

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: **Lee Christine Harris**

Postal address: [REDACTED]

I am the co-owner of the following property:

[REDACTED]

Primary contact person/s:

Lee Harris

Email address:

[REDACTED]

Phone numbers:

Home:

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Business:

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

Lee Harris

Date: **3 October 2023**

Name (BLOCK CAPITALS): LEE HARRIS

I oppose the application

I wish to be heard in support of my 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**

I **have not** served a copy of my submission on the Applicant as per Section 96(6)(b) of the RMA.

I expect the joint councils will fulfil this courtesy to the applicant, so that they understand concerns and issues raised in opposition to their application.

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@wrc.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 from TiGa to operate a mineral sands operation on the Barrytown Flats.

My partner and I moved to the West Coast 10 years ago to be part of a community that cares for each other and the environment. I am a regular road-side walker and occasional cyclist, I attend events in Barrytown and Punakaiki regularly and was one of the Tāiko Festival organisers for about five years.

I work from home, and my partner and I run a tourist-oriented business at Fox River (the Rusty Cup Café). We are currently building a house which will at times be available on Airbnb. I don't believe this new mining operation will benefit the West Coast when looked at holistically – the economics don't make enough sense, the potential damage to the West Coast Natural Untamed Wilderness brand - and therefore the hundreds and hundreds of us (if not thousands) on the West Coast who have a foot in the tourism market - is palpable. The Government has recently invested around \$26million into redeveloping Dolomite Point to attract and retain overseas visitors. Has input been asked from Government funders about how they view this drastic new direction with an entirely new type of mining on the West Coast, and how it will impact on their investment?

The 57 jobs referred to by the company are either for trucking, some low-end site operations and most likely largely visiting offshore experts and an admin team based in Greymouth or offshore.

Given there are a multitude of West Coast companies that are already crying out for staff, there is no net gain in cannibalising staff from other positions to work in this fossil fuel industry.

The company hasn't adequately explained how they will offset emissions from maybe 50 truck movements per day (maybe more, if a second mining operation is consented on the Barrytown Flats). When looking at the cumulative effect of the Barrytown truck movements, and truck movements around the Coast from Okari in Buller, and the various new operations further south from Greymouth, the Coast becomes trucking central. Bunding and planting between the mining site and the state highway will be inadequate for shielding local homes from the noise of truck engines warming up and changing gears from 5am in the morning through to 10pm or later at night in the summer. Anyone who has ever had children who are light sleepers will know what a nightmare this will be for families. And there are a number of families very close to the proposed initial site, and to what will most likely be subsequent sites. That the company's application lodged while there is still a commitment to reduce carbon emissions fails to address how it plans to do so suggests that West Coasters will not be able to expect anything other than the absolute minimum efforts from TiGa to do the right things.

Along with the cumulative effect of trucking noise is also the cumulative effect of dust, vibrations and road damage. I'm also concerned about the potential for accidents on our narrow and fragile roading network. As a West Coast ratepayer and taxpayer, I see no reason to have to help pay for roading damage done so an offshore-owned company can destroy our lifestyles and environment.

The proposed site is not a remote and unpopulated part of Western Australia, with very little in the way of unique flora and fauna. I'm concerned about the effects the operation would have on the Tāiko, our local bird hero whose only nesting site in the world is just along the road from the initial operations site. In the Avian Management Report, in point 1.2, second paragraph, the experts have referred to Barrytown J V Limited, not even the correct title of the applicant, but instead a previous incarnation that was unsuccessful in its efforts to undertake the same mining two years ago. The report itself alludes to the potential for impact - *Tāiko will fly past the site and could be affected by lighting or other activities there (1.2: Page 4)*. This company is out to make profit – do we really trust that they will (as per their management plan) carefully discourage any birds from nesting and if they find nests, will put up 50m barriers? What sort of independent monitoring will take place? Will a Forest and Bird member be allowed on site daily to check for signs of avian life?

The proposed site is very close to the sea, and operations are expected to ultimately drop land levels. With global warming and oceans rising, the opportunity for inundation into the area during the lifetime of the operation is very real. What measures will TiGa take to mitigate emergencies, to return the area to a suitable state should disaster occur and chemicals/compounds etc begin to leach into surrounding wetlands and waterways? Everyone who lives on the Coast knows we could expect a magnitude 8 earthquake along the Southern Alps at any time over the next 50 years. In the event of such a disaster, roads north and south of Barrytown are likely to be closed for months. There should be no tolerance for stockpiled mined minerals. Will the company have adequate insurance to make good the site immediately should a disaster occur three weeks, months or years into operations? What sort of guarantees are going to be bonded so we're not left cleaning up a toxic site for years?

With a potentially disastrous effect on the tourism market and the landscape, many people who have recently moved to the Coast, or are considering a lifestyle shift will go elsewhere – this is more than a minor effect on amenity values. House prices will drop as people begin to see this quiet slice

of paradise drowned out by trucks every 10 minutes. Families will no longer want to move into the district and the school roll (until recently climbing steadily) may suffer as a consequence.

I have to assume TiGa has upped their game in terms of getting expert hydrological and ecological advice, and presume the Grey District and West Coast Regional Councils will be seeking independent advice as to the suitability of reports furnished by the applicant's experts. I assume the same will happen in all other areas of the application, to ensure that as well as meeting all the rules and adequately demonstrating an ability to manage issues, the councils and independent hearing commissioners can be assured that granting this application will not be the downfall of a unique and vibrant community.

I seek the following decision from the Local Authority:

That the application be declined in its entirety