

Hello,

My name is Thomas Maunsell. I write to you on behalf of my father, Greg Maunsell, myself, and my brother Rory Maunsell, with input from Paul Quinn who has been speaking with Taiko Critical Minerals Ltd on our behalf. The following comments are reflective of our perspective.

To add some context, both my father and Kevin have been working for the better part of 30 years towards improving their property. They have always intended to retire there. My father is a little over a year away from retirement. My brother and I have frequently visited the property since we were young children, and we both share a love and appreciation for the land and the natural beauty of the surrounding area. We also have intentions of one day living on the property.

Since we first learned of the Barrytown Minerals Project, we have remained optimistic about the outcome. We recognise the potential economic benefits for the community, as well as the possibility that the disturbed land area will be left in an enhanced condition compared to its current state, however, the way things have unfolded indicates to us that this may not be the case.

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 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.

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.

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. 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?

Overall we feel there has been a general lack of concise, consistent information, and we have not been given due consideration as an affected party.

When Taiko Minerals (TM) first stated its intention to mine the Barrytown flats, we didn't realise just how big an impact it was going to have on our property. We were not advised that they were also planning to put the hub of the whole Industrial mining operation right on our boundary.

Some 3-4 months ago we found the information being supplied to us was in a form and layout that we were struggled to fully comprehend and understand what was being proposed and also how it was going to impact us.

At this stage, we asked a family friend Paul Quinn (PQ) who has experience with a large mining companies and working with companies applying for resource consents in New Zealand for business purposes. Once PQ had a read over our information, we asked him to represent us in all communication and dealings with TM. We asked him to go through all the information that had been provided to us on this project and then to help us understand what was being said and how TM came to these conclusions.

After PQ had gone through the preliminary paperwork supplied and also the electronic download provided to him after his first meeting with the CEO of TM; he found information around the Resource Consent that had already been approved; and a copy of it was in the

paperwork provided by TM for the WCP to be built adjoining our property; we had no knowledge of what had been approved or what TM's plans were.

PQ also found that it had been indicated the WCP was going to be located at the water inlet by Canoe Creek's exit to the sea. The Residents in this area did not agree and there was enough push back from them that TM decided it would relocate the WCP away from this group of residents; and put it in the place currently in their application, directly adjoining our property.

After making this decision TM made zero contact to advise this change of plan. The first we became informed of it was when PQ asked us why we agreed to sign off on this as a directly affected party. We didn't sign it off and were not approached.

TM managed to make this change to their plans without making any direct communication with us and we are the single most affected party. The application managed to go through the council; who also did not contact us for some reason; this is a question we still have not received an answer for. In the approved resource consent application it states the only directly affected party to this application was Transit NZ. How can this be as we are the most affected party to this project; our property is on the boundary, it would make us Neighbours.

We were and still are totally stunned by this information and as a family started to see that we needed to work with PQ to really get a good understanding of how to proceed. PQ met with TM again and try and get an understanding around how this consent had happened and what their intentions were. They did not give an explanation.

Barrytown Residents have been promised that TM wanted to be good neighbours, if this is how they view being a good neighbour, we are most concerned for Barrytown's future. PQ spent the next 6 to 8 weeks having meetings with TM on our behalf. Initially they were to try and gather accurate information on plans and the impact of this on Barrytown, our property and homes. There were many "unknowns" in this proposal for us; PQ suggested to TM that to help allow us to understand the true effects of having a heavy industrial WCP operating right beside your property to fly two of our group to an equivalent operation; already working and using the same or similar size WCP. They pointed out, that there was nothing available in NZ that was comparative, they would have to find something equivalent in Australia. While the NZ CEO agreed that this would be a good way to allow a proper understanding of the potential effects on our property, it was indicated the approval never came from Australia for this to happen.

Despite feeling ignored by the Australian part of the project, PQ continued in discussions with the NZ CEO on how it could potentially be made to work allowing TM to build and operate its mine, and also allow us to still have the property to use as we have for the last 30 years in a peaceful and undisturbed manner.

PQ reported back to us that in his view no mitigation was ever going to entirely negate the

many negative consequences of this proposed mining operation; but was continuing to have discussions with the NZ CEO around mitigation options that would enable us to continue living on our land safely. These discussions were continuing up until two weeks out from the final submission date for the Fast Track application.

PQ met with the NZ CO and asked TM to put into writing what they were prepared to do in mitigation for our varied and number of concerns. We need this information to understand what our future holds and so that we can also start to make our own plans.

We were advised we would have a written draft MOU proposal, as soon as the CEO had it approved by Robert Brand who it seems is the final decision maker of this project; we were advised no MOU would be sent to us without his approval. This was 12 odd days to the submission deadline.

After 5 days and no contact from TM and the deadline looming, PQ contacted TM, we received an email from the NZ CEO, with no MOU attached. He provided a brief outline and there was no information or mention of the mitigation measures we had spent some weeks discussing between the parties.

When we expressed our absolute concern that nothing we had discussed was included in the information in any way that had been agreed. A second email was received from TM with a formal MOU attached; it had been approved by Mr Brand to be sent to us. This MOU also didn't include any of the areas that the parties had been discussing, though we believe it also included a very thinly veiled threat from Mr Brand that if we didn't like the supplied MOU, we may discover that access to our property as we currently enjoy it for the last 30 years will be stopped.

Mr Brand appears to have a different view of "Good Neighbour" than we are used to here in Barrytown and New Zealand.

PQ advised TM that the access had been in place for over 30 years; and had been agreed in the original sale. TM advised us that they had checked all the available council records and there was no record of an access agreement. It has come to our attention that TM has not gone unconditional on the SPA for the property surrounding us and they are implying we are going to have access issues. We suggested that they speak directly to the people they are claiming to be buying the land from. They later advised that they understood from the current owner of the land that we do have guaranteed access.

We have aimed to stay in communication with TM, despite feeling that we have been treated very poorly; and have done up until the second to last working day before the submission deadline. We believe that since Mr Brand has been actively involved in this process we have received 2 potential MOU agreements that refuse to address the mitigation we have tried to table to TM and despite the many hours of conversations with the NZ CEO.

It appears to us that we have been given lip service for weeks, be made to feel that we would be able to make an agreement and then to have nothing delivered at the end. It appears that TM believes the fast track process will totally protect them acting and operating in any form of good faith or with any real regard to the consequences of the people on the ground in Barrytown. Who were here long before Mr Brand started lusting after the resource below the Barrytown flats.

Every time we have asked for technical details around areas we have real concerns around, we get told what they intend to do, but no actual proof of what they will be using to complete what they say they are going to do. In a project of this size there are many different issues that are generated, to not be able to supply us with written technical details of the exact processes and equipment that will be used isn't acceptable.

How can we be expected to make factual and specific submission when so many of the subjects that we have raised as genuine concerns have not been resolved and we are being asked to agree to something that is not being made specific. With the lack of exact technical information in relation to this application, TM has only shown us that they believe it's their way or no way.

When we review and see public information around the financial aspect of the project, the numbers allocated to specifically benefit NZ ie tax, royalties etc it appears to be constantly changing. We note that the company appears to be structured so it will receive an income to allow it to meet all of its NZ commitments. We question how the valuable NZ ore exported to Australia (where it is refined) and then on sold through Mr Brands companies will then decide on how much it will pay our country for the NZ sourced ore? It would seem the majority of the profit will go to the refiner in Australia?

If that is so, how does that make this application of National significance to NZ, if Australia are going to enjoy the majority of the profit?

We have highlighted a lack of accurate information, much of it technical and vitally important for decision making; a lack of open and honest conversation and what we feel are bullying and intimidating behaviour towards those questioning them, leads us to believe that this application must be Denied.

We believe the idea to mine the flats has real merit and that it could potentially benefit many people and organisations in the Barrytown and West Coast area. However for us to support this application it would need to be made by a company that not only has NZ's best interests at heart, but also could be trusted to treat affected people and groups in a fair and reasonable manner. Two things it appears TM's Australian owner does not believe are important.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this project. We thank the Panel for its consideration.

