

**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: LUN 3154/23

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	Katherine Crick		
Postal address	[REDACTED]		
I am the owner/occupier (delete one) of the following property:	Owner		
Primary contact person/s	As above		
Email address	[REDACTED]		
Phone number/s	Home:	[REDACTED]	Business:
	Mobile:	[REDACTED]	Fax:

Signature:	Date:
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Name (BLOCK CAPITALS):	
Katherine Crick	

*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)

See attached

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

I strongly appeal to the local authority to decline this application 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.



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 the granting of this application because it will adversely affect both the local and visiting human community and the natural environment as described broadly below; in ways that are more than minor. There are also many uncertain effects and risks due to this type of sand mining being relatively new to NZ.

My partner and I moved to Barrytown 3 years ago, attracted like many people to the nature that this area is famous for; not to live amidst a large-scale, long-term mining operation. There exist smaller, artisanal mining operations already in Barrytown, being far more appropriate for such a place than the size and scale of this applicant's proposal. There have been many examples of poor local body decisions and outcomes in this region with associated disasters for both humans and the environment. This application is an example of a proposal in the wrong place. The West Coast is not outback Australia.

### **I oppose the application due to:**

#### **\* The adverse effects of trucking:**

The road is already narrow, windy and dangerous; however at the moment there are still long, quiet spells on the road, where residents and visitors can get some peace, respite and quiet enjoyment. The proposal's vast increase in traffic volume, 17 hours a day, 7 days a week, with metronomic regularity every 20 minutes (or potentially more); will spell the end of this. The road will become more and more like an industrial haulage route; significantly more dangerous for all road users, cyclists, locals and tourists alike. In turn this will adversely affect amenity, natural and property values as people will be naturally repelled from proximity to industrial scale operations and associated transportation. There would be a greater risk of people being killed on the road as a result of this proposal. With increased heavy use the road will become more labour and cost intensive to maintain.

#### **\* The adverse effects on tourism:**

Tourism is thriving at the moment in a post-covid environment as people are attracted to the natural values that this unique part of the world offers. Many businesses, nature tours, accommodation providers etc are located on the Coast Road and this proposal would undermine their value and attributes along the entire length of the potential trucking route. Reverse sensitivity arguments should apply to any company looking to threaten an already established, thriving industry. There would be also a risk of reputational damage to the success of the West Coast brand: "Untamed Natural Wilderness"; which should be of major concern. This particular stretch of highway is often quoted as being one of the most scenic drives in the world.

#### **\* Adverse effects on community and wellbeing:**

There has already been much stress, anxiety and worry for the local community, sleepless nights and wasted time in fighting an largely unwanted proposal. We arrived in this place to find many in the community traumatised from the first proposal under Barrytown JV. We know and love this place for it's unique and natural values and what is proposed is a decades long threat to this way of life and misery for many. All from a company with a majority overseas and speculative shareholding background.

#### **\* The adverse effects on the environment, waterways, flora and fauna:**

The proposed mine is located metres from the sea and coastal lagoons, and has a high water table. Despite all the reports and planning; it is still uncertain to how the ground will react until operations start. These operations would likely adversely affect the habitat of many species as well as the integrity of hydrological

systems. There is also a risk of seawater incursion and the proposal will result in a huge net loss to the ground level due to all the material being removed.

\* The adverse effects on Tāiko/Westland Petrel:

This vulnerable species with its only nesting site in the world located in the vicinity; would be at serious risk from the industrial aspects: traffic, lights, and noise of this operation. The flightpaths of the fledgeling petrels often diverge away from the site of the burrow, putting them at further risk from both the plant and increased night time trucking. Even the loss of a few Tāiko would be catastrophic for the population.

\* Speculative Economics:

I oppose the application as the proposal touts 'growth and jobs' as its main benefits; however on the West Coast there are a shortage of workers, the highest wage growth in the country, low unemployment and positive economic growth already. We don't need speculative ventures such as this putting the area at risk in all the ways mentioned. There is already evidence that it's discouraging investment in the area and opportunities of smaller scale, less intensive and harmful activities, are being lost. It is uncertain what proportion of any benefits will stay in the local economy vs being exported offshore or to shareholders elsewhere. Overall, the benefits for a few will likely not outweigh the adverse effects for many and the effects on the thriving nature tourism industry will be particularly dire. Just because the West Coast has a history of mining does not mean we should accept every proposal that comes along, regardless of the negative costs to community and environment.

\* The proposal is carbon intensive:

The use of fossil fuelled machinery and trucks will hinder the transition to a low carbon economy in a world where we need less, not more carbon emission-rich industries. This contravenes the Zero Carbon Act. The application lacks an emissions report, and is in opposition to targets and actions of the Emission Reduction Plan.

\* The potential adverse effects of radiation:

NZ does not currently have any safety standards to monitor any potential radiation. Sand Mining is a relatively new type of mining in NZ and could risk adverse effects.

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