commissioners who are not members of the local authority.

I have served a copy of my submission on the Applicant as per Section 96(6)(b) of the RMA via email (info@tigamm.co.nz)

Section 1 - Request for dismissal of resource consent application due to incomplete information

My submission requests that this application is dismissed in it's entirety and a heading does not proceed at this time due to incomplete information in the application and interference in the resource consent consultation process by the applicant.

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 interference 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.

Examples of misleading information

The 'Ownership' section of the 'Community information' sheet which TiGa placed in letterboxes of affected residents.

Says

"TiGa is a New Zealand-registered company. The majority of the economic benefit of its operations will accrue to the West Coast and Grey District. The company originated as the 'Barrytown Project', an initiative of New Zealand entrepreneurs and investors to develop an ilmenite mine. In 2012 they formed a company called Westland Titanium Limited. As requirements for development grew, the founders looked overseas for additional capital to fund operations. Now operating as TiGa Minerals & Metals, the company retains many New Zealand investors."

TiGa is actually 89% foreign owned, meaning economic benefits will largely be to overseas shareholders. The purpose of the Overseas Investment Act 2005 was to prevent activities such as TiGa's proposal from occurring. TiGa have circumvented this via not owning the Barrytown mine site, rather the land which the applicant is seeking consent to mine is owned by another party, an arrangement purely to navigate legislation put in place to prevent ventures such as this from occurring.

The 'Duration of Consent' section of the 'Community information' sheet

Says

"The Barrytown mineral sands proposal has been planned as a small and short duration bespoke mining operation " .."While TiGa has applied for consent to operate the Barrytown mine site for 12 years, the period of active mining will only be about five years. During the active mining stage, only five hectares will be mined at any one time, with the land rehabilitated as the mine"

This statement partly printed in red ink is misleading in that TiGa's clear intent is to expand it's operations across the Barrytown Flats. It is clear from its current Mining Permit (NZPAM [60785](#) being 800 hectares and the current request to extend this permit (NZ PAM [60785.03](#)) which covers an additional 449 Hectares that this current resource consent application area of 63 Ha is just the beginning.

More evidence of this is being the case comes from TiGa's application for an exploration permit (NZPAM [60917.01](#) {which covers the majority of the area of the south Barrytown flats including land which I own which is not covered by their existing Mining Permit (#60785 or it's extension #60785.3)

TiGa state that at "The Barrytown mine site" ... "active mining will only be about five years" When TiGa's current application to NZPAM (Permit Change 60785.03 submitted 18/11/22) requests a duration of 20 Years and their exploration permit for the majority of the remainder of the flats (NZPAM 60917.01) covers 5 after which appropriate mining permits shall be sought.

Of note no notification has occurred from NZPAM to those landowners who TiGa have applied for an exploration permit over the land beneath them, as such even those directly impacted by the precedent of this hearing's judgement on this consent application do not know of TiGa's agenda and intent.

This application must pause in order for time for full awareness and local engagement with the TiGa's proposal in the context of their wider NZPAM permits and applications across the Barrytown flats.

Incomplete information in application

The application states that this activity does not trigger Hazardous Activities and Industry List (HAIL) Requirements when their storage of fuel and handling of this alone should trigger these requirements.

Further information is required for both HAIL requirements section completion by the applicant and this overarching resource consent application.

There is no Toxicant Management Plan provided with this application and the applicant proposes to produce one only if a certain threshold level is reached. The regime for monitoring and recording these various toxicant loadings is not provided nor is any discussion or proposals as to how sampling, testing and remediation shall relate to consent conditions.

Given that all potential toxicants are not explored nor is their granular impact on the environment and the potential presence of a multitude of toxicant substances concurrently then this application cannot proceed until these risks and their management strategies are fully documented in an ecotoxicology report and available for scrutiny.

Furthermore TiGa's proposed action if a toxicant does breach a threshold level is offsetting and compensating for 'more than minor effects' This is unacceptable handling of a reasonably likely event occurring as a direct consequence of the approval of this consent therefore more information is required in order for a determination to be made to the significance of the risk to freshwater and marine ecosystems from the 'Separation Facilities' (of mineral concentrate) which back directly onto Collins creek.

As such this toxicant management plan is a requirement of this application and given it is not provided then this application must be halted until such time it is available.

In the 'Mining Sequence' section on page 15 and 16 of the Applicant's Supporting information produced by Tai Poutini Resources there appears to be several steps missing between steps e) and f) detailing how toxicants shall be

monitored and what action will occur if thresholds are met such as diversion to a treatment facility or a halt in operations

Section 2 - I oppose this application in it's entirety based on the proposed activity's impact on:

- **The special character of our home on the Barrytown flats**
 - I, like many others moved to this region due to it's special character, being close to mountains, sea and our National Park, this special character is put at risk by this application, not only around the area of this mine site but along the full length of the coast road.
- **The ability to enjoy travel along the coast road safely**
 - Motorcycle riding: This route draws people from around the world.
 - Cycling and to those doing the 'Full Paparoa loop' consisting of cycling the Paparoa track and retiring via the coast road.
 - Walking - the iconic low tide headland walk to view the Motukiekie Rocks is on the map, it is walked by tourists and locals alike and requires a return back to the parking location at Greigs by following the road and there is no path nor space for a path along this section of road which is one of the twisty sections where trucks will cross the centreline thus potentially putting walkers in danger by forcing on-coming vehicles into their path.
 - Driving enjoyment and the view ahead.
 - Impact of Dairy trucks already too high.
 - The Novo group did not investigate nor provide any commentary on the above issues when preparing their 'Integrated Transport Assessment, for TiGa therefore their finding that "the proposal can be supported from a traffic perspective and the effects on the traffic environment can be considered as being **less than minor.**" Must be reassessed in light of the proposed activity's impact on other road users as summarised above.
- **Birdlife, esp Tāiko**
 - As Truck movements shall begin before dawn and carry on beyond dusk the lighting from these trucks presents a risk to the threatened Westland Petrel/Tāiko
 - Approval of this application would contravene the requirement of policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) 'to avoid adverse effects on threatened or at-risk indigenous species and their habitats'
- **The Impact on future viability of road pavement and foundations** especially at 10 Mile Bluff and Meybillie bay, compacted and vulnerable areas.

- The coast road has a 'Damage Law Exponent' in the top perhaps 1% of New Zealand's State Highway network meaning a doubling of axle load shall be of much more significant impact than on typical NZ highways. The Damage Law Exponent level of 6 considered for typical NZ rural state highway would be closer to the 16 which the American Association of State Highway Official (AASHO) recommended and NZ previously used.
 - The DLE is significantly greater than typically used due to the significant sections of road built on compacted aggregate over time, the significance of braking and accelerating along the entire section of coastline from Baker's Creek to Rapahoe, especially in sections when vehicles are decelerating rapidly whilst cornering on compacted road sections.
- The \$1.5 Million in royalties per annum will unlikely cover the additional maintenance requirements on the road given there shall be 50 trucks each containing 30 tonnes of mineral concentrate per day.
- Our road is required for our safety as we need access to emergency services in town. Our road is already vulnerable due to the topography and the precarious nature of it's perching upon ledges and infilled cracks in the face of the bluff. Our road is our lifeline and must not be put at risk of additional closures and one-way traffic light systems to manage slips and subsidence which are an inevitable consequence of the truck loading proposed in this application.
- **The Economic impact on Tourism,**
 - There has been a noticeable increase in tourists driven by the governments expenditure on the Paparoa track. Many cyclists choose to ride the "Full Paparoa loop', going back to the beginning at Blackball via the iconic coast road, this would be a potentially scary experience if the truck loading requested by the applicant is approved..
 - The coast road attracts motorcyclists from around the world as it is regarded as one of the most scenic in the world by Lonely planet etc.
 - The impact of trucking activities will make the experience we have had of travelling and holidaying along the whole of the coast road an experience of the past. It will change fundamentally the lived experience of all of those along the entirety of the coast and will remove our tourist draw card for domestic and international tourists alike.
 - Approval of this application would be inconsistent with our regions marketing to tourists "Untamed Natural Wilderness"
- **Subsidence and the integrity of the Coastal Strip**
 - 250,000 tonnes of material are proposed to be removed from site

per year when only 15,000 cubic metres a year resulted in significant coastal erosion at Mangawhai leading to storm surges breaking through the spit. The removal of 250,000 Tonnes/year is significant, if this becomes the norm for the remainder of TiGa's intent with the Barrytown flats much of it will no longer have a long term future due to salt water intrusion and coastal erosion.

- Ends
- ..