
Barrytown Minerals Project Fast Track Application

From Don Kerr [REDACTED]
Date Sat 26/09/2026 12:43 AM
To FastTrack Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>

 2 attachments (555 KB)

CCCP Planting Plan at 01.04.26.pdf; FastTrack Details Form 25.09.26.pdf;

To Whom It May Concern

Please accept this as a submission in opposition to the application as referred.

For reference, I attach a copy of the completed Contact Form. I also attach a copy of our Planting Plan which provides context for our concerns and sets out our intentions for the land we own at [REDACTED]

General Comments

1. I am writing on behalf of myself and my partner, Wendy Larner. We are joint landowners at [REDACTED]
2. We object to mining of the Barrytown Flats outright and have done so from the outset. This is based on our grave concerns for the negative impact mining would have on the indigenous flora and fauna AND for the impact it will have on the community.
3. We have also become aware of the serious public health risks associated with mining and the likelihood of the release of dangerous levels of radiation that will occur as a result of mining.
4. For context, we are developing a native afforestation project on our land with support from the Billion Trees Scheme and Trees That Count. We have a QEII Trust Covenant in place that will serve to protect this development in perpetuity. Details of this project can be found in the attached Planting Plan.
5. Our objections to the proposal are multiple, and can be summarised as including *inter alia* ...

Environment

1. The long term impact on waterways, streams and the water table of the proposed mining is of real concern. The proposal to suppress ground water is concerning especially given the very high rainfall in the location. We believe any change in direction or flow rates of the surrounding streams and rivers (including Canoe Creek) that result from mining activity will have deleterious impact both downstream and upstream of the mining site. This is particularly so given that Canoe Creek is a very dynamic river system.
2. We are concerned about the leaching of toxic material and heavy metals and simply do not believe mitigation measures will be sufficient to protect against this over the long

term.

3. We are very concerned by the serious public health risks associated with mining and the likelihood of the release of dangerous levels of radiation that will occur as a result of mining. This includes atmospheric release of elevated levels of radioactive thorium, uranium and radon. We do not believe the company adequately understands this risk, and its potential impact on individuals' health. We do not believe there are satisfactory mitigation measures in place. In this matter alone, the application must be stopped until a full and independent expert panel has been assembled and fundamental review undertaken.
4. We are concerned that mining activity will speed up coastal erosion, and do not believe the mitigation measures as promised will be sufficient to protect this fragile ecosystem. Climate change is already serving to speed up erosion of the foreshore and there can be little doubt that the type of mining as proposed will accelerate this tendency - both in terms of the overarching emissions that will accrue in mobilisation, operations and execution as well as in trucking, but also in terms of the several destabilising effect strip mining will have on the coastal ecosystem. The proposed mining operation would significantly reduce the average land elevation potentially exacerbating climate impacts of coastal erosion and seawater incursion into groundwater from sea level rise and storm surges in a rapidly warming climate
5. Relatedly, whilst the applicant promises all manner of safe guards, controls and mitigation against environmental damage, we do not believe these will be delivered nor adequately policed by local government bodies. On a regional and national basis, such developments are notorious for environmental damage and for not operations to be in breach of undertakings to protect the environment. This is perhaps even likely so in this case given the balance of ownership is off-shore and where there is very minimal respect for local conditions or the West Coast's unique natural ecosystems.
6. Relatedly, we are concerned at the impact of mining on the adjacent Canoe Creek lagoon, and the wide range of bird life that is present there. We believe there is vastly insufficient physical separation between mining activity and the costal lagoons.
7. The sand plain forest is also a critical site for native forest restoration as is demonstrated by the government-funded regeneration activities of Conservation Volunteers New Zealand as well as a number of local landowners including ourselves.
8. Finally, the presence of peat beds within the mining site is notable given peat beds serve an important function in sequestering carbon. Strip mining will destroy these beds fully and completely.

Flora and Fauna

1. Perhaps of most concern is the deleterious impact the proposed mining will have for the taiko (Westland petrel). The taiko is endemic to New Zealand and only breed within a very small area along the Barrytown coastal plain. Taiko are already extremely vulnerable. They are vulnerable given their small numbers and their slow reproductive rate. Even just a few deaths can have a significant effect on the breeding potential of the colony.
2. We believe strip mining along the coast where taiko breed will exacerbate these vulnerabilities. We already know that taiko are adversely affected by the bright street lights of Punakaiki - surely, there is little doubt that the mining operation as proposed would be at least as disruptive for these precious and unique birds.
3. Climate change and the recent Tasman Sea marine heatwaves affect the abundance and distribution of the taiko food sources and may impact breeding success.

4. Additionally, trucking operations present light distraction threats and the adverse effects of potential injuries and mortalities. This is inconsistent with the requirement of Policy 11(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) to avoid adverse effects on threatened or at-risk indigenous species and their habitats in the coastal environment.
5. We oppose the application due to adverse effects on indigenous flora and fauna and their habitats in the coastal environment. The proposed mining sites cover one of the best remaining coastal lowland habitats on the Barrytown Flats – wetlands, coastal lagoons, creeks and re-generating kahikatea forests. The area provides critical connectivity to other remnant habitats and the forested Paparoa range.
6. Mining is proposed within a narrow margin of wetlands and coastal lagoons - all of which are important habitats for threatened and at-risk indigenous species. Birdlife would be adversely affected by noise, lighting, vibration, human activities and vehicle movements near their habitats, particularly during the breeding season.
7. As stated, we hold a QEII Covenant in the Paparoa foothills, east of the proposed mining site. This protects our native forest afforestation project in perpetuity. The overarching plan is to protect and enhance the existing vegetation and at the same time plant native trees and shrubs in those areas that are currently covered in deteriorating pasture. This is a privately funded and managed project. Restorative afforestation of permanent native forest is intended to protect and enhance native vegetation and establish a conducive habitat for birds, assist in soil conservation, protect watersheds and improve stream water quality, and provide for carbon sequestration, at scale. Overall, it will enhance biodiversity outcomes. This is a very long-term endeavour. A key element is to provide a critical connectivity link between the marine area, coastal lagoons and regenerating forests up to the Paparoa ranges. Mining in adjacent areas significantly compromises this endeavour.

Community Issues

1. More generally, we are concerned about the sustained disturbance that will result for neighbours and local residents as a result of strip mining operations. The proposal would create adverse wellbeing effects arising from noise, dust, haulage, and light pollution in an otherwise dark environment.
2. We completely reject applicant's claims that the proposal enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health & safety. We believe it will, in fact, have the exact opposite effect. There are significant health and safety risks. We are very concerned about the obvious long term health risks of heightened levels of radiation that will be released as a result of this mining activity. We believe community wellbeing and environmental values will be compromised.
3. Neighbours and residents of Barrytown have a natural-justice right to a peaceful existence which an industrial scale mining operation would severely compromise.
4. In addition to significant adverse effects on residents' wellbeing, we predict there will be a rapid and sustained decline in property values and increasing difficulty in selling as potential buyers are dissuaded by proximity to mining and trucking.
5. We believe the majority of neighbours and residents are very opposed.

Summary

1. This is a summary of our concerns. As stated, we strongly object to the proposal and believe the application should be denied pending a fundamental review of the proposal by a newly formed and independent expert panel.

2. We believe the impact of mining activity proposed for this location will have a highly deleterious environmental impact and that it will have a severely damaging societal impact on individuals, families and the Barrytown community.

Thank you.

Don Kerr

