

**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	Geoffrey Paul Broad		
Postal address	[REDACTED]		
I am the owner/occupier (delete one) of the following property:	[REDACTED]		
Primary contact person/s	Geoffrey Paul Broad		
Email address	[REDACTED]		
Phone number/s	Home: [REDACTED]	Business: [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
	Mobile: [REDACTED]	Fax: [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Signature:	Date:
[REDACTED]	13/10/23
Name (BLOCK CAPITALS):	
GEOFFREY PAUL BROAD	

*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

My/our submission is that: (state in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific proposal, or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons)

see attached

I/we seek the following decision from the Local Authority:(give precise details)

no mine

### 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 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.



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

**Olivera Angelovska**  
**Geoffrey Paul Broad**

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

**Sent 13/10/23 3.50pm**

### **Economy**

I'm against the application because the negative social and environmental consequences outweigh any immediate economic gains.

Opposition to the application is rooted in the belief that the adverse social and environmental costs far outweigh any short-term economic benefits. The assertion that locals will benefit is inaccurate in that many people in Barrytown need to be qualified to fill the jobs available at the mine.

Additionally, the foreign ownership of TiGa Minerals and Metals Ltd raises questions about who truly benefits from the project, and the strain on state highway maintenance could result in costs surpassing the applicant's contributions. Further, the mining proposal hinders the opportunity for a more sustainable, nature-focused economic model based on tourism for the area.

### **Amenity Values**

The opposition to the application stems from concerns about its adverse effects on the area's pleasantness, the visual harmony of the surroundings, cultural attributes, and recreational opportunities, which are integral to both the community's wellbeing and visitors to the area. Amenity values can significantly influence people's wellbeing, their desire to live in or visit an area, and the overall quality of life in a community.

I am a local resident who has lived in the area for over 20 years. In that time, the area has remained the same. It is a small community offering peace and quiet and opportunities for visitors to immerse themselves in nature.

Farming work in the area has had minor effects on this, as an occasional industrial noise is not ongoing.

I live minutes from the mine and can see the entire proposed mine site from where I live. At night, I see no lights from my property. Should the mine go ahead, this will change the landscape. I will see buildings, lights, machinery, and the whole mine from my home. This will ruin my peace and wellbeing.

I take visitors to the lagoon to view the many bird species that inhabit the area. It is an area of relaxation that will be changed should a mine proceed, and the bird habitat may be destroyed, as is evident if we go too close to the birds or make noise; they often leave.

The mine would turn a small village into an industrial area, and the road, even though a state highway it is a quiet rural road, would be turned into an industrial road.

Despite statements that may be made that the area is insignificant, Barrytown is a significant area surrounded by nature and coast, national parks and birdlife. It is the nature of this area that drew me to live here 20 years ago.

### **Wellbeing**

I have concerns for my wellbeing and the local community's wellbeing. I have met with local people who have literally been crying over the proposed mine. Locals are trying to raise children in an otherwise quiet, isolated natural environment. Some people have grown old in the area and are now threatened with the last years of their lives being in an industrial area.

I came here for the natural environment after travelling to over 50 countries in the world. Finding an environment as significant and undisturbed as the Barrytown and surrounding area is rare. This will change should a mine go ahead.

This will affect my wellbeing and the community's wellbeing.

### **Environmental effects**

I oppose the application due to adverse effects on the environment, including radiation.

The proposal will see increased carbon emissions from industrial machinery, trucks, and open-cast mining. I have significant concerns about radiation, especially since New Zealand has no code of practice for managing radiation safety in the mining industry. I have seen no recent evidence to confirm that this untested New Zealand mining activity will not result in harmful radiation levels, including the health of children and the elderly in the area.

I am worried that my organic farming practices will be negatively impacted by the proposed mine due to potential dust. The area is prone to strong winds, and the mining activities could lead to increased levels of dust, radiation, and even coastal erosion.

Further processing & transportation of the mineral sands expose greater risk to those along the processing/supply chain.

If sand mining becomes a significant new industry, this needs to be addressed for everyone's safety along the processing and transport chains.

### **Trucking activities**

The proposal for heavy truck traffic on State Highway 6 is a significant concern due to safety issues on the vulnerable road, the risk of closures that are frequent in the area, and adverse effects on other road users, such as cyclists, pedestrians, and motorists. These heavy trucks pose dangers, including crossing centerlines on tight corners and making residential areas and school bus routes riskier.

While it is a state highway, locals and visitors can not deny that it is more like a quiet rural road. In the winter, few movements occur during the day, especially at night. The dramatic increase in traffic movements, especially heavy truck and trailer movements, will create noise and severe safety issues. It is already a dangerous road. We see international travellers struggle to drive on the West Coast's windy mountainous roads.

Trucks travelling through Punakaiki would decrease the amenity value for visitors, seeing "50 truck and trailer movements per day." This will have negative impacts on tourism.

Additionally, the noise at night past my place will disturb my wellbeing and my sleep.

Further, any industry noise before 9 am and after 5 pm is unacceptable. Additionally, I am a writer who is very sensitive to industrial noise; both the traffic and brakes from drivers at the site and excavation noise may disturb my writing during the day.

The economic impact could lower property values and affect livelihoods, while noise and vibration stress compromises the community's wellbeing.

Plus, an influx of traffic poses safety issues for tourists, impacting the local economy.

### **Adverse effects on indigenous flora and fauna**

The mining activities will likely disrupt indigenous flora and fauna and their habitats, adversely affecting the natural environment. This disruption, caused by noise, vibration, truck movements, heavy equipment and



construction machinery, lighting, dust, waterway sedimentation, and changes in hydrology, will have detrimental effects. For instance, the threatened matuku/Australasian bittern is likely to be affected and may try to avoid noisy areas.

Additionally, the proposal raises concerns about the Tāiko population, particularly the risk of headlight distraction to petrels due to trucking hours, mining operations during darkness, and potential adverse effects on indigenous species and their habitats.

Petrels are known to follow the coastline and have been seen in Greymouth. A few years ago, I found an injured one on the road in front of our place, across from Burke Rd. Barrytown. There is a significant risk that they could be confused by any lights, especially along sections of the Coast Road that are close to the coastline. The slow reproductive rate of Tāiko makes any deaths a significant threat to the species' breeding potential.

The proposal does not align with Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS), which mandates the prevention of negative impacts on vulnerable native species and their environments.

### **Hydrology concerns**

I oppose the application due to concerns about its impact on the area's waterways and hydrology. There's a lack of information on how the proposed mining might lead to heavy metal leaching into coastal lagoons, wetlands, and freshwater springs.

Additionally, questions arise about handling excess water from heavy rainfall, potentially introducing contaminants into freshwater systems. I have concerns about flooding and contamination from the mineral extraction entering freshwater systems. Plus, soil disturbance up to 14 meters deep may compromise its physical, chemical, and biological properties.

### **Tourism**

Opposition to the application is rooted in concerns about the detrimental impact on West Coast tourism. Industrial mining contradicts the "Untamed Natural Wilderness" strategy, jeopardizing the region's natural environment. Nature tourism is increasingly valuable worldwide and offers the West Coast a sustainable, employment-rich future. Additionally, the mining proposal undermines government investments, like the Dolomite Point redevelopment, discouraging tourists.

The area has seen an increase in local nature tourism operators, accommodation businesses, and small, locally-owned establishments along the route. However, they will likely suffer due to the heavy traffic, noise, and associated reputational damage caused by the mining proposal. I had planned to offer eco-tours along the beach and to the lagoon and provide eco-accommodation, but these plans have been put on hold due to the mining proposal.

Additionally, Lonely Planet has named The Coast Road one of the world's top 10 coastal drives. Even with bunds, bus visitors that seat people in more elevated positions will see the mine. They will see the trucking activities. The development will have a negative impact on nature tourism and reduce the overall attractiveness of the area. It would be unfortunate if the Coast Road lost its status as one of the world's top 10 coastal drives, as it would likely result in a decrease in visitors.

While the mine claims to provide more job opportunities for locals, it differs from the type of world locals want. Tourism offers many growing employment opportunities for locals, which will decrease if a mine goes ahead as it would adversely affect tourism.

In conclusion, the opposition is based on the belief that nature tourism is vital to the West Coast's economy and wellbeing, and the mining proposal will negatively impact and threaten this valuable sector.

Overall, the proposal raises various interconnected issues affecting the community, infrastructure, tourism and the environment.