

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S82
Submitter Name	SOPHIA ALLAN
Submitter first name	SOPHIA
Submitter middle name	JOSEPHINE
Submitter surname	ALLAN
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	horsewagontours@gmail.com
Wish to be heard	Yes
Joint presentation	Yes
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend	<p>As an example the Heavy Mineral Concentrate Mine proposed for the Barrytown Flats may become a central hub for possessing material from other sites on the West Coast and will therefore have huge trucking movements. This will impact negatively on existing businesses especially in the tourism sector.</p> <p>The Coast Rd Highway is one of the "great Drives of the World" according to Lonely Planet.</p> <p>Some 500,000 visitors per year visit our local DOC Visitors Center in Punakaiki alone, drawn here by the Paparoa Great Walk, the Blow Holes, and the Untamed Wilderness, (as marketed by Tourism West Coast)</p> <p>Here's a link to visitor statistics for the West Coast Punakaiki area, a bit out of date but still reliant trend and an idea of where we are likely to recover to post Covid. https://www.punakaiki.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/tourism-west-coast-Data-Statistics-v3-Fact-book-28-July-2016.pdf</p> <p>Visitor numbers quoted 5th chapter down under the heading Tourism. https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Punakaiki</p>	<p>There should be a daily maximum volume of truck movements established, not just for each mine application but for all heavy industry transportation.</p> <p>This should apply not only where the activity is taking place but should take into account the cumulative effects of all mines or heavy industry trucking to and from source and destination.</p> <p>For example to and from Greymouth and Westport ports, quarries, mines, dairy etc</p> <p>The allowable movements of heavy trucks should be between 11pm and 6am (as currently for milk tankers).</p>

Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ	Oppose	<p>MINZ do not apply to the Barrytown Flats because these land parcels do not have a resource consent for mineral extraction. On the contrary, a mining resource consent was recently declined for this property. Therefore they cannot be zoned as a Mineral Extraction Zone. The decision to decline the consent by the commissioners considering the Barrytown JV mining application on grounds of likely more than minor effects on the environment/wildlife, hydrology and community impacts was comprehensive and unequivocal.</p> <p>The commissioners during the hearing described the application by BJV Minerals as, quote 'desk top jottings' and quote 'barely conceptual'. To let the Mining companies and the councils have the sole decision for activities on a piece of land is far too permissive. By trying to implement a MINZ the council and BJV are undermining the resource consent possess and as such would be operating a mine in the Barrytown area with, according to the commissioners, substandard controls and conditions.</p> <p>The MINZ in general is a bad idea as the mining industry is not known for self regulation. Quote Greymouth star, Monday July 11th 2022 "overall the council recorded 14 complaints or incidents in June and dealt with 8 resource consent noncompliance matters.'</p> <p>Prohibition Mine was the most toxic mine site in New Zealand and cost taxpayers 2.6million\$ to clean up</p> <p>https://www.odt.co.nz/regions/west-coast/toxic-waiuta-site-cleaned</p> <p>and yet the bond for the new Oceana Gold mine was recently only \$260,000 https://www.odt.co.nz/business/oceana-gold-lodges-bond-blackwater</p> <p>And more recently American-owned Elect Mining Ltd allegedly carried out illegal earthworks at its Butlers alluvial goldmine near Ross which caused the slip into the Minehan Creek catchment – one of two that feed the town.</p> <p>https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/101519206/mining-company-charged-with-contaminating-west-coast-water-supply</p> <p>The piece of land the MINZ is proposed to cover on the Barrytown Flats doesn't actually have a lot of mineral value contained within it. Reference Carpentaria Mining data sourced from geologist Paul Caffin which he will be submitting. The concern is that the MINZ is proposed to facilitate further heavy mineral processing on the site. The company has hinted in its resource consent application that it would like to refine its processing techniques which could involve heavy chemical processing at this MINZ site. If the MINZ is granted this could give them the power to do so without any community or environmental input.</p>	<p>I do not support the designated Mineral Extraction Zone on the Barrytown Flats</p> <p>It needs to be changed to General Rural Zone in keeping with the rest of the agricultural land on the Flats.</p> <p>I do not support MINZ being applied anywhere on the West Coast</p>
General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R25	Amend	<p>GRUZ-R25 Requires modification to address potential issues arising where multiple land parcels near to one another may be granted mining consents as is currently being proposed on the Barrytown Flats. This should include provision for maximum cumulative local transport movements, noise, dust, lighting effects and effects on local wildlife and waterways.</p> <p>GRUZ-R25 as it stands will allow mining companies to mine multiple land parcels simultaneously with out any resource consent. Another example of the TTPP trying to overrule the RMA process.</p>	<p>Amend the rule to take account of potential cumulative effects of multiple mining operations in the same locality as proposed on the Barrytown Flats</p>

General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R18	Oppose	This rule only applies to previously mined locations active since 2002 and listed in Schedule 10. Schedule 10 is empty, making GRUZ R18 irrelevant. Therefore this rule should be removed. All proposed mineral extraction activities in General Rural Zones should be considered Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary (GRUZ R25).	Remove GRUZ R18
General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R12	Oppose	The permitted activity under this rule (mineral extraction of up to 20,000m3 a year per property and 3ha at any one time) provides inadequate control where large-scale sand mining is proposed on several adjacent land parcels as is the case on the Barrytown Flats. Here there are 6 current mining permits issued to local artisanal sand miners totalling 88.4 ha. All of these are coastal and do not immediately affect residents. By contrast, one company, TIGA Minerals and Metals Ltd., has two exploration licenses covering 797ha and a mining licence covering 800ha of the Barrytown Flats (https://data.nzpam.govt.nz/permitwebmaps/?commodity=minerals). TIGA's permits cover several farms and numerous land parcels. They have a declared aim of mining the whole of the Barrytown Flats (Greymouth Star, 06/09/22). GRUZ-R12 would permit TIGA to begin large-scale sand mining on several properties on the Barrytown Flats, with cumulative effects on traffic (10 heavy vehicle truck movements per day per property), dust, noise, light pollution, amenity values, wildlife disturbance and potentially other unanticipated effects. GRUZ-R12 is therefore not fit for purpose and needs to be removed. Mineral extraction should be regarded as a Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activity (GRUZ - R25) in areas such as the Barrytown Flats with a mix of Rural Lifestyle and General Rural Zones, thereby allowing for appropriate levels of community consultation and adequate oversight of the consenting of mineral extraction operations.	Remove GRUZ R12 and make Mineral extraction a restricted discretionary activity in Rural Zones.
General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R25	Oppose	Extensive MINZ mining is not an excepted and ongoing activity in some rural areas so reverse sensitivity should not apply. For example our rural environment has never been mined as extensively as the proposed TIGGER mining application. We support the role tourism plays in our rural environment and we don't see how a major mining development can co exist along side our tourism industry.	More protection for existing communities and businesses.
Rural Zones	RURZ - P4	Support		We support low traffic and moderaet noise levels. We also support setbacks from property boundries
Rural Zones	RURZ - P5	Support		support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P7	Support		support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P9	Support		Support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P10	Support		Support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P11	Support		Support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P12	Support		Support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P13	Support		Support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P14	Support		Support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P15	Support		Support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P19	Oppose	This rule creates a reverse sensitivity where once a mine or other large scale activity is established other activities may be restricted ie tourism and accommodation	Limit noise, dust, traffic, and acctivities assoiated with heavy industry that is out of keeping and charactor in our rural areas.

Rural Zones	RURZ - P21	Amend	Because otherwise its death to the native environment by a thousand cuts.	Rehabilitation of land should be to its original stat be that native bush or farmland
Rural Zones	RURZ - P22	Amend		Rehabilitation of land should be to its original stat be that native bush or farmland
Rural Zones	RURZ - P23	Support		support
Rural Zones	RURZ - P24	Oppose	MINZ offers no protection to existing communities and businesses.	amend to more protection for our communities. Get rid of MINZ
Rural Zones	RURZ - P25	Amend		we would like to see more independent surveying of water quality noise levels, flora and fauna etc as mining companies and councils don't always have the expertise and will to evaluate these conditions correctly. For example the woefully lacking BJV mining application on the Barrytown flats was rejected by commissioners for lack of information and research. It was left to anyone apposing the application to prove what was here to protect. Critically endangerd birds, water quality etc.
Rural Zones	SETZ - PREC3- P3	Support		Support
Rural Zones	SETZ - PREC4 - P4	Support		Support
Rural Zones	GRUZ - PREC 5 - Highly Productive Land Precinct Policy	Support	It creates instant settlements which are out of keeping with out rural environments and stresses our limited info structure. It also cuts up our productive rural farming land.	General rural land should not be subdivided down to less than 50 acres
Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R4	Oppose	We don't believe reverse sensitivity should exist, for example for huge mining operations that have never been a feature in our rural areas previously	We want far more protection for our communities.
Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R3	Oppose	It seems the rules now are for residents to protect themselves from new obtrusive noise levels rather than have appropriate level control at source	More protection for existing communities from heavy industry moving in.
Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R8	Support		support
Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R10	Oppose	None	Documents included with submission
Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R11	Amend	It would seem that the point of the the TPP is to make mining permitted with less restrictions and protections for our communities. The money received by council from rates from our communities will be far more than moneys received from mining etc so how can big development like this benefit our communities? We are mostly all employed already in sustainable jobs. There's more to life than extractive industry.	More protection for the local people.
Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R11	Amend	Because it would be incredibly unfair to allow residential development, subdivisions, lifestyle blocks etc, and then encroach upon their environment and character with heavy industry.	There should be setbacks for any mining operation of at least 300 meters from any legal dwelling