

**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	Chanelle van Rooyen			
Postal address	[REDACTED]			
I am the owner/occupier (delete one) of the following property:	[REDACTED]			
Primary contact person/s	Chanelle van Rooyen			
Email address	[REDACTED]			
Phone number/s	Home:	N/A	Business:	N/A
	Mobile:	[REDACTED]	Fax:	N/A

Signature:		Date:	12 October 2023
Name (BLOCK CAPITALS):	CHANELLE VAN ROOYEN		

*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)

I strongly OPPOSE the application and have attached my reasoning in a separate document, please see attached. (This box is too small).

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

That the application be DECLINED in its entirety.

### 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)

## **Submission**

### **I strongly oppose this application for the following reasons:**

1. This is a long-term, large scale, industrial mining operation, proposed to be operating in a populated rural area. An operation like this will have significant and widely distributed adverse effects on the residents (ratepayers), and the currently pristine environment. I am not against mining in general, but the Barrytown Flats is NOT the place for this kind of operation. This is our home!!

TiGA might claim that this operation will be beneficial economically, however, this proposed operation will bring ZERO benefits to the Barrytown residents and community, this operation will have nothing but a negative impact on the immediate environment and the people who live here and call Barrytown (and surrounding areas) home.

For many, our property is our biggest asset, and an operation of this scale will certainly cause property values in Barrytown to decline. As a consequence of degraded amenity and reduced property values, there will be great difficulties for residents in selling, as potential buyers will be dissuaded by the proximity to mining and excessive trucking operations.

2. I oppose the application due to adverse effects on amenity values and the local community's mental health and wellbeing. Current amenity values are high and certainly the reason why we (and many other residents) have chosen to make Barrytown our home. The proposal would completely degrade the natural character of the coastal environment, social fabric of the community, and the recreational values.

TiGa has no social licence to operate here – their proposal to operate this industrial site on a 24/7 basis, without respite in the evenings, weekends or public holidays, in a currently quiet, rural area, is excessive and unreasonable and demonstrates a blatant disregard for the wellbeing of those (residents) who will be affected. This will have a huge negative impact on our wellbeing. We don't want to and should not have to listen to this large operation all hours of the day and night. I live here so that I can sit outside on the weekends and evenings, listening to the ocean and the birds, not the vibrations and nuisance of machines and trucks operating all the time. I also treasure the quiet and the dark, starry skies we have out here. This will be completely changed with an industrial operation, going 24/7.

TiGA's proposal is threatening everything that makes this place special and will have a huge impact on the wellbeing of the residents of this area.

Coming home is our safe and quiet space and should be our sanctuary, instead, if this proposal goes ahead, it will be nothing but stress for the residents.

3. I oppose the application due to adverse effects on indigenous flora and fauna. There is the potential for unacceptable cumulative effects on the treasured Westland petrel / Tāiko population. The notably slow reproductive rate means even a few Tāiko deaths can have a significant effect on the breeding potential of this already threatened species. The proposed mining and trucking during the hours of darkness present light distraction threats.
4. I oppose the application due to adverse effects on the value of West Coast Tourism, and its marketing.

Industrial mining on the scale proposed by TiGA, would both contradict, and jeopardize, the West Coast's "Untamed Natural Wilderness" strategy, which promotes the West Coast's most valuable asset: the natural, untouched environment.

Local nature tourism operators and accommodation providers do well on the fact that visitors from NZ and all over the world, visit Barrytown and the surrounding areas for its untouched beauty, wilderness, peace and quiet. These local businesses re-invest into the community and the West Coast economy. An operation as proposed by TiGA is very likely to adversely affect these local businesses – they won't survive as no one will want to visit this area if it is turned into an industrial mine site, and this little slice of paradise will turn into a little ghost town.

TiGA's proposal to 'bund' and plant vegetation to hide their operation from the highway, is not something that will help with this image either. This stretch of road is absolutely beautiful the way it is and rated one of the top drives in the world. Looking out over the green pastures, and out to the ocean, with the Paparoa's on the other side is part of what makes this place special. Personally, I don't want to look at a man-made pile of dirt on the side of the road, waiting for vegetation to establish and likely be overgrown by gorse and weeds, when I can look at the green pastures and ocean instead. We already have natural, beautiful, established vegetation on the other side of the road (Paparoa's).

5. I oppose the application due to adverse social and environmental costs outweighing any short-term economic benefits.

TiGA keeps boasting the economic benefits of their proposal, but these benefits are uncertain. Environmental values, and resident/community wellbeing should not be compromised in the pursuit of speculative economics.

TiGA is only registered as a NZ company with the NZ Companies Office, but it is Australian owned - and all their profits will be going offshore. They are saying that they will create local jobs and be "one of the biggest employers on the Coast", yet, they have not confirmed the number of **local** jobs they will provide and gave conflicting messages on local jobs at their public meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> October in Barrytown. These "local" jobs are likely to only be lower paid, admin, truck driving and maybe a few mobile plant operator jobs, they will be bringing their 'experts' and 'technical' people in from overseas – stated by Mr Berry at the public meeting.

The West Coast has one of the lowest unemployment rates in NZ and local businesses are struggling to recruit staff, including local mining companies. We don't need this proposed operation, Barrytown and the West Coast is doing just fine without it.

TiGA is also not forthcoming with the full extent and details of this operation - they cannot even confirm which route they intend to be trucking their minerals on and they misled people at the public meeting referred to earlier. The company was specifically asked by a local, that they had heard TiGA is planning to mine the entire Barrytown Flats. Mr Brand stated that "It is only this one area (64ha) by Canoe Creek which they wish to mine, no more". It wasn't until Mr Brand was challenged by concerned residents, that he 'backtracked' and said that they are planning future stages of mining as they have permits covering the entire Barrytown Flats. It is no wonder that there is a distrust of the company by the affected residents.

I do also have to question the stability of this company as there had been several changes to their directors over the last 6 months.

6. I oppose the application due to the proposed hours of operation and adverse effects of the excessive trucking movements associated with the mine. This will have an adverse effect on the environment, State Highway 6, safety of all road users and on local community wellbeing.

I feel that the proposed 50 truck movements **every day** (including weekends and public holidays), between 5am and 10pm is excessive and the impacts of these movements are far more than minor. People will need a break from the effects this industrial scale operation would bring.

7. I oppose this application due to the potential adverse effects of radiation associated with this type of mining and the lack of a New Zealand code of practice for managing radiation safety in the mining industry. TiGA is relying on only 2 samples taken....one of them over 20 years ago, with no chain of custody. This is not adequate to make a fair and reasonable assessment on the potential radiation effects this operation brings. TiGA's whole radiation assessment report consists of about 3 pages, this seems incredibly light for something that could have serious health and safety risks associated not only to the workers involved, but also the entire community and everyone involved in the supply chain. This must be investigated properly.

8. I oppose the application due to adverse effects on climate change. The application lacks an emissions report, and this critical lack of information means the proposal cannot be measured against the climate change provisions in the RMA and the Climate Change Response [Zero Carbon] Amendment Act. During the public meeting in Barrytown on the 10<sup>th</sup> of October, TiGA were asked what they are doing about carbon emissions – they could not answer this and Mr Brand seemed to think because they are paying Road User Charges on their trucks, that they are compliant with NZ laws – this was the only answer offered by the company.

The proposal involves heavy use of fossil fuelled mine machinery and trucking (24/7), which would generate significant new carbon emissions. This goes against the Zero Carbon Act.

The proposed mining would reduce the 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 warming climate. The ocean is changing, and we are seeing more regular, 'bigger' seas. There are days, even during low tide, when the beach is inaccessible due to the big seas we are having of late. The erosion of the land along the beach is clearly visible with clumps of dirt/land being washed away with every high or big tide.

With this operation digging into the water table, this close to the ocean and dropping the land elevation by 1.2m, in a tsunami hazard zone, it would pose a significant risk to those living around this proposed mining area. It doesn't take an expert to figure that this can't be a good idea and could be disastrous.

9. I oppose the application due to adverse effects on the area's hydrology and waterways. There is a critical lack of information to demonstrate that the proposed mining will not result in leaching of heavy metals from the disturbed subsoils, mineral sands and mine waste backfill

on exposure to rainwater and air. This leaching could result in heavy metal contamination of the coastal lagoons, wetlands, and freshwater springs.

Questions remain around the intended method of dealing with excess water from the mining pit after heavy rainfall i.e., by introducing it to Collins Creek and Canoe Creek. Any contamination from the mineral extraction will likely then enter the freshwater systems. Technical concerns remain that a significant amount of mine water management infrastructure will need to be installed within 20m of the mine pit wall, leading to pit wall instability (Water Management Plan 7.6.2 p30).

The TiGa application says they will mine to 9m, but the hydrology peer review memorandum reveals [p13] that “the maximum depth of excavation is estimated to be approximately 14m from the peak of a ‘hump’ in the ‘hump and hollow topography”.

The hydrological assessment provided by “KSL” appears to rely heavily on historic data and even states that *“In the Barrytown area, all rainfall stations are historic having not been continued to the present day. The last station at Punakaiki Rocks (F21132) ceased in March 2004.”* And *“None of the creek catchments crossing the Barrytown Flats are routinely gauged, although spot gauging was undertaken on all creeks crossing SH6 in the winter and spring of 1990.”*

How can accurate rainfall assessments be made without current data, in a changing climate? Our summers are becoming drier and drier, and experts have indicated that this is only going to get worse with windier and warmer climates. In the last 2 summers, Barrytown residents have experienced drought conditions, with many needing to purchase water to fill up their rainwater tanks as they have run dry. Shouldn't our freshwater resources be treasured and protected to assist our communities in drought conditions, rather than having them depleted for offshore financial gain?

Furthermore, the report talks about *“3.2.3 Potential effects on External Eco-Hydrological Systems”, where depletion of creeks, lowering of wetlands and water-tables are listed as some of the potential effects.*

TiGA has also indicated that they intend to self-monitor. This is so inappropriate and a conflict of interest. Any monitoring of issues that could have an adverse effect on the environment and affected parties, should be undertaken by an independent, competent person.

The proposal is contrary to the Resource Management Act, and many national, regional and district level objectives and policies designed to protect the environment.

I ask that the serious, negative impacts this operation will have on the environment, Petrels, local businesses the affected residents (ratepayers), be taken seriously and considered in the assessment of this application. Our wellbeing is being threatened by the proposed operation with its relentless 24/7 operation, over several decades, generating excessive truck movements, dust, noise, and light pollution.

I seek that the application be **declined** in its entirety.