

MISSION  
 APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT  
 SECTION 96  
 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

Office  
Use Only



**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	LYNDA GAIL RICHMOND HARRY SCHOLZ		
Postal address	[REDACTED]		
I am the owner/occupier (delete one) of the following property:			
Primary contact person/s	LYNDA RICHMOND		
Email address	[REDACTED]		
Phone number/s	Home:	[REDACTED]	Business:
	Mobile:	[REDACTED]	Fax:

Signature of the submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of the submitter):	Date:
<i>Lynda Richmond</i> <i>Harry Scholz</i>	11/10/23
Name (BLOCK CAPITALS):	
X LYNDA RICHMOND Harry Scholz	

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 *Please serve on my behalf.*

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are: (give details)

All of it.  
Oppose: Resource consents for:  
• Land Use Permit water  
• Discharge Permit water  
• Discharge Permit dust  
• Water take permit  
• Land Use Consent. No breaching District Plan. Particularly trucks on Coastal Road.  
*please also refer to typed attachment for further comments*

~~I~~/our submission is that: (include whether you support or oppose the application or specific parts of it; whether you are neutral regarding the application or specific parts of it; and the reasons for your views).

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

To decline the Resource Consents for mining Barry Town Flats by TIGA Minerals + Metals Ltd.

~~I~~/am not\* a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.

\*Select one.

~~I~~/am not† directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that—

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

\*Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor.

†Select one.

I request/do not 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.

\*select one.

**Important information – Please read carefully.**

To Grey District Council and West Coast Regional Council.

We oppose application for Resource Consent to do Mining at Barry Town by a company called TIGA Minerals and Metals Ltd.

As highlighted in a recent newsletter by Tourism NZ, the Tourism Industry is a very important for our economic recovery.

It is of grave concern that our iconic Coast Road maybe in jeopardy as this Australian Company proposes to allow 50 truck and trailer load movements per day to transport mineral sands from Barry town to Westport or Greymouth. We believe that heavy industrial traffic of this road could seriously impact it's scenic value as a Tourist destination.

This spectacular route is hailed by Lonely Planet to be one of the top 10 roads in the world and is central to the *Untamed Wilderness* Brand that West Coast Tourism providers have been promoting over recent years. Not only does The Coast Road have national historic value to New Zealanders, but is also considered a primary destination for overseas visitors coming to the coast. Punakaiki (Pancake Rock) being the 'jewel in the crown' for those visiting the Greymouth area

At present millions of dollars of tax payer and Iwi funding has been invested into the Pounamu Pathway. The Punakaiki upgrade being an essential part of this.

West Coast councils have supported and agreed to this plan. Yet, are now considering the consenting of a mining company whose operations could undermine the years of planning and development by the Tourism Sector. It seems like a case of having the cake and eating it too!

It is important to note that If such a plan were to be consented, this would negatively impact the income of many Tourist operators who derive their income from people who come to enjoy a roadie along this iconic route.

Therefore we oppose any consenting for TIGA mining company along this remarkable coast line.

Harry Scholz and Lynda Richmond  
Noah's Ark Backpackers



## 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.

<b>West Coast Regional Council</b> 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 <a href="mailto:info@wrc.govt.nz">info@wrc.govt.nz</a> Website <a href="http://www.wrc.govt.nz">www.wrc.govt.nz</a>	<b>Grey District Council</b> 105 Tainui Street PO Box 382 Greymouth, 7840 <a href="mailto:planning@greydc.govt.nz">planning@greydc.govt.nz</a> 03 769 8600
---	---

## Note to submitter

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B.

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.

If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners. You may not make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to an application for a coastal permit to carry out an activity that a regional coastal plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.

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.