

Barrytown Minerals Project (Southern Block) Project

Attachment A: Applicant responses to relevant comments from Adjacent Owners and Occupiers, Administering Agencies, Local Authorities, Ministers of the Crown, Requiring Authority and Specified Approvals

This document contains relevant comments from Adjacent Owners and Occupiers, Administering Agencies, Local Authorities, Ministers of the Crown, Requiring Authority, and Specified Approvals.

Out of Scope comments

This document does not respond to comments which are outside scope of the Application including: traffic, trucking and vehicle movements on State Highway 6, noise associated with the Wet Concentrator Plant, and matters relating to the Mineral Separation Plant at Rapahoe.

Comments in support from Landowners, who are also neighbours

The Applicant particularly thanks Cargill Road Barrytown Limited* and George and Caryl Coates^ (Nikau Deer Farm Limited), as landowners and neighbours, for their comments in support of the Application.

**properties include: Section 4 Block IX Waiwhero SD; Part Section 5 Block IX Waiwhero SD; RS 4034; Part RS 2628; Section 1 SO 3127; Lot 1 DP 406050; Lot 2 DP 410504; Lot 4 DP 3912; Part RS 2629; Lot 3 DP 425488; Lot 1 DP 425488*

^properties include: 3261 State Highway 6; Section 4 Block V Waiwhero SD; Section 5 Block V Waiwhero SD; Section 6 Block V Waiwhero SD; Section 7 Block V Waiwhero SD; Section 8 Block V Waiwhero SD; RS2847; Lot 1 DP 412689

Adjacent Owners and Occupiers

1. [REDACTED] (24-37 Warren Road, Barrytown)
2. [REDACTED] (2617 Coast Road, Barrytown)
3. [REDACTED] (3195 Coast Road, Runanga)
4. [REDACTED] (Lot 2 DP 2178)
5. [REDACTED] (50 Warren Road, Barrytown)
6. [REDACTED] (86 Cargill Road, Barrytown)
7. [REDACTED] (2617 Coast Road, Barrytown)
8. [REDACTED] (41 Warren Road, Barrytown)

Administering Agencies

9. Department of Conservation
10. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Local Authorities

11. West Coast Regional Council

Grey District Council advised by email to the EPA they had no issues so did not provide a Comment.

Ministers of the Crown

12. Hon Nicola Willis – Minister for Economic Development
13. Hon Tama Potaka – Minister for Māori Development
14. Hon Shane Jones – Minister for Regional Development
15. Hon Mark Patterson – Minister for Rural Communities

Requiring Authority

16. New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi

Specified Approvals

17. New Zealand Conservation Authority
18. West Coast Tai Poutini Conservation Board

Adjacent Owners and Occupiers

1. [REDACTED] (37 Warren Road, Barrytown)

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
1.1	Concerned about noise – thunder of machinery. Heavy earthmoving equipment, water-based ore processing, and continuous truck movements will be audible and disruptive from the moment operations begin each day. The World Health Organization identifies sustained noise above 55 decibels as causing serious community annoyance, and above this level regards it as a genuine health hazard, contributing to sleep disruption, chronic stress and cardiovascular harm. Given my proximity, noise from continuous earthworks, pumps, screening plant	Noise	Appendix L7 – Assessment of Noise Effects	Noise has been assessed for the properties located along Warren Road. Restrictions are proposed in the conditions to ensure that appropriate controls are in place to meet the noise limits set in the District Plan. Where these cannot be met, mitigations such as bunding and/or operating hour restraints have been proposed to address effects. Refer to reply statement provided by Jon Farren included at Attachment E.

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	and truck movements will foreseeably and repeatedly exceed this threshold at my dwelling.			
1.2	Concerned about light – dark sky lit by floodlights.	-	Substantive Application 6.119 - 6.123	The activity is to be undertaken during daylight hours only. Any lighting required will be for health and safety purposes and adhere to both the district plan standards and Australian Government's National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife (May 2023 or subsequent revision) .
1.3	Concerned about air quality and radiation – air will carry radon and silica dust. The peer-reviewed study by Bradley, Smith and Chouinard (New Zealand Journal of Geology and Geophysics, 2026) confirms that Barrytown heavy mineral concentrate contains monazite and uranothorite bearing thorium and uranium, and that in-situ alteration is actively releasing radon into the environment. Magnetically concentrated fractions reach up to 77.5 Bq/gm — nearly eight times the Radiation Safety Act 2016 threshold of 10 Bq/gm for declaring material radioactive — and radon readings at nearby residences already exceed both the WHO reference level and levels recorded elsewhere in New Zealand. Disturbing, excavating, stockpiling and processing this material at scale, metres from occupied dwellings, self-evidently increases the risk of radon exposure and airborne radionuclide release to neighbouring residents including myself	Erosion and Sediment Control	Appendix M8 – Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (s.4.9) Appendix M5 – Dust Management Plan	As set out in the application documents, substantial and ongoing monitoring will be undertaken in regards to dust. Refer to reply statement provided by David Bougourd included at Attachment F.
1.4	Concerned about vibration with extraction.	-	-	The concern is acknowledged. Refer to reply statement by Jon Farren included at Attachment E.
1.5	Concerned about ability to use and enjoy land.	-	-	The site is currently used as an operational dairy farm. Mining activities are an anticipated activity within the Rural and General Rural Zones of the Grey District Plan and Te Tai o Poutini Plan. Conditions of consent will be imposed to manage adverse effects that could potentially affect adjacent properties.
1.6	Section 57 of the Crown Minerals Act 1991 withholds authorisation for mining that is likely to have a prejudicial effect on the use and enjoyment of neighbouring land by its owner or occupier. Section 55(2) of the same Act separately singles out land within 30 metres of a dwelling, land adjoining indigenous forest, and landholdings of 4.05 hectares or less as categories warranting specific protection from imposed mining access. My property falls squarely within the description these provisions were designed to protect — a small, forest-adjoining landholding with a dwelling metres from the proposed works.	-	-	These sections relate to access arrangements under the Crown Minerals Act 1991 and are not relevant to the Application. The Applicant currently hold all requisite access arrangements or otherwise owns the land subject to mining in the application.
1.8	Concerned with loss of 'sense of place' and that it is a real and measurable harm.	-	-	This concern is acknowledged. The Application is located on highly modified private farmland, and is zoned Rural under the Grey District Plan and General Rural under the Te Tai o Poutini Plan. Mining, earthworks and associated machinery is expressly anticipated to occur in these zones and mitigation has been offered to ensure acceptable effects on neighbours.
1.9	Respectfully ask the Panel to decline this application, or, at minimum, to require an independently verified, site-specific noise and radiological assessment addressing effects at my boundary before any approval is contemplated.	Noise	Appendix L7 – Assessment of Noise Effects	Refer comment 1.1 re noise and the reply statement by Jon Farren included at Attachment E. Conditions have been offered that require that the Consent Holder to undertake quarterly systematic testing of the heavy minerals concentrate from within the active mining area to confirm that the material remains below the

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
				acceptable level of radioactivity concentration limits as specified in Schedule 2 of the Radiation Safety Act 2016. The Consent Holder must also carry out all activities on site in accordance with the Compliance Guide: Management of Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM) in Mining and Mineral Extraction published by the Ministry of Health. The Guide requires that if radiation levels exceed 1 Bq/g, then the Director for Radiation Safety (the Director) should be notified and a comprehensive assessment carried out to determine the risk. If the results of this show the material above 1 Bq/g would give doses less than 1 millisieverts (mSv) per year, then the assessment should be provided to the Director, and no further regulatory action is required. If the results of this show the material above activity concentrations may exceed 10 Bq/g and/or it is likely the potential dose to people arising from the operations may exceed 1 mSv per year, operations may be subject to licensing under the Radiation Safety Act 2016 (the Act). Under these circumstances, an application for a source licence under the Act should be made to the Director. Refer also to the reply statement by David Bougourd included at Attachment F.

2. [REDACTED] (2617 Coast Road, Barrytown)

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
2.2	There needs to be an in-depth independent report done on all aspects of any radiation caused by the radon that will be released by the opening up of the mining ground, and the further processing of the ROM. It seems that this has been quite overlooked, but could have quite serious health consequences, for both the community, and the mine workers. We deserve, and need, to know that our concerns with this are being taken seriously	-	-	Refer comment 1.9 and to the reply statement provided by David Bougourd included at Attachment F.
2.3	If this project does go ahead, the least that TCM could do is gift all, or some of the mined land back to the community, for the community to benefit from. There could be walking/biking tracks, sports fields, community run facilities, parks etc. This would foster goodwill, and also go a long way to healing the community, and promoting togetherness.	-	Substantive application 8.7 – 8.13	The positive effects of the project are well documented. For the wider Barrytown Mineral Sands project (not part of this application) TCM has committed to upgrading of the existing power line from Rapahoe, support of the Barrytown School (gifting of land, funding new classrooms and associated facilities). For this project there will be the maintaining of full-time roles, and construction of a 51ha wetland, riparian planting and habitat enhancement.
2.4	Noise - Then there is the annoying man-made noise of heavy trucks on the road, and large diggers on our boundary, as we will be direct neighbours of the mine.	Noise	Appendix L7 – Assessment of Noise Effects	Refer comment 1.1. The southeastern corner of the mining disturbance area abuts the northwestern corner of this property. There is approximately 250m

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
				of vegetated land between the proposed application area and buildings located at 2617 Coast Road. Refer to reply statement by Jon Farren included at Attachment F.
2.5	Property value - In fact, I would say any properties, especially direct neighbours of the proposed mine, and properties overlooking it, will find their property value declining considerably.	-	-	The concern regarding potential effects on property values is acknowledged. The Courts have considered this matter on several occasions under the RMA and established that property value effects are not, in themselves, a relevant consideration in determining whether consent should be granted. If any diminution of property value were to occur, it would be considered as a potential indicator of effects on amenity values which has been separately considered.

3. [REDACTED] (3195 Coast Road, Runanga)

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
3.1	Concerned about radioactivity management and what would be returned to the land. In Appendix point 19; there is a mention of a slurry coming back from the Mineral Separation plant at Rapahoe to be deposited in the Northern Resource Block, which is alongside our farm, as part of the rehabilitation process. (Appendix, page 19, Para 5, bullet point 3). We are wondering how the slurry will be monitored for radioactive components and radioactivity and when. We hope the panel looks really closely and under advice, as to where the radioactive minerals Monazite, Thorite, Uranothorite, Zircon and others – with Thorium and Uranium contents would go during and after processing-including during transport and storage stages, for the future proofing of the health of Barrytown people and its environs, as well as for Rapahoe/Runanga Residents. We would hope there would be good provision for monitoring in place for radioactivity both at the time, and in future.	-	Appendix H3 Appendix H4	There are conditions relating to the monitoring of both radiation and radon in the consent conditions of both the MSP and WCP. Refer also to reply statement provided by David Bougourd included at Attachment F.
3.2	The release of Radon gas during the process of mining is also a silent unknown risk we have on the Barrytown Flats, we are now aware of. It seems in New Zealand, we are very much infant in our data collection and monitoring of radon and its affects on public health. So the long term health effects of any increase in this, from the mining, we would like some assurance on, and any monitoring that will be done to safeguard us at our property.	-	-	The Applicant has offered amended conditions (refer 8.5 of the condition set) to ensure it will comply with the Compliance Guide: Management of Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM) in mining and Mineral Extraction published by the Ministry of Health. As part of this, the Applicant will prepare a Radiation Management Plan for its entire operations. Refer to reply statement provided by David Bougourd included at Attachment F.
3.3	Impacts on our farm over the fence, dust and noise. While we appreciate a dredge would be electric, we are unsure how impacts from machinery/ industrial noise and dust from mining would be managed to the immediate south of us in association with activities. Would this be managed for grazing to be viable and so as not to cause any reverse sensitivity issues for our land use.	TPRL Noise	Appendix M5 – Dust Management Plan Appendix L7 – Assessment of Noise Effects	Note that the farm in reference is on the northern side of Canoe Creek and that at this distance any effects as a result of noise or dust are extremely unlikely. The Dust Management Plan provides for a combination of visual inspections and dust deposition monitoring. Table 4 sets out a Dust Inspection Programme consisting of daily and weekly inspections, as well as additional inspections when works commence in new areas, providing an active means of identifying

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
				visible dust generation and triggering further dust management where required.
3.4	We have concerns around bird scarers being named for use, in the Avian Plan. Especially for the large flocks of birds that we have watched needing to rest/feed here over the years on the flats. We see a 50+ flock of Black-backed gulls regularly come and go on farmland around here, around 130 Red-billed gulls, a large group of White-Fronted terns congregate frequently at Canoe Creek mouth. Currently theres a flock of 41 Variable Oystercatchers (black), currently in our high paddocks these past few weeks, that are resting and feeding. Large scale industrial noise and bird scarers will likely affect these flocks in unknown ways. If industrial activity on the land and its associated noise makes it difficult for them and they become displaced, as the Barrytown flats is a geographically isolated sand plain surrounded by steep mountains, the closest flat land for birds to utilise are over long distances beyond the mountains or a long way down the coast.	Ecology	Appendix M2 – Avian Management Plan	The Avian Management Plan notes that birds habituate to devices and approaches, such as acoustic bird scarers, relatively quickly. The use of such devices is not considered to have a long term effect on the flocks identified by the commenter, hence why a range of deterrents is recommended.
3.5	Cutting up the deeper layers of any still naturally layered wetlands on the flats, means they will not hold, drain or direct the water in the same way again. The unknown of that is, the literal ‘flow-on’ effects of this disturbance into the future.	-	-	Approximately two thirds of the site has been previously dredged and as per reply statement provided by Jens Rekker included at Attachment G, there is not considered to be any ongoing impact as a result of the dredging in the undredged section of the site.

4. [REDACTED] (Lot 2 DP 2178)

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
4.1	The first concern we have is with the assessments of the noise and visual disturbance. The Marshall Day Acoustics assessment of noise effects (9 March 2026) makes predictions on decibel levels and their range. The assessment makes no mention of the pumps that are required to move ground material and water to the WCP. It also omits any assessment of vehicle movements on site, despite the fact that the site access road runs directly along our northern boundary. The assessment provides several scenarios that predict noise levels under different stages of mining. Scenario 2 depicts noise levels during operations along our western boundary, while Scenario 6 depicts the cumulative effects of the dredge and WCP. No scenario depicts the cumulative effects of operations along our western boundary and the WCP together. This assessment also makes no mention of sound frequency or the consistency/persistence of the noise. Our understanding is that industrial low-frequency mechanical droning has a uniquely high annoyance potential, and the World Health Organisation speaks about adverse effects on the human body as low as 30dBA. Such effects include but are not limited to prevention of achieving REM sleep and the chronic activation of the sympathetic nervous system. We are obviously uncomfortable with the idea of living in such conditions. Has there been	Noise	Appendix L7 – Noise Assessment	The effects of noise have been assessed against Lot 2 DP 2178 as set out in Appendix L7. Refer to reply statement provided by Jon Farren included at Attachment E. The site access road has been consented as part of the Wet Concentrator Plant.

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	any testing or reporting on this matter? We believe these factors are important as they distinguish the difference between noise from industrial equipment and naturally occurring sound such as bird calls or ocean surf, and the effects they have on people.			
4.2	Planted bunds have been proposed as a way to mitigate both noise and visual disturbance. While bunding will help with mitigation, we are uncertain that this will prevent significant disturbance to our property. The very nature of the solution creates a problem. In the Glasson Huxtable Landscape and visual Assessment (May 2026), it is acknowledged that the bund will obstruct our view of the ocean that we currently experience. This assessment also concludes that this effect is not considered “significant” under the FTAA as the effect is relatively short-term and reversible. Also, the disturbance created by mining operations is predicted to be at least 9 years. Depending on where you are on our property, you can see all of the Barrytown flats to the south, as well as Mt Cook on a clear day. Given this fact, and the fact that no mention was made of what disturbance the WCP may cause, we suspect that we will feel the effects of the mining operation for its entire duration. In the context of my father's age, as well as the average human life span, we do not agree that these effects are insignificant nor short term.	-	-	There is no general right to retain an uninterrupted private view over adjoining or surrounding land. Landowners can undertake activities on their property that are permitted by the relevant planning framework, which may include planting vegetation or establishing buildings or other structures which may restrict another's view, subject to any applicable rules and restrictions. The bunding proposed will restrict views of the mining activity itself and mitigate against noise effects. The Applicant is happy to work with adjoining neighbours on appropriate species and planting in line with the Landscape Mitigation Package (Appendix M9). Refer also to reply statement provided by Jon Farren included at Appendix E.
4.3	We are yet to see any information that can provide peace of mind in regards to whether or not changes to the surrounding landscape will have adverse effects on our property. We are aware of there being materials in the ground with radioactive properties and measurable amounts of radon present in the area. We still feel inadequately informed about how mining activity may expose us to radiation. Especially in regards to dust generated by mining activity and where that dust may accumulate on our property. Is there a dust management plan? We catch rain water for drinking and maintain large vegetable gardens. Will our food and water remain safe from contamination? Are there any reports or studies submitted that cover topics like the effects of this radiation and its prevalence? What assurances or protections are in place? Taiko has mentioned that they wish to conform to the Australian standard for this issue. However we have not been told how this standard will be applied in relation to how this area is mined.	TPRL	Appendix M5 – Dust Management Plan	The proposed activity will be subject to the Dust Management Plan and associated consent conditions, which provide for monitoring and management of dust generated by the mining operation. The Dust Management Plan provides for a combination of visual inspections and dust deposition monitoring. Table 4 sets out a Dust Inspection Programme consisting of daily and weekly inspections, as well as additional inspections when works commence in new areas, providing an active means of identifying visible dust generation and triggering further dust management where required. Refer comment 1.9 and also reply statement provided by David Bougourd included at Appendix F.
4.4	We are also aware that the proposed water source is Canoe Creek. We have observed Canoe Creeks water level drop extremely low during periods of dry weather. Will Canoe Creek be able to service the project's demand for water year round?	Hydrology	Appendix L3 – Hydrological Assessment (7.16a)	Canoe Creek has been confirmed as an appropriate water source for the activity. The effects of the taking of Canoe Creek water via the Canoe Creek alluvium in an infiltration gallery at peak rates less than ten percent of MALF7d in Canoe Creek (proposed maximum take is 63 litres per second), have been assessed as less than minor.

5. [REDACTED] (50 Warren Road, Barrytown)

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
5.1	Concern about the effect that regular machinery, noise, movement and industrial activity could have on the character of the environment around my home. The concern for me is not only what happens when mining is taking place immediately beside my property. I understand that the proposed activities will move through different areas over time. However, I believe that mining activity in the nearby blocks will still be visible and audible from my home and studio, and that this will change the experience of the wider landscape around during the periods working intensively in the studio.	Noise Landscape	Appendix L7 – Assessment of Noise Effects Appendix L6 Landscape Assessment – section 12.9	Refer comment 1.1 re noise and the reply statement provided by Jon Farren included at Attachment E . There is no requirement to retain an uninterrupted private view over adjoining or surrounding land. Landowners can undertake activities on their property that are permitted by the relevant planning framework, which may include planting vegetation or establishing buildings or other structures which may restrict another's view, subject to any applicable rules and restrictions. The Landscape Assessment assesses the adverse visual effect as very low (less than minor) at this location due to the proposed bunding along the boundary of the site at the end of Warren Road. There will be no restriction of views of the mountains or landscape to the north, south or east. The Applicant is happy to work with adjoining neighbours on appropriate species and planting in line with the Landscape Mitigation Package. (Appendix M9).

6. [REDACTED] (86 Cargill Road, Barrytown)

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
6.1	Concerned over radioactive dust. Dust collecting on both the roof used for potable water, and the fruit trees and vegetable gardens.	-	-	Refer comment 1.9 and statement of reply of David Bougourd included at Attachment F .
6.2	Property will have no value and will not be able to be sold due to proximity to the site.	-	-	Refer comment 2.5.

7. [REDACTED] (2617 State Highway 6, Barrytown)

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
7.1	Property borders mine site. Concerned about future value of property. Also does not want industrial mining operation to negatively affect future of home.	-	-	Refer comment 2.5.
7.2	Concerned about radon and public health. Wants independent and comprehensive investigation before mining proceeds.	-	-	Refer comment 1.9 and reply statement provided by David Bougourd included at Attachment F .
7.3	Does not want community to bear consequences of increased industrial activity.	-	-	The site is currently operated as an active dairy farm and includes activities such as earthworks, use of tractors and other large farm machinery, milking sheds and milk tankers. Mining is also an anticipated activity within the Rural and General Rural Zones of the Grey District Plan and Te Tai o Poutini Plan. The maximum area of disturbance for the activity is restricted to 16ha and will be a slow moving activity across the 280ha mining disturbance area.

8. [REDACTED] (41 Warren Road, Barrytown)

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
8.1	How much traffic would be coming down Warren Road	-	-	There is no movement of vehicles associated with the activity proposed to occur on Warren Road. All access to the application area will be via the Wet Concentrator Plant and its' access further north on State Highway 6.
8.2	Noise from the ongoing mine operation	Noise	Appendix L7 – Assessment of Noise Effects	Refer comment 1.1 and reply statement provided by Jon Farren included at Appendix E.
8.3	Bund mound blocking some sun and view	-	-	There is no requirement to retain an uninterrupted private view over adjoining or surrounding land. Landowners can undertake activities on their property that are permitted by the relevant planning framework, which may include planting vegetation or establishing buildings or other structures which may restrict another's view, subject to any applicable rules and restrictions. There is not considered to be any shading of buildings as a result of the proposed bunding.
8.4	Bund mound running long the creeks will act like a stop bank and in big floods stop water flowing to the mine area and force water to run through properties causing damage that would not otherwise have happened.	-	-	Bunding will be constructed to retain existing flow paths of creeks and avoid the effects of flooding. Refer to reply statement provided by Jens Rekker included at Appendix G.
8.5	Space on the property near western boundary for our children to build on if choose. With mine timing it makes it less appealing.			The site is privately owned and currently operated as an active dairy farm with activities including grazing of cows, use of tractors and other farm machinery, pasture maintenance activities and application of fertiliser including lime. Mining is an activity that is anticipated within the Rural and General Rural Zones of the Grey District Plan and the Te Tai o Poutini Plan. The Applicant is happy to work with this neighbour to ensure appropriate mitigation for any potential future development, consistent with the approach taken for existing properties in the Landscape Mitigation Package.
8.6	Active mine site would devalue our property and reduce options if were to move on.			Refer comment 2.5.
8.7	Revegetation and wetland if done well sounds good but would be better started 5 years earlier.	Landscape	Appendix M9	Rehabilitation, including wetland construction and planting of wetland and riparian margins, will occur progressively following mining. Bund planting will occur as soon as consent is granted, with the Applicant happy to work with adjoining neighbours on appropriate species and planting in line with the Landscape Mitigation Package.

Administering Agencies

9. Department of Conservation

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
9.1	DOC notes that the avian management conditions had a number of significant differences from the Central Block conditions. These were listed in the comments that DOC provided to the Applicant during post-lodgement consultation.	-	-	The commenter is correct in their statement. The proposed measures are consistent with the scale and intensity of the activity, which is a daytime mining activity that does not include any buildings or fixed lighting. This is different to the Central Block and the avian management plan conditions reflect this.
9.2	The absence of lighting management in respect of the current FTAA application was raised by DOC. This issue is still to be resolved.	-	-	No lighting plan has been prepared as the application provides for daylight-only operations, with no fixed lighting proposed. Artificial lighting would only be used in limited circumstances for health and safety purposes, such as equipment breakdowns or emergency repair works, and would be limited to headlamps or handheld torches. The draft conditions have also been amended to require increased ground searching for grounded seabirds where artificial lighting is used, providing an additional safeguard for avian species. Refer statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley included as Attachment H.
9.4	DOC noted that mining operations should be designed so that no high-quality habitat (wetlands or shrubland) are reduced in extent throughout the life of the mining operations i.e. this habitat should be reconstructed and allowed to reach an adequate degree of maturity before any currently occurring habitat is mined, so that there is never any net decrease in area of extent or quality of habitat over the lifetime of the mine.	-	-	Statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley considers that protection of existing wetland habitat to ensure no temporary loss of wetland extent over the project timeframe is unwarranted due to the affected wetlands being highly modified and their ecological value ranging from 'low' to 'moderate'. They do not provide high-quality habitats for fauna. However, the Applicant is willing to volunteer a condition to provide protection during the term of the project where practicable within a working farm environment. Refer new condition 7.6.
9.5	DOC noted that some wetlands had been classified incorrectly, and that wetland fauna had not been considered. The net result after wetland reconstruction is presented as a net gain. However, for transparency, and to demonstrate that the proposed wetland reconstruction is sufficient to offset the loss of the existing wetlands, the actual calculations should be presented. The time lag between wetland removal and reconstruction, and effects on wetlands outside of the Southern Block were also raised.	-	-	Refer statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley included as Attachment H which sets out the classification of wetlands across the site in detail. The wetlands north of Granite Creek do not provide high-quality habitat for wildlife, and construction of replacement wetlands will commence immediately following mining in Years 1 and 2 in the area north of Granite Creek. Removal of wetlands south of Granite Creek would occur in Years 8–11, with additional wetland construction undertaken at that time. The highest-quality wetland habitat for fauna is located south of Granite Creek. The proposal will result in more wetland being created than the area of existing wetland removed, with wetland creation progressively occurring as mining advances.
9.6	The riparian planting offered was identified as very narrow (3 metres wide on each bank). 5 metres should be the minimum width provided, with 10 metres being more adequate.	-	-	The Applicant has volunteered to extend the riparian planting offered to 5m. Amend condition 28.2(b)(ii) Minimum of ~~3m~~ 5m for all other reconstructed creeks
9.7	DOC expects to see a "cease take" threshold to be included for the water take from Canoe Creek i.e. a flow level in the Creek which, if crossed, would trigger the project to cease taking water from the Creek in order to protect instream ecology.	-	-	The requirement for compliance monitoring and a cease take flow rate of the Canoe Creek water take is considered out of proportion to the scale of the activity and the remaining sensitivity of the environment. Refer statement of reply of Jens Rekker included as Attachment G.

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
9.8	Concerned about the incidental killing of birds that might, despite the applicant's best efforts, be nesting in the path of the mine. DOC understands that the Applicant is not proposing any measures to avoid nests if they are in the path of the mine. The incidental killing of protected birds is an offence under the Wildlife Act 1953 unless authorised under section 53(1) by the Director-General. The incidental killing of birds is not included in TCM's application for the Barrytown Minerals Project	-	-	The risk of incidental bird mortality has been considered in the proposed management approach. The site is currently an operational dairy farm, with regular grazing by cattle and use of tractors and other farm machinery, which can also disturb or destroy nests within pasture. The proposed approach focuses on habitat modification and deterrence to encourage birds to nest in suitable habitat outside the mining path. There is abundant alternative habitat outside the area to be mined, including pasture, shrubland and forest, and bare-ground nesting habitat is available on adjacent Pakiroa Beach. The draft Avian Management Plan sets out measures to encourage birds to use these areas. Where an active nest is identified outside the mining path, a setback will be established and activities will not proceed within that area until the nest has failed or the young have fledged. These measures substantially reduce the risk of incidental mortality, although, as with any activity undertaken in a rural environment, the risk cannot be entirely eliminated. Refer also statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley included as Attachment H.
9.10	Concerned about the adverse effects on Westland petrels (Tāiko) - specifically measures on nights where equipment repairs are required or there are other unforeseen events requiring light at night.	-	-	Artificial lighting would only be used in limited circumstances for health and safety purposes, such as equipment breakdowns or emergency repair works, and would be limited to headlamps or handheld torches. The draft conditions have also been amended to require increased ground searching for grounded seabirds where artificial lighting is used, providing an additional safeguard for avian species (refer condition 13.3d). Refer statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley included as Attachment H.
9.13	Concerned about protecting freshwater values and extent, including river habitat in reconstructed channels and through addressing concerns for water quality and quantity.	-	-	These concerns have been replied to in detail in the reply evidence of Dr Fitzpatrick, Mr Montgomerie, and Mr Rekker.
9.14	Concerned that a dedicated lizard survey has not been undertaken to adequately inform the suggested management framework for the range of lizard species that may be impacted by this Project;	-	-	This approach has been deliberately adopted because the majority of the Project Site is an active farm, and as such, areas of potential habitat, particularly for grass skink (including rank grass, debris piles and the like) are not fixed in location and will likely change (move location, increase or decrease in size and shape) before mining commences. Given the length of time (years) proposed for mining, the large size of the site and the continuation of the current land use, the draft proposed conditions and the draft LMP provide for survey to occur at the time it is needed (immediately prior to mining commencing) in order to ensure that the Site conditions and lizard abundance at that time are taken into account in planning for salvage and relocation. Refer statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley included as Attachment H.
9.15	Concerned incorrect identification of which grass skink is likely to be present (i.e., Northern grass skink as opposed to Canterbury grass skink)	-	-	This has been amended in the draft LMP.
9.16	Concerned survey and salvage methods contained inconsistencies between the LMP and Wildlife Approval Technical Report, and do not align with best practice in terms of duration and contingencies;	-	Lizard Management Plan (revised draft – Attachment B to Dr Bramley's reply), Sections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.9	The survey and salvage methods in the revised draft LMP have been updated to address the recommendations of Ms Wairepo (paragraph 27 of her advice), including a minimum five-day trapping period (six days for Threatened species) with a contingency to continue trapping where lizards are still being caught on the final day, checking of artificial cover objects on alternate days, and specified timing for trap checks. Wildlife Approval special conditions 2 and 3 require the authorised activities to be undertaken

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
				in accordance with the the certified LMP and current DOC best practice protocols, including the Herpetofauna Inventory and Monitoring Toolbox. Refer to statement of reply from Dr Bramley at [18].
9.17	Concerned methods also lacked clarity between Protocols 1 and 2, and do not provide adequately for Threatened species	-	Lizard Management Plan (revised draft, Attachment B to Dr Bramley's reply), Sections 2.2 - 2.4.	The revised draft LMP distinguishes between the protocol for Not Threatened and At Risk species (Section 2.3) and Threatened species (Section 2.4). The Threatened protocol includes an additional pre-clearance survey phase using species-appropriate methods (including tree-mounted artificial cover objects and funnel traps, and nocturnal spotlight searches) deployed for at least six weeks, a longer minimum trapping period and hand deconstruction of habitat. While West Coast green gecko is considered unlikely to be present given the lack of arboreal habitat, the survey approach provides for targeted surveys (e.g., spotlighting) if suitable habitat is present. Refer statement of reply from Dr Bramley at [16]-[18].
9.18	Concerned the proposed lizard release site doesn't align with best practice requirements and will not be appropriate for all species that have been applied for under the permit application	-	Lizard Management Plan (revised draft, Attachment B to Dr Bramley's reply) Sections 2.10 and 2.11	The proposed release sites have been updated to include Canoe Creek as recommended by DOC in the Section 51 Report, with Granite Creek and the coastal margin as alternatives, subject to a habitat suitability assessment by the Project Herpetologist before any lizards are released. Threatened species (i.e., West Coast green gecko) would be released directly into suitable arboreal habitat at Canoe Creek. Dense rock-stack refuges, built to the specifications of Lennon (2023) and Herbert et al. (2023) will be constructed at release sites ahead of salvage to provide refuge from predators. Refer statement of reply from Dr Bramley at [19]-[20] and [23] - [24].
9.19	Concerned no provisions for predator control for lizard protection have been included, and it is recommended that this is reconsidered, particularly in the context of At Risk and/or Threatened species that may be present on the site.	-	-	Pest control has not been recommended because achieving the level of pest control sufficient to protect lizards is practically very difficult to achieve and also difficult to verify at a location such this for a number of reasons. Refer statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley included as Attachment H.
9.20	Concerned that the proposed mining activities have the potential to affect a wider range of protected avifauna than currently identified in the Avian Management Plan	-	-	It is possible that additional species use the Southern Block site. However, the wetland habitat provides much lower quality habitat for wetland birds, including bittern and marsh crake. It is possible these birds visit the Southern Block occasionally, but it would not provide breeding habitat. Refer statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley included as Attachment H.
9.21	Concerned that management of effects on breeding birds relies heavily on deterrence to prevent nesting within the area to be mined over the breeding season; the effectiveness of which is uncertain	-	-	Experience at other sites suggests that deterrence is not completely effective, probably because individuals vary in their sensitivity to the deterrents proposed and some individuals can habituate to them quickly, nonetheless, if properly applied deterrents can be effective in the short term (days to a small number of weeks), which can be enough when birds are prospecting for nests, to make them choose somewhere else. Refer statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley included as Attachment H.
9.25	Concerned that Department of Conservation input/consultation is not required as part of development and review of avifauna management plans; although the Applicant has subsequently proposed a change to the conditions requiring the Avian Management Plan be developed in consultation with the Department of Conservation, which Dr Parlato supports. This is important for providing greater certainty that any changes/amendments needed to improve avifauna management and protection at the site are identified	-	-	Condition 13.9 requires the Applicant to provide the Avian Management Plan (AMP) to the Department for comment, with any feedback and resulting amendments provided to Council. The Department has also been actively engaged in the development and review of the AMP through the Fast-track process, and their comments have been appropriately considered and incorporated into the AMP. The condition provides an ongoing opportunity for the Department to be involved in this process.

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
9.26	Concerned that while the ratings for the ecological value of the stream habitat and macroinvertebrate fauna in the Ecological Effects Assessment (EEA) are considered to be reasonable, the ecological value of the freshwater fish fauna in streams and artificial drains is considered to have been underestimated. Given the number of Threatened and At Risk species present in watercourses in the Project area, Dr Storey rates the ecological value of the fish fauna as very high. Mr Murray (Appendix E) highlights provisions of the West Coast Regional Policy Statement that support this view.	Ecology	Ecological Effects Assessment – Appendix L4	The fish survey undertaken was comprehensive and involved sampling a wide range of sites and habitats using both electric fishing and eDNA. Refer reply statement of Richard Montgomerie included as Attachment I.
9.27	Concerned that spring habitats have not been assessed for their ecological value and have not been included in effects assessments.	Ecology	Ecological Effects Assessment – Appendix L4	Springs have been included in the thorough assessment of the site. Refer reply statement of Richard Montgomerie included as Attachment I.
9.28	One of the main potential impacts of the Project is its effect on water quality. Extracting, processing, and redepositing the mineral sands may result in mobilisation of various contaminants including heavy metals and nutrients into the watercourses, with impacts on aquatic fauna (fish and macroinvertebrates). The relevant assessments describe the potential contaminants, threshold concentrations for the contaminants, the treatment method to reduce discharge of the contaminants, and their expected concentrations in surface waters. Because of the importance of water quality effects, the Panel should consider a review by a specialist geochemist to determine whether the effects are likely to be as stated.	-	-	Potential adverse effects of mining due to the discharge of mine water to the mine pond will be avoided both during operation and upon completion of the project. Refer reply statement of Dr Mike Fitzpatrick included as Attachment J.
9.29	The plume of poor-quality groundwater is expected to take more than 15 years to pass through the area, therefore should be regarded as a long-term effect	Hydrology	Hydrological Assessment – Appendix L3	Matters of groundwater are addressed in the Hydrological Effects Assessment.
9.30	Another potential effect is change to subsurface water flow patterns, and hence, changes to flow in surface watercourses as a result of the mining. The Panel should consider requiring a review by a specialist hydrologist.	-	-	The dredge pond will rest at the same level as the adjoining water table. No dewatering is envisaged. The activity is designed to be volume neutral. Stream flows will not be affected by mining activities and there is no risk of adverse effects on the ecology of the creeks and artificial drains. Refer reply statements of Jens Rekker and Richard Montgomerie included as Attachments G and I respectively.
9.31	The methodology for diverting and restoring streams and avoiding direct harm to indigenous fish appear adequate overall, though some minor additions to the Native Freshwater Fish Capture and Relocation Plan are recommended	-	-	Where changes are sought to conditions. These have been replied to in detail in the reply evidence of Dr Fitzpatrick, Mr Montgomerie, and Mr Rekker.
9.34	Consent conditions are lacking performance measures and remedial actions in a number of places. For example, conditions associated with erosion and sediment control should include threshold values for turbidity and remedial actions if they are breached.	-	-	Where changes are sought to conditions. These have been replied to in detail in the reply evidence of Dr Fitzpatrick, Mr Montgomerie, and Mr Rekker.
9.35	Conditions for restored watercourses should specify the metrics to be used for monitoring their ecological condition (specifically macroinvertebrates, fish, physical habitat, flow and riparian condition) and performance standards to be achieved. Should include SEV Monitoring.	-	-	The best and most direct measures of ecological functioning are the macroinvertebrate and fish communities, which will be directly and closely monitored both pre- and post-mining. SEV monitoring has been added to the pre and post monitoring plan for all stream monitoring sites. Refer statement of reply by Richard Montgomerie included as Attachment I.
9.37	Avifauna and fish values of wetlands were not adequately considered in the Ecological Effects Assessment. Ecological values of the wetlands should be considered as 'high' or 'very high', and that they would meet	-	-	These have been reviewed. While some values have been corrected it has not resulted in the values being recognised as 'high' or 'very high' as suggested. Refer statement of reply from Dr Gary Bramley included as Attachment H.

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	the criteria for ecological significance in the West Coast Regional Policy Statement (WCRPS)			
9.38	It is not clear that the effects management hierarchy of the NPS-FM has been applied in this case, or that the proposed compensation meets the principles for compensation in the NPS-FM	-	Appendix LA, Ecological Effects Assessment (EEA) from pages 103 and 110.	The effects management hierarchy has been applied (Refer p103 of the EEA), and assessed specifically against the NPS-FM (Refer p110 EEA). No compensation is considered necessary or offered.
9.41	Mr Brass notes that the entire site is within the Coastal Environment (as mapped in the TTPP), so Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) applies. This requires, inter alia, that all adverse effects on Threatened and At Risk species are to be avoided. While this Policy is not determinative in its own right for decision-making under the FTAA, the NZCPS is a relevant matter to consider under s81(2)(b) and Schedule 5 cl17 of the FTAA. Mr Brass considers that, unless it is inconsistent with the FTAA's purpose or the requirement for conditions to be "no more onerous than necessary" (s83), the conditions of consent should therefore seek to ensure that effects on Threatened and At Risk species are avoided.	-	Appendix LA, Ecological Effects Assessment (EEA) from page 15.	The technical evidence supporting the Application confirms that there will be no material harm to Threatened and At Risk species (i.e. avoidance), and that the proposal is consistent with Policy 11 (refer EEA, page 15).

10. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
10.1	One proposed edit to condition 18.1 to insert: <u>In the areas not subject to an archaeological authority, the following accidental discovery process applies;</u>	-	-	This is accepted. See condition document responding to proposed amendments to conditions.

Local Authorities

11. West Coast Regional Council

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
11.1	Council's Chief Engineer has suggested that: "A baseline survey of the stream inverts should be conducted; together with survey of the predominant channel cross-sections. Ideally this would be completed by a skilled drone operator, with representative cross-sections surveyed at regular intervals – maybe every 100m. This would define the baseline stream morphology. It obviously has to be completed prior to the waterbody being interfered with." This recommendation has been incorporated into the additional suggested conditions of consent.	-	-	Refer reply statement of Jens Rekker included as Attachment G. This has been included as a new consent condition at 28.6.
11.2	Council's Chief Engineer has identified an anomaly in the calculations for the peak flow estimates which needs to be	-	-	The applicant notes Mr Blackwood's comments regarding the runoff coefficient used in the peak creek flow estimates presented in the

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	addressed before reliance is placed on the relevant peak-flow assessment. Subject to that matter being resolved, the Chief Engineer otherwise agrees with the hydrological assessment. The Chief Engineer has suggested the following: "Provided the conveyance (flood carrying capacity) of the stream channels during mining and after rehabilitation is at least equivalent to that existing now, then there should be no problems. However, I would recommend that at all bends, the banks and streambed be armoured with designed rock. The normal standard would be to withstand without damage, velocities in a 20-year (5% AEP) flood." This recommendation has been incorporated into the suggested conditions.			Hydrology Assessment. Those estimates were included in as general background comments to provide an indication of the order of magnitude of potential flows from the eastern hill catchments and were not relied upon for the design, sizing, or performance assessment of any project infrastructure. The difference identified by Mr Blackwood relates to a modelling assumption, namely the appropriate runoff coefficient to adopt, rather than any error in methodology or conclusion material to the Project's proposed water management measures. Mr Rekher has considered this matter raised and advises any variation in the estimated peak flows does not affect the assessment of effects or the mitigation proposed.
11.3	Subject to resolution of the peak-flow calculation anomaly identified above, and incorporation of the additional and amended consent conditions recommended by WCRC, WCRC has no significant outstanding concerns with the application.	-	-	Refer Attachment C for the review of proposed consent conditions. The Applicant thanks the West Coast Regional Council for their comments.

Ministers of the Crown

12. Hon Nicola Willis – Minister for Economic Development

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
12.1	On balance, the proposal appears likely to deliver significant economic benefits under section 22(2)(a)(iv) with further national benefits through exports and Crown revenue, although these national effects are less comprehensively assessed.	Economics	Appendix L1	The Applicant thanks the Minister for their comments.

13. Hon Tama Potaka – Minister for Māori Development

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
13.1	I support the application having considered the information provided and the relevant statutory criteria. I also encourage the Expert Panel to have regard to Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae as the primary mana whenua body in the project area.	-	Appendix F3.	The Applicant thanks the Minister for their comments.

14. Hon Shane Jones – Minister for Regional -Development

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
14.1	Regional Development - Based on the information provided by the applicant, I consider the project is likely to have significant regional economic benefits in terms of the jobs it is expected to create, its contribution to regional economic output (estimated in the analysis to be 4.4 per cent of the West Coast region's current nominal GDP) and export growth.	Economics	Appendix L1	The Applicant thanks the Minister for their comments.
14.2	Resources comments - The applicant has projected that the operation will generate additional exports of \$230 million per annum. This would be a significant contribution to growing export receipts and materially supporting progress toward the Minerals Strategy's export growth target. New Zealand's Critical Minerals List, which was published alongside the Strategy identifies 37 critical minerals, including titanium, rare earth elements, and zirconium. These elements are also recognised internationally as critical minerals, and feature on the equivalent lists of jurisdictions including Australia, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The project is planned by Tāiko to export ilmenite, which is a form of titanium ore; concentrate containing rare earth elements; and zircon, a mineral containing zirconium. These exports would support international supply chains for these minerals, which are necessary for the objectives of New Zealand and our partners, such as the clean energy transition. I therefore consider that the project, as described in the application, would support the resilience outcome under the Minerals Strategy.	Economics	Appendix L1	The Applicant thanks the Minister for their comments.

15. Hon Mark Patterson – Minister for Rural Communities

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
15.1	Generally supportive of the application. Interested to see the Panel's deliberation on feasibility of the Rehabilitation management Plan as this has significant implications for the local community following the completion of mining at the site.	-	-	The Applicant thanks the Minister for their comments.

Requiring Authority

16. New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
16.1	NZTA understands that this application being considered by the Expert Panel through this Fast track Approvals Act process, is to authorise mining in the 'Southern Block' and mined material will be processed in the Wet Concentrator Plant that has previously been authorised as noted above. The substantive application notes that transportation effects and access upgrades have previously been authorised and hence does not provide further assessments on these matters. NZTA's internal Asset Management and Safety experts have reviewed the relevant substantive application documentation, and do not have any further concerns with this application. NZTA's position on the substantive application is neutral on the basis that no additional impacts on the State Highway network or infrastructure are anticipated.	-	-	The Applicant thanks NZTA for their comments.

Specified Approvals

17. New Zealand Conservation Authority

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
17.1	The NZCA considers that an increase in wetland area alone does not demonstrate an ecological gain. Before approval, the Panel should be satisfied that wetland extent and classification have been adequately resolved and that the effects of wetland loss, including the period before replacement habitat becomes functional, have been assessed.	-	-	Refer to responses provided in 9.4 – 9.5 and to the reply statement provided by Dr Gary Bramley included at Attachment H.
17.2	If the application is approved, a robust monitoring and compliance process needs to be put in place as a condition of the application approval. This needs to include who is responsible for the monitoring, frequency, mitigations and consequences if the above intentions are not enacted.	-	Appendix P1	The consent conditions set out the monitoring required of the site. The type and frequency of monitoring is supported by the technical experts of the project.
17.3	The application proposes measures to mitigate effects on wildlife. However, the Department's report and Dr Parlato's assessment identifies uncertainties and shortcomings in the proposed management measures. The NZCA supports their recommendations for stronger protection of nesting birds, management of lighting effects on tāiko, and an effective lizard survey, salvage and relocation measures. The final management plans should be informed by adequate baseline information and reviewed in consultation with the Department before relevant works commence.	-	-	Refer to responses to Dr Parlato in the reply statement provided by Dr Gary Bramley included at Attachment H.

18. West Coast Tai Poutini Conservation Board

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
18.1	The WCTPCB has concerns that all “Assessments” relating to environmental and conservation effects were ‘desk-top’ only and that no site visits were scheduled for the proposed area to be mined. This has particular relevance for the lizards. The mining activities will destroy potential habitats and as it has previously been found, there are unique populations of lizards to specific areas on the West Coast. There needs to be a physical survey and a capture and relocation plan as well as long-term monitoring of the impacts of the mining in a protected area. This will mitigate pest predation	Ecology	Ecological Effects Assessment – Appendix L4	Comprehensive on-site ecological assessments have been undertaken on the Southern Block. In regards to lizards, a desk top approach has been deliberately adopted because the majority of the Project Site is an active farm, and as such, areas of potential habitat, particularly for grass skink (including rank grass, debris piles and the like) are not fixed in location and will likely change (move location, increase or decrease in size and shape) before mining commences. Given the length of time (years) proposed for mining, the large size of the site and the continuation of the current land use, the draft proposed conditions and the draft LMP provide for survey to occur at the time it is needed (immediately prior to mining commencing) in order to ensure that the Site conditions and lizard abundance at that time are taken into account in planning for salvage and relocation. Refer to reply statement provided by Dr Gary Bramley included as attachment H.
18.2	For clarification in 6.114 (activities within 500 metres of specified dwellings), the time is 0600 to 0700. Is this one-hour period correct?	Planning	Appendix N Rule 19.7.16 (p.4) Noise R5 (p.11)	The time noted is correct. Mining is restricted to ‘daylight’ hours. Noise limits change from 45dBA L10 to 55dBA L10 (Grey District Plan) and 45 dB LAeq to 55dBA LAeq (TTPP) from 0700. Refer Rule 19.7.16 of the Grey District Plan and NOISE R5 of the TTPP.
18.3	Dust control, is it intended to monitor the potential impacts of dust on the mine workers health?	-	-	This is an operational matter for the Applicant and will be part of internal health and safety planning. As set out in the application documents substantial and ongoing monitoring will be undertaken in regards to dust on the wider environment.
18.4	There is no “Assessment” of the mining activities relating to the marine environment. Hector’s dolphins are known to be frequent visitors along the Barrytown marine area.	-	-	There is a 50m setback between the activity and MHWS. Extensive water monitoring is proposed along the western edge of the application area and an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan is required as a condition of consent. There is no anticipated effect on the coastal marine environment. Refer conditions 7.1 and 21.0.
18.5	No pest management strategy could be identified for the proposed area for mining activities, and there should be a requirement for reporting any impacts of the activities on avifauna. The proposal to create artificial wetlands lacks detail and the potential impact on wetland related species	-	-	The site is an active dairy farm. Pest control will be undertaken for the constructed wetland area only, and as recommended by an appropriately qualified ecologist to ensure the ongoing functioning of the wetland. New condition 16.15 <i><u>The Consent Holder must establish predator control as recommended by a qualified ecologist to ensure the ongoing functioning of the constructed wetland.</u></i> Condition 13.11 reviews an annual bird management report.
18.6	In the “Management Plans” (14.2) there is no indication for the requirement of record keeping relating to the stated activities, or audit and review periods.	-	-	The requirement for reviews and audits differ depending on the type of management plan. Where these are required they are set out in the respective management plan.