

# Fast-Track Pre-Lodgement Consultation Summary

**Purpose** - This document provides a summary of information from DOC following a pre-lodgement consultation request.

## Project Details

<b>Project name:</b>	Barrytown Mineral Sands Project
<b>Engagement type:</b>	Pre-lodgement engagement for a Substantive Application
<b>Applicant/agent:</b>	Tāiko Critical Minerals Limited ('TCM')
<b>Proposal overview:</b>	<p>The Barrytown Mineral Sands Project ('the Project') proposes to undertake mineral sand mining to obtain ilmenite, garnet and other minerals. The application for the Project will seek all approvals for mining and related activities within the 480 ha Southern Block including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) The extraction of sand using a floating dredge over approximately 280 ha (the mining disturbance area); and</li><li>(b) Remediation, rehabilitation and closure activities, including the establishment of a constructed wetland and reshaping contours over 411 ha.</li></ul> <p>Mining is expected to commence in 2034 or 2035, once the mineral resource of the Central Block has been exhausted, and take place for 14 years. Mining will be followed by rehabilitation of the site. Taking into account pre-mining construction works, post-mining final rehabilitation and mine closure works, it is anticipated that the Project will be completed between 2055 and 2060. Approvals are sought for 35 years to provide sufficient time for mining activity to occur over stages and to allow for final rehabilitation and operational factors to take place.</p> <p>All properties that form part of the site are privately owned.</p> <p>Resource consent has <u>already been granted</u> to TCM for the initial stages of the mining, including to undertake mineral sands mining to the north of the Project site (on the Central Block), establish and operate a Mineral Separation Plant at Rapahoe (including transportation from Barrytown Flats to the MSP) and to establish and operate a Wet Concentrator Plant for processing on site.</p> <p>It is proposed to set mining back from key environmental features and boundaries as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) 20m from the consent boundary;</li><li>(b) 20m from Granite Creek;</li></ul>



	<p>(c) 20m from Fagan Creek;</p> <p>(d) 50m from Mean High Water Springs (MHWS);</p> <p>(e) 20m from the proposed SNA PUN-049, which is adjacent to Section 2 (Granite Creek South);</p> <p>(f) 20m from all private property boundaries not within the consent area; and</p> <p>(g) 200m from dwellings other than where noise bunds are proposed.</p> <p>There are two recorded archaeological sites within the mining disturbance area.</p>
<b>Location:</b>	Across an area of the Barrytown Flats, in Grey District.
<b>Date pre-lodgement request received:</b>	<p>Initial contact was made on the 13<sup>th</sup> of May 2025. A first consultation meeting took place on the 27<sup>th</sup> of May 2025. A Project Description was received on the 11<sup>th</sup> of June 2025. On 22<sup>nd</sup> of June 2025 copies of the Ecological Assessment, Avian Management Plan and Wetland and Riparian Planting Plan were requested. On the 27<sup>th</sup> of August 2025 the applicant advised DOC that they were re-considering their authorisation strategy and placed consultation on hold. On the 20<sup>th</sup> of October 2025 the applicant advised that they had applied to have an area on the south, that wasn't captured in the original application, to be listed via a referral. On the 23<sup>rd</sup> of February 2026 the applicant confirmed by e-mail that they would be making a Fast-track application for the Project and were aiming to lodge mid-April 2026.</p> <p>Draft documents for review were received on the 19<sup>th</sup> of March 2026. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tāiko Critical Minerals Limited Consultation – Letter to Department of Conservation</li> <li>• Appendix A – Project Description</li> <li>• Appendix B1 – Draft Conditions</li> <li>• Appendix B2 – Draft Wildlife Act Authorisation</li> <li>• Appendix C – Draft Ecological Assessment</li> <li>• Appendix D – Draft Avian Management Plan</li> <li>• Appendix E – Draft Native Freshwater Fish Capture and Relocation Plan</li> <li>• Appendix F – Draft Lizard Management Plan</li> <li>• Appendix G – Landscape Mitigation Package</li> </ul> <p>Draft documents received on the 30<sup>th</sup> of March 2026 included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of evidence M Fritzpatrick (Water Quality) (cover plus 7 pages)</li> <li>• Statement of Evidence R Montgomerie (Freshwater Ecology) (cover plus 7 pages)</li> <li>• Statement of Evidence Dr G Bramley (Terrestrial Ecology) (Cover plus 9 pages)</li> <li>• Draft Conditions – Wildlife Act Authority (10 pages)</li> <li>• Appendix M6 Draft Rehabilitation Plan (30 pages)</li> </ul> <p>The Letter to the Department requests a response by the 10<sup>th</sup> of April 2026.</p>

**Summary of pre-lodgement Consultation**

**Fast track project lead DOC:**

Terry Calmeyer – Consultant Planner Fast-track Applications.

**DOC specialist input required:**

Fast Track Project Lead – Terry Calmeyer  
RMA Planner – Murray Brass  
Permissions Advisor(s) - Lauren Bollu  
Statutory Manager (Regional Office) - Jo Stratford and Ange Paget  
Legal – Ceri Warnock  
BHV Freshwater – Richard Storey  
BHV Lighting – Ellen Cieraad  
BHV Terrestrial Ecology – Jane Marshall  
Stat Planning – Katherine Hughes  
Ranger – Kate Simister

**DOC Permissions/ Approvals Identified by applicant in pre-lodgement request as potentially required:**

Authority under the Wildlife Act 1953 (birds and lizards, including incidental killing)

<p><b>DOC Commentary on Fast Track approvals and permissions identified:</b></p> <p><b>Note DOC's role in relation to specific</b></p>	<p><b>Wildlife Act Permissions</b></p> <p>General advice: Include up to date survey results, clearly state the activities that approvals are sought for (catch, kill, liberate). Ensure species applied for (particularly lizards) are clearly identified in the plans.</p> <p>Ensure that the specific Wildlife Act approval term per species is included in the application document(s).</p> <p><u>Potential issues to consider -</u></p> <p><u>Lizards:</u> Due to the earth moving requirements of the mining methods, any survey and salvage that doesn't locate a lizard will mean a high likelihood of death for those lizards not found.</p> <p>Methods other than artificial retreats should be used.</p> <p>The number of devices being used in each area or habitat type isn't specified.</p> <p>An assessment of the suitability of proposed release sites for lizards should be included. Confirmation of whether the release sites will be protected from further development in future (for example, by designating it a protective covenant) should be provided.</p> <p>Pest control at release sites is required to increase both the chance of released lizards successfully establishing at the site, and also to increase their breeding success rates to mitigate the loss of lizards that aren't found and salvaged.</p> <p>There is no proposed long-term lizard monitoring to ensure the population has successfully established and has then increased to similar numbers/density as before the development commenced. Lizards may need to be monitored for a considerable time – e.g. once immediately after each year's salvage, and then every 3 years for 3 measures (annually during mining and 9 years post-mining).</p> <p>Contingency measures, if monitoring shows lizards haven't well-established or the population hasn't re-established to similar levels, should be provided.</p>
<p><b>Treaty partners:</b></p>	<p><u>DOC is aware of the following Treaty partners with interests that may be relevant to this site:</u></p> <p>Ngāi Tahu</p> <p>We encourage the applicant to engage directly with relevant Māori groups as required by section 29 of the Act.</p>
<p><b>Treaty Settlement implications/considerations:</b></p>	<p>DOC is aware of the following Treaty settlement obligations that may be relevant to this site under the Ngaī Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conservation of aquatic life and freshwater fisheries</li> <li>• Wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga and other historic places of significance to Ngāi Tahu</li> <li>• Taonga species listed in Schedule 97 including fish species and Kororā (little blue penguin)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Potential Resource Management Act (RMA) considerations and effects:</b></p>	<p><b>Relation to public conservation land</b></p> <p>The Project site is adjacent to the following public conservation areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Langridge Scenic Reserve</li> </ul>

Note: DOC's role in relation to 53(2)(m)(i) FTAA

- Canoe Creek Conservation Area
- Marginal Strip – Canoe Creek
- Marginal Strip – Tasman Sea, Barrytown

The Project site is close to:

- Barrytown Flat Conservation Area
- Paparoa Range South Conservation Area
- Punakaiki Scenic Reserve

#### **Consistency with the resource consents for the central block**

We are pleased to see, in paragraph 10 of the Letter to the D-G that:  
*“consultation was assisted by the extensive engagement TCM had undertaken on the publicly notified resource consent for the Central Block, where DoC was an active participant, including in appeals against the council decisions to grant consent. Robust resource consent conditions in relation to the Westland Petrel were agreed with DoC and other parties to the appeals via consent order. Lighting conditions for this application follow those agreed conditions and as mining activity will only occur during daylight hours, there are no anticipated effects on the Westland Petrel.”*

Although the draft Avian Management Plan includes some of these measures, the avian management conditions have a number of significant differences from the central block conditions, including:

- The conditions do not require protection of existing nesting by Threatened and At-Risk species;
- No ground searching for Westland petrel is provided;
- No requirements to respond to any Westland petrel interactions is provided;
- No requirement has been included to consult DOC in preparation of the Avian Management Plan;
- No pest control is provided;
- The Avian Management Plan objective has not included ‘protection of surrounding habitat’;
- The Annual Bird Management Report does not require reporting of Westland petrel groundings and responses to the same;
- The conditions do not specify who will be authorised to do lighting audits (at commencement of mining and if/when any grounded or dead seabirds are recorded).

Similarly, lighting is addressed in the draft management plans and not in the conditions themselves. Lighting requirements are considerably reduced when compared to the Central Block, despite the fact that the risk to Westland petrel will be the same. No Lighting Management Plan is required to be prepared, and the references to the Australian Wildlife Guidelines are incomplete and only apply to design, not installation and operation.

The management plans are draft and subject to amendments. The avian and lighting provisions should, therefore, be included in the actual conditions, so that they cannot be excluded from subsequent versions of the management

plans. The Southern Block conditions should align with the final version of the Central Block conditions, other than for provisions which are location-specific.

The basis for setting the bond at \$300,000 has not been provided by the applicant. It appears proportionally lower than the bond for the Central Block given the much larger mining area and should cover rehabilitation in addition to mine closure.

The landscaping conditions refer to a superseded version of the Landscape Mitigation Package. Given that landscaping management needs to be comprehensive and ongoing, the landscaping management plan should be included within the management plan's suite of conditions instead of only having selected elements referred to in the conditions.

The proposed setbacks addressed in Condition 7.1 of the landscaping conditions appear small and are not justified in the information provided.

There is no assessment of hydrological effects of mining on surface water and wetlands outside the mine footprint.

The establishment of a Community Liaison Group should be considered.

The hours of darkness when outdoor operations are prohibited should be consistent with the Central Block, i.e. sunset to sunrise, and not 30 minutes after sunset to 30 minutes before sunrise. This is because dawn and dusk are important times for bird movements. Lights should also be required to be off when not in operation and this addressed within the conditions.

In the Avian Management Plan, it is stated that an audit will be undertaken if any grounded seabirds are recorded. An appropriate management response to grounded seabirds should be captured in the conditions.

#### **Avifauna**

Koroā are a taonga for Ngāi Tahu and pest control targeting stoats, mustelids (stoats and weasels) and cats should be implemented.

If native bird numbers decline (e.g. 5-10%) from a baseline (pre-operation) density during any seasonal bird monitoring, additional measures should be implemented (e.g. pest control targeting mustelids, cats, rats and possums, with target residual numbers established for each pest).

Wetlands should be monitored for bittern and marsh crake (including farmland wet areas such as hump-and-hollows for bittern). Vegetated wetlands and margins should additionally be monitored for fernbird.

Bittern in farmland could be monitored using static cameras during the non-breeding season to discover if the site is intermittently used by bittern as a foraging site. Booming calls made by breeding male bittern can be surveyed during Oct/Nov in suitable wetland sites. Crakes and fernbird can be surveyed by 5MBC or playback calls to obtain a population estimate.

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.

On page 34 of the Avian Management Plan it is stated that as part of annual reporting: “*Number and location of any grounded tāiko*” be included.

Management undertaken and the outcome for any grounded tāiko collected should be addressed within the Plan.

### **Lighting**

The consent conditions refer rightly to the 2023 updated version “National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife - DCCEEW, however the appendix references the old 2020 versions (which are different).

### **Planning framework**

The draft documents provided do not include a planning assessment, which will be required under FTAA Sch 5 cl 5. Relevant provisions are to be found in national direction (especially the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB) and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS)), the West Coast Regional Policy Statement (WCRPS) and Regional Land and Water Plan, and Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP).

Of particular relevance will be plan provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity, including WCRPS Ecosystems and Indigenous Biological Diversity Objective 4 and associated Policies 2, 7 and 8; and TTPP Objective ECO-O1 and Policy ECO-P7.

The application will need to demonstrate how the proposal will avoid impacts on the persistence, population size, occupancy and threat status of Westland petrel.

### **Wetlands**

Some wetlands have been classified incorrectly. Wetlands resulting from poor drainage from hump-and-hollow landforms, and from historic mine dredge pits, have been classified as artificial wetlands (therefore not subject to the regulations in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (NES-F)). However, for them to be classified as artificial wetlands, they would need to have been created intentionally as wetlands, and maintained as such, according to MfE (2021). Since this is not the case, these wetlands should be classified as induced wetlands, which are subject to the policies and regulation in the NPS-FM and NES-F, respectively. Reclassifying these wetlands brings the total area of natural inland wetlands to 42.1 hectares within the Southern Block (SB) and 35.8 hectares within the mining area.

No consideration of wetland fauna. The assessment of the ecological value of the wetlands considers only their vegetation. There is no mention of birds, fish or other fauna. It is noted there are eBird records of fernbird and Australasian bittern within 10 kilometres of the site, though they were not recorded at the site

during field surveys. Including fauna may increase the ecological value of the wetlands.

Need for transparency in demonstrating net ecological gain. The reconstructed wetland proposed in the Project is larger in area than the wetlands to be destroyed by the mining, even after including the hump-and-hollow and dredge pit wetlands as natural inland wetlands. The AEE authors also optimistically claim that the ecological value of the reconstructed wetland will be higher than the current wetlands due to higher value flora and greater hydrological connectivity. Therefore, 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.

Time lag between wetland removal and reconstruction. The reconstructed wetland will be constructed in stages, as mining progresses. The first stage is in the north of the Southern Block: mining in this area occurs between Years 1 and 7, and wetland reconstruction begins in Years 1 and 2 (or possibly Years 1 and 7, as stated in another place). The second stage is in the centre of the Southern Block: mining in this area occurs between Years 8 and 11, and wetland reconstruction begins in Years 10 and 11. The AEE authors predict that vegetation and ecological functions in the wetland will take about five years to develop. There is therefore a significant time lag between loss of the current wetlands and construction of the new wetland. As such it would be appropriate for Tāiko Critical Minerals Limited to lodge a bond to the value of \$40-50,000 per hectare of natural inland wetland that will be destroyed. This amount is roughly based on the per hectare cost of restoring new wetland habitat, including site preparation, plant supply, planting labour, and post-planting maintenance for a minimum of three years.

No consideration of effects on wetlands outside the Southern Block. The AEE states that wetlands occurring outside the Southern Block but within 100 metres of it were not considered due to lack of access. However, NES-F Sections 52-54 still apply if activities within the Southern Block may lead to partial or complete drainage of wetlands within 100 metres. The risk of this occurring needs to be assessed, particularly in relation to wetland hydrology.

Reference to the Rehabilitation Management Plan ('RMP'). The AEE makes frequent reference to the RMP (Tai Poutini Resources Ltd (2026)) in relation to the wetland reconstruction. Therefore, assessing the reconstruction relies heavily on the RMP.

Reference: Ministry for the Environment. 2021. Defining 'natural wetlands' and 'natural inland wetlands'. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment.

#### **Effects on water quality**

A technical expert with specialist expertise in geochemistry would be required to assess whether the project will cause significant contamination of freshwaters with metals, acid mine drainage, etc.

#### **Streams**

	<p>At present there are no criteria and no standard for assessing the ecological condition or functioning of the remediated streams. The AEE states, in section 9.3.3.1, that “<i>Post-mining reconstruction will focus on achieving no net loss in stream extent and enhancing freshwater values through improved channel alignment, riparian fencing and planting.</i>” However, no measures are provided by which to assess whether freshwater values have been enhanced (or in fact degraded). It is suggested that the Stream Ecological Valuation would be a suitable method to set a standard and determine whether it has been achieved.</p> <p>The riparian planting offered is very narrow (3 metres wide on each bank). 5 metres should be the minimum width provided, with 10 metres being more adequate.</p> <p><b>Water take</b></p> <p>The water take from Canoe Creek – DOC expects to see a “cease take” threshold to be included. 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.</p>
<p><b>DOC Statutory Planning Document considerations in relation to site (e.g. CGP/CMS/CMP):</b></p>	<p>As this application is not on Public Conservation Land the identified provisions relate only to either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wildlife approval</li> <li>• Engagement</li> <li>• DOC’s advocacy provisions – to support comments by our other colleagues</li> </ul> <p>The application is unlikely to be inconsistent with the relevant statutory planning provisions. However, consideration needs to be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• managing rare, threatened and at-risk species that may be found on the site to ensure their persistence and disturbance is minimised</li> <li>• protection of freshwater fisheries, fish habitat and fish passage</li> <li>• preservation of threatened indigenous freshwater species.</li> <li>• consultation with Papatipu Rūnanga if any species found are taonga species listed in Appendix 4 of the West Coast Te Tai Poutini Conservation Management Strategy.</li> </ul> <p>Conservation General Policy 2005 (CGP)</p>
<p><b>Any specific information requests to applicant(s)/agent for pre-app engagement at this point:</b></p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b>Any further information/considerations:</b></p>	<p>Potential issues to consider -</p> <p>The Project description states that creek beds will be reconstructed in the same or similar locations and represent meandering pathways, and water will be drained during diversions, five creeks across the Southern Block will require diversion, and the reclamation of beds or rivers. The applicant should consider</p>

	<p>whether any of these activities trigger the requirement for a complex freshwater fisheries approval, and whether to include this in the fast-track application.</p> <p>The Ecological Effects Assessment makes no mention of avoiding whitebaiting season or the spawning season of trout or native fish, which are mentioned specifically in the definition of Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activities in the FTAA.</p> <p>The Native Fish Capture and Relocation Plan makes no mention of biosecurity – how the Project will avoid spreading pest aquatic organisms (plants or fish) into or out of the works area.</p> <p>The mining technique is different from that proposed in the originally consented application. It would be good to understand what experience and information we have in the New Zealand context and how that impacts on ecological evaluations.</p>
<p>Additional Notes:</p>	<p>In App B1 Draft conditions, p.11, it refers to the Conservation Status (Threatened or At Risk bird species) - the incorrect name is used. This should refer to the New Zealand Threat Classification system ('NZTCS') nzctcs.org - and not "DOC's Threatened Classification System" - it is however administered by DOC.</p> <p>Adverse impacts on birds of future lighting of the highway could be an induced impact that this Project contributes to.</p> <p>It is not clear what the situation is for trucking movements. If trucking is part of this application, then trucking the mined material away under lights should be prohibited. If it is not part of this application, then it should be clearly explained how it is covered elsewhere.</p> <p>While DOC will assist applicants as much as we can when they engage in pre-lodgement consultation, it is the applicants' responsibility to comply with the FTAA and to ensure they have applied for all permissions they need.</p> <p>Note that a panel will invite the statutory bodies listed in clause 4 of Schedule 7 to comment on the application (NZCA, conservation boards, Fish and Game Council, and Game Animal Council). We encourage applicants to engage with these bodies in advance of filing a substantive application.</p>