

From: [Don Kerr](#)
To: [GDC Planning \(Resource Consents\); info@wrc.govt.nz](#)
Subject: SUBMISSION ON AN APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT UNDER SECTION 96 OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991
Date: Thursday, 12 October 2023 12:05:41 am

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] This email is from an external source, be careful with any links, attachments and payment requests.

Dear Colleague

Please accept the following as a formal submission in opposition to the proposed activity as applied for by TiGa Minerals and Metals Ltd (consent # WCRC: RC-2023-0046, GDC: LUN3154/23).

I trust this is an acceptable format - the formal submission form appeared to be locked and I could not access it in a usable format.

Thank you.

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: [Donald Kerr and Wendy Lerner](#)

Postal address: [REDACTED]

I am the owner of the following property: [REDACTED]

Primary contact person/s: Don Kerr

Email address: [REDACTED]

Phone numbers:

Home:

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Business:

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

Date: 11 October, 2023

Name (BLOCK CAPITALS): DONALD CHARLES KERR &
WENDY JOAN LARNER

I/we oppose the application

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. **NOT APPLICABLE**

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: **NOT APPLICABLE**

I/we have served a copy of my/our submission on the Applicant as per Section 96(6)(b) of the RMA

We 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.

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.wrc.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. Please note the following comments in explanation of our opposition.

General

1. I am writing on behalf of myself and my partner, Wendy Larner. We are local landowners.
2. We object to the mining application in the strongest possible terms. Our reasons for opposing the application can be summarised as including environmental and community concerns, and the likelihood of deleterious impact on native flora and fauna. For context, we are developing a native afforestation project on our land with support from the Billion Trees Scheme and Trees That Count. We have a QEII Trust Covenant in place that will serve to protect this development in perpetuity.
3. Our objections to the proposal are multiple, and can be summarised as including *inter alia* ...

Environment

1. The long term impact on waterways, streams and the water table of the proposed mining is of real concern. The proposal to suppress ground water is concerning especially given the very high rainfall in the location. We believe any change in direction or flow rates of the surrounding streams and rivers (including Canoe Creek) that result from mining activity will have deleterious impact both downstream and upstream of the mining site.

This is particularly so given that Canoe Creek is a very dynamic river system.

2. We are concerned about the leaching of toxic material and simply do not believe mitigation measures will be sufficient to protect against this over the long term.
3. We are concerned that mining activity will speed up coastal erosion, and do not believe the mitigation measures as promised will be sufficient to protect this fragile ecosystem. Climate change is already serving to speed up erosion of the foreshore and there can be little doubt that the type of mining as proposed will accelerate this tendency - both in terms of the overarching emissions that will accrue in mobilisation, operations and execution as well as in trucking, but also in terms of the several destabilising effect strip mining will have on the coastal ecosystem. The proposed mining operation would reduce the average land elevation by 1.2m, potentially exacerbating climate impacts of coastal erosion and seawater incursion into groundwater from sea level rise and storm surges in a rapidly warming climate
4. Relatedly, whilst the applicant promises all manner of safe guards, controls and mitigation against environmental damage, we do not believe these will be delivered nor adequately policed by local government bodies. On a regional and national basis, such developments are notorious for environmental damage and for not operations to be in breach of undertakings to protect the environment. This is perhaps even likely so in this case given the balance of ownership is off-shore and where there is very minimal respect for local conditions or the West Coast's unique natural ecosystems.
5. Relatedly, we are concerned at the impact of mining on the adjacent Canoe Creek lagoon, and the wide range of bird life that is present there. We believe there is vastly insufficient physical separation between mining activity and the costal lagoons.
6. More generally, landscape and the value of the environment is a sometimes contentious issue. This is not an 'unremarkable' landscape. Rather, as discussed in Ngā Uruora, the Victoria University Press book authored by Dr. Geoff Park, this land was previously part of the sand plain forest. This book is instructive with respect to the Barrytown coastal plain where small remnants of the plains forests' indigenous ecosystems of kahikatea and harakeke still survive. The histories of these places, what they mean to Māori, their ecological vulnerability and their significance for conservation are major concerns. There can be no doubt of the historic, social, cultural, and ecological importance of the Barrytown coast and the sand plain forests.
7. The sand plain forest is also a critical site for native forest restoration as is demonstrated by the government-funded regeneration activities of Conservation Volunteers New Zealand as well as a number of local landowners including ourselves.
8. Finally, the presence of peat beds within the mining site is notable given

peat beds serve an important function in sequestering carbon. Strip mining will destroy these beds fully and completely.

Flora and Fauna

1. Perhaps of most concern is the deleterious impact the proposed mining will have for the taiko (Westland petrel). The taiko is endemic to New Zealand and only breed within a very small area along the Barrytown coastal plain. Taiko are already extremely vulnerable. They are vulnerable given their small numbers and their slow reproductive rate. Even just a few deaths can have a significant effect on the breeding potential of the colony.
2. We believe strip mining along the coast where taiko breed will exacerbate these vulnerabilities. We already know that taiko are adversely affected by the bright street lights of Punakaiki - surely, there is little doubt that the mining operation as proposed would be at least as disruptive for these precious and unique birds.
3. Climate change and the recent Tasman Sea marine heatwaves affect the abundance and distribution of the taiko food sources and may impact breeding success.
4. Additionally, trucking operations present light distraction threats and the adverse effects of potential injuries and mortalities. This is inconsistent with the requirement of Policy 11(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) to avoid adverse effects on threatened or at-risk indigenous species and their habitats in the coastal environment.
5. We oppose the application due to adverse effects on indigenous flora and fauna and their habitats in the coastal environment. The proposed mining sites cover one of the best remaining coastal lowland habitats on the Barrytown Flats – wetlands, coastal lagoons, creeks and re-generating kahikatea forests. The area provides critical connectivity to other remnant habitats and the forested Paparoa range. Again, Ngā Uruora is instructive in relation to this.
6. Mining is proposed within 20m of wetlands and coastal lagoons, including a SNA, all of which are important habitats for threatened and at-risk indigenous species. Birdlife would be adversely affected by noise, lighting, vibration, human activities and vehicle movements near their habitats, particularly during the breeding season.
7. As stated, we hold a QEII Covenant in the Paparoa foothills, east of the proposed mining site. This protects our native forest afforestation project in perpetuity. The overarching plan is to protect and enhance the existing vegetation and at the same time plant native trees and shrubs in those areas that are currently covered in deteriorating pasture. This is a privately funded and managed project. Restorative afforestation of permanent native forest is intended to protect and enhance native vegetation and establish a conducive habitat for birds, assist in soil conservation, protect watersheds and improve stream water quality, and provide for carbon sequestration, at

scale. Overall, it will enhance biodiversity outcomes. This is a very long-term endeavour. A key element is to provide a critical connectivity link between the marine area, coastal lagoons and regenerating forests up to the Paparoa ranges. Mining in adjacent areas significantly compromises this endeavour.

Community Issues

1. More generally, we are concerned about the sustained disturbance that will result for neighbours and local residents as a result of strip mining operations. The proposal would create adverse wellbeing effects arising from noise, dust, haulage, and light pollution in an otherwise dark environment.
2. We completely reject applicant's claims that the proposal enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health & safety. We believe it will, in fact, have the exact opposite effect. There are significant health and safety risks. We believe community wellbeing and environmental values will be compromised.
3. Neighbours and residents of Barrytown have a natural-justice right to a peaceful existence which an industrial scale mining operation would severely compromise.
4. In addition to significant adverse effects on residents' wellbeing, we predict there will be a rapid and sustained decline in property values and increasing difficulty in selling as potential buyers are dissuaded by proximity to mining and trucking.
5. Whilst the application refers to some consultation having been undertaken with neighbours and across the Barrytown community, it makes no mention as to whether those individuals are supportive or opposed to the mining activity. We believe the majority of neighbours and residents are very opposed.

Summary

1. This is a summary of our concerns. As stated, we strongly object to the proposal and believe the application should be denied.
2. We believe the impact of mining activity proposed for this location will have a highly deleterious environmental impact and that it will have a severely damaging societal impact on individuals, families and the Barrytown community.

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

Thank you
don

Don Kerr

