

**FORM 13: 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:

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	Marilyn <u>Jill</u> Bradley		
Postal address	[REDACTED]		
I am the owner/occupier (delete one) of the following property:	[REDACTED] (This was mistakenly omitted from my previous submission)		
Primary contact person/s	Marilyn <u>Jill</u> Bradley		
Email address	[REDACTED]		
Phone number/s	Home:	-	Business:
	Mobile:	[REDACTED]	Fax:

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

J Bradley

Date:

6/10/2023

Name (BLOCK CAPITALS):

MARILYN JILL BRADLEY

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

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

See attached

My/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 oppose the application - see attached.

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

See attached.

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

*Select one.

~~*I am/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.

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

My submission relates to the placement of the mine in an area of natural environmental beauty of international significance and the negative impacts of this are contrary to the RMA.

Specifically my submission relates to the adverse effects on:

- the impact this poses to the fauna and flora of the area in particular the petrels.
- the economic impact on us, the local population and to the region and in particular the tourism industry and other social and community costs that result in diminishing wellbeing
- the loss of amenity, recreational opportunities and wellbeing for those of us who live, use and cherish this special unique area.
- the mass transport of mineral sands and the associated costs borne by me and the community eg safety, maintenance costs, carbon emissions, loss of wellbeing and radiation

My submission is that (include whether you support or oppose the application and the reasons for your views)

I oppose this application in it's entirety because it does not confer the significant local, regional or national benefits that the RMA requires of a discretionary activity. It is not functionally imperative that the mine be situated in an area of such unique fragile natural beauty. These minerals are abundantly available worldwide. This is not outback Australia.

The application has not taken due regard of the negative impacts this project will have on the local community and to the region. This mine is not necessary. It is not an essential industry such as electricity or water.

My general reason for opposing this application in it's entirety is because it will adversely affect my wellbeing and my quality of life and the quality of life of those around me. I am very worried and distressed by this proposal.

Firstly, the trucking on this international scenic drive, the Coast Road, will damage this fragile frequently closed road due to erosion, rockfall, flood, slips and earthquake. It will cause more damage than on other State Highways and be more costly for the public to repair. I have a medical condition and getting to the hospital quickly is imperative. [REDACTED] We will need to erect a high sound proof safety fence to protect against the trucking (est \$10,000). There have been 2 deaths almost outside of our section.

It is a dangerous fragile strategic road and entirely unsuitable for the mass movement of raw product. Essentially the proposal commanders the Coast Road as part of their mine. And we pay their costs. It's not fair!! Never before on the West Coast have mining activities been responsible for such enormous mass movement of

product on public roads for such long distances 365 days a year for years and years!!!

That brings me to the economics which TiGa claim will improve our lives. We have our own household costs but also as a citizen are affected by public monetary and social costs of this proposal. Costs such as building a fence, carbon emission costs, tourism loss, lower house valuations, health and safety costs from increased death and injury, the health costs of distress and worry and loss of amenity etc have not been accounted for and will negate the benefits claimed. The health costs of radiation exposure. The social cost of one road death (NZTA) over \$5,000,000. Why would we socialise all the costs but send the profits off shore to the shareholders gained by TiGa's Australian share float? I'm not that generous!!

Economically the West Coast is doing as well or better than the national average on unemployment, average wages, and economic growth. In addition the West Coast has this amazing natural 'untamed' resource of international value that is inspiring continual new local ventures that strengthen the areas environmental attributes. The tourism industry completely relies and grows on this natural untamed unindustrialised environment. The world is increasingly recognising the value of these diminishing natural areas. So why oh why would we jeopardise this. For what????

That brings me to news reports out today regarding September being the hottest on record and even beyond what the scientists thought possible. The international costs to NZ of not meeting our international carbon commitments is very significant.

Yet TiGa plan to locate a very very high carbon emissions operation in an internationally recognised scenic area of tourists and tourist businesses, residents, children, locals who recreate, a unique bird breeding area, an area of outstanding beauty that cannot be replicated and being coastal has a highly fragile ecosystem. The petrels have no other breeding environment. Again and again this is not outback Australia!! This does not make sense.

I am very worried about climate change and the environment generally and this proposal is adversely affecting my mental health. The economics of retaining such a unique internationally important environment is totally discounted in the proposal.

After lengthy consideration of this proposal I cannot find any reasons why this proposal will benefit me and my community in any way. All I can see is longterm costly reputational damage to the West Coast and that makes me sad.

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@wcr.govt.nz Website www.wcr.govt.nz	Grey District Council 105 Tainui Street PO Box 382 Greymouth, 7840 planning@greydc.govt.nz 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.