

Kayla Sims

From: Laksmi Crick <laksmi.crick@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 12 June 2023 17:39
To: TTPP Info
Subject: Further Submission

This email is from an external sender. Please be careful with any links or attachments.

Hello TTPP Committee,

I am writing this email to make a further submission to the TTPP now that the original submissions have been made public.

My name is Katherine Crick and my original submitter number is: (S101). I registered as a further submitter (FS68), but found the online process confusing and complex: so I am writing this email in addition.

Broadly; I wish to oppose all submissions that **support** the creation of a Mineral Extraction Zone, (MINZ) at Barrytown; on the basis that this would facilitate large-scale industrial activity that has no social licence to operate, create adverse effects for the environment and community - with risks here outweighing any benefits mostly accruing to a largely foreign owned shareholding in a time of low unemployment.

Furthermore, support all submissions that **oppose** the creation of a MINZ in Barrytown.

Also I would like to point out that the advice of the professional planners' on deleting the Barrytown Mineral Extraction Zone from the plan was ignored. The economic benefits of extractive industries should not outweigh the environmental and community amenity impacts for such a potentially long-term and large-scale industrial operation in such a scenic location with threatened wildlife, wetlands, a growing community and being a popular tourist destination along an incredibly scenic and narrow road.

TiGa does not have a social licence to operate and by far the majority of the locals oppose this venture. The stress and worry foisted upon the community by this proposed big industrial venture has been significant and for a multitude of reasons, (some mentioned above), the MINZ should be removed from the plan and the land zoned as General Rural or Rural Lifestyle.

More specifically, in relation to TiGa Minerals and Metals Ltd original Submission:

I oppose submission 493 by TiGa Minerals and Metals Ltd. The bulk of the submission points are contrary to one or more of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), the West Coast Regional Policy Statement 2020 (RPS), Environmental Standards and Regulations, and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS).

In particular:

1. Point 10 puts significant natural areas (SNAs) at risk. Infrastructure is defined in section 2 of the RMA. It is very specific and does not encompass all the multitude of activities with either a functional or operational need.

2. Points 11 & 12 are outside the scope of the TTPP. The transport network exists for all road users and modes of transport, including cyclists and pedestrians. This is clear in the Land Transport Act 1998 and associated Land Transport Rules. Amenity values must remain in the transport section as it is the

responsibility of councils to ensure the health and wellbeing of people and communities are protected from significant levels of noise and vibration, including that generated from State Highway users.

3. Points 17 & 18 are superfluous and contrary to the RPS and NZCPS. Offsetting and compensation for ecological adverse effects can only be considered in certain limited circumstances, including only if adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated. Section 7, Policy 3 of the RPS clearly outlines the criteria. Directive provisions seeking to "avoid, protect, prevent" or "minimise, restrict and preserve" are critical to the purpose of the RMA: the integrated sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Sustainable management is not limited to SNAs.

4. Point 20 are not "minor amendments" to provisions in the Rural Zones. They fundamentally undermine the purposes and principles of the RMA, e.g. "management of effects" is a very different matter to "minimisation of effects".

5. Point 21: the formation of the proposed mineral extraction zone clearly fail the test set out under the National Planning Framework. The holding of a mining permit or exploration permit under the Crown Minerals Act does not dictate land zoning. It is entirely unjustified to suddenly change the zoning of long-standing rural zones to the proposed and highly contentious mineral extraction zone solely because a private company holds a mining or exploration permit.

6. Point 22: as per point 4 above. Management of effects would likely lead to very different outcomes from that of minimisation of effects. It puts biodiversity, community wellbeing and culture at risk.

7. Points 23, 24, 26, 28 & 33. Overlays are an important and essential sustainable management tool and ensure compliance to higher order statutory instruments such as environmental standards and regulations, National Policy Statements and the NZCPS. To allow functional need, or worse still, operational need, to automatically trump overlay restrictions puts natural, cultural and wellbeing values at risk and again fundamentally undermines the purpose of the RMA.

8. Point 31 puts people's health and wellbeing at risk. Noise relief at weekends and public holidays from that generated during weekday hours is essential to health and wellbeing.

9. Point 32 on applying the mineral extraction zone to multiple rural zoned properties has absolutely no justification. See point 5 above.

10. Point 35 is contrary to the RMA and RPS. PUN-W034 is a scheduled SNA in the Coastal Environment. It is absurd to suggest it be deleted from Schedule 4 because it is inconvenient to TiGa.

Name: Katherine Crick

Address 28228 Coast Rd, Barrytown, RD1, Runanga, 7873.

Contact email: laksmi.crick@gmail.com



Virus-free. www.avg.com