



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

MINUTES OF MEETING OF TETA O POUTINI PLAN COMMITTEE HELD AT GREYMOUTH DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT 9.00AM ON 14 FEBRUARY 2024

Present

R. Williams (Chairman), Mayor T. Gibson (GDC), Cr A. Gibson (GDC), Mayor J. Cleine (BDC), Cr G. Neylon (BDC), Mayor H. Lash (WDC), Cr A. Cassin (WDC), Kaiwhakahaere P. Madgwick (Makaawhio), F. Tumahai (Ngāti Waewae), Cr P. Haddock (WCRC)

In attendance

T. Mehrtens (WCRC), D. Lew (WCRC), S. Bastion (WDC)
Via Zoom- M. Conland (WCRC), L. Easton (Kereru Consultant on behalf of WCRC)

Welcome

Apologies

Cr B. Cummings (WDC)

Moved (Cr Cassin/ Mayor Cleine) *That the apologies of Cr B. Cummings be accepted.*

Carried

Confirm minutes of the previous meeting held 12 October 2024

The draft minutes were amended to refer to Cr Cassin instead of Mayor Cassin.

Moved (Mayor Gibson/ n/a) *That the minutes of the meeting held 12 October be confirmed.*

Carried

Matters arising from previous meetings on 11th December 2023

Moved (Mayor Lash/ n/a) *That the notes from the workshop on 11th December 2023 are noted.*

Carried

Feedback on Draft Variation to Activities on the Surface of Water Chapter and Recommendation to Proceed with Variation

L. Easton presented to the Committee on the draft Variation to Activities on the Surface of Water Chapter. There were five pieces of feedback that were received, all supporting the proposal. L. Easton noted that some amendments were sought to refer to the correct name of the ports, and clarify that the new rule would not affect other commercial activities. Amendments have been made to address these points, which were attached to the report. Some people providing feedback wanted to expand the scope of the Variation, but this is not supported as those matters are being dealt with in submissions being heard next week. L. Easton recommended that the Variation proceed to public notification.

L. Easton noted that the team is constrained in terms of staff resources as it does not have a Senior Planner at the moment, and so an exact date of notification could not be set at this stage.



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

Moved (Mayor Cleine/Mayor Gibson)

1. *That the Committee receives the report*
2. *That the proposed Variation for Commercial Activities and Port Activities on the Surface of Water in relation to Port of Greymouth and Westport Harbour Port be adopted by the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee for legal public notification as a Variation to the Proposed Te o Poutini Plan by Thursday 28 March 2024.*
3. *That the submission period for the proposed Variation for Commercial Activities and Port Activities on the Surface of Water in relation to Port of Greymouth and Westport Harbour to Te Tai o Poutini Plan be from the date of notification to 5pm Friday 3 May 2024.*

Carried

TTPP Budget information and cost codes

M. Conland noted the budget for the TTPP process, and that this has been divided up over 5 years in order to deliver the operative plan. M. Conland noted that the table in the agenda is missing data for the years 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 and provided the following updated information:

Year	Budget	Actual
2019/2020*	650,000	\$557,917
2020/2021	\$692,167	\$740,580
2021/22	\$1,394,324	\$1,053,280
2022/23	\$1,021,429	\$803,592
2023/2024	\$1,950,952	\$617,414*
Total	\$5,058,872	\$3,214,866

M. Conland noted that the 2019/2020 financial year was financed in a different manner to the latter years. From 2020/2021 onwards, and as directed by clause 13(1) of the Local Government Reorganisation Scheme (West Coast Region) Order 2019, WCRC is required to raise a regional rate to fund TTPP. In addition, a loan has been taken out over a period of 10 years for any expenditure not covered by the targeted rate.

M. Conland then spoke about the codes and in particular the explanations for what is covered by these costs codes. She noted that a report will be brought to the next Committee meeting with details of the forecast to complete the TTPP process and the budget included in the Long Term Plan.

S. Bastion noted the Local Government Grant was \$200,000 rather than \$150,000. M. Conland replied that the budget was for \$200,000 but the actuals show that only \$150,000 was received.

S. Bastion noted that we could seek the remaining \$50,000.



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

P. Madgwick asked how much of our plans are we going to have to unpick with the new government. What effect will this have on the budget. R. Williams noted that this will be looked at in April when the budget for the next year will be set out.

D. Lew noted that the staff will need to be agile in relation to any future changes put forward by the government, and this is why some hearings have been pushed out towards the end of the hearings process to add flexibility. If some work is no longer needed then we can accommodate that and that may result in some cost savings. D. Lew also noted that he is quite comfortable with where we are at with the budget of \$5million but noted that there are still quite a few hearings to get through and then there are also likely to be costs for environment court or high court appeals. Now that the financials are sorted we need to forecast out to the end of the project and see what those figures look like as we need to stay within the \$5 million as its enough of a rates burden as it is. While the environment court costs are not currently included within the \$5 million, D. Lew noted that if the hearings can be completed for less than \$5 million then that will provide some headroom for any court costs. All Councils are currently facing sunk costs to date as the new government takes a new approach. F. Tumahai noted that by constraining the timeframes the way that they are is going to result in more costs as appeals will be more likely. He considers that the schedule needs to be relooked at and in relation to the Mining Extraction hearings in particular. D. Lew responded that those were helpful comments and that this would be looked into further.

M. Conland noted the second part of the report which provided details of the expense items and what they cover.

S. Bastion noted the LTP commentary around the TTPP, and if we're sticking with the budget of \$5 million then there will be no forecast budgets for the next LTP potentially. D. Lew said we haven't included any additional budget over and above the \$5m to complete this process, but there will be ongoing costs once the plan is operative for maintenance of the plan such as plan changes. He noted that budget provision and resourcing is an ongoing cost to provide for the ongoing maintenance of the plan to meet the needs of the community, and that we must not let it get to the place where is it so out of date again. D. Lew noted that rolling reviews each year are the best way to go for the plan to remain current.

Cr Gibson asked if the budget goes over \$5million, is this money to come out of rates or would we seek additional external funding? D. Lew said we would come back to the Committee with those options.

P. Haddock said that seeking additional funding is a live action and the opportunity to do that is still there.

Moved (Cr Gibson/Cr Neylon) *That the Committee receives the report.*

Carried



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

Report – Financial statements for to 30 November 2023 and 31 December 2023

M. Conland noted in the December statement, the expenditure for the Isovist e-plan Platform appears to exceed the year to date budget but explained that this is because the invoice for the annual subscription fee received in December was entered incorrectly. She stated this should be fixed by the time she does the statements for January and February.

She also noted that the expenditure is tracking well below the budget, due to online hearing and some unpaid invoices that came in during the Christmas period shut down.

R. Williams said the financial statement is very credible compared to the previous financial statements. D. Lew noted that we now have a fully staffed up financial team to support all of the budget managers in the Council. S. Bastion noted that the forecast needs to be revisited. Cr Haddock noted that they were very clear to understand. R. Williams thanked Ms Conland for her hard work which gave them much confidence.

Moved (R. Williams/Mayor Lash) *That the Committee receives the report.*

Carried

Public Forum - Vance Boyd

Mr Boyd addressed the Committee in relation to the draft coastal hazard mapping. He believed it was premature to notify the mapping at this stage, and that further study and community consultation was required. Mr Boyd noted that the feedback presented in the report of Ms Easton was similar to his.

Mr Boyd stated there was a problem with how the information about the draft variation was notified. He said that only people who had submitted on the original maps were emailed, and that many affected people are unaware of the proposal. Mr Boyd noted the 2017 MfE publication, *Coastal Hazards and Climate Change – Guidance for local Government* and considered in his view that the process should follow this guidance. He also discussed what he viewed as shortcomings with the NIWA report, as well as issues with the LIDAR data used. Mr Boyd also noted the coastal uplift that is likely following an earthquake on the Alpine Fault and thought that this was much more likely than a coastal hazard threat in the next 50 years.

Mr Boyd said that the TTPP should take the approach of allowing individuals to control their own destinies in relation to natural hazards and the approach proposed by the TTPP is not warranted.

Mr Boyd reiterated that the notification of the variation should be delayed.

Mr Boyd handed out pages from the NIWA report.

Cr Gibson commented on the 100 year timeframe and noted that 25 or 50 could be better to work with.

Cr Neylon asked if the mapping that hadn't been made public was the 50 year mapping. Mr Boyd noted that it was. He noted that he'd only seen the 100 years mapping and that the MfE guidance says that the timeframes that should be considered is 100 years but it doesn't say that you shouldn't considered 25 or 50 years.



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

Cr Haddock asked at Hannah's Clearing whether Mr Boyd had noticed a change in erosion levels on his property. Mr Boyd noted nothing in the first 10 years but in the last three years they've had three episodic events and then last year in June, there was beach erosion of approximately 1m but in other parts its building up. It's currently in an erosive phase although its not affecting any properties. He said there was uncertainty though as we don't have the data

P. Madgwick noted that erosion is one matter and sea level rise is another, and he noted that he doesn't believe that clear evidence of sea level rise has been produced.

Mr Boyd noted in the Otago Daily Times that Dr Cox, Chief of GNS Science, had spoken about site specific assessment for South Dunedin which he felt was more appropriate than a broad brush approach. Mr Boyd feels the same about Hannah's Clearing.

Mayor Cleine asked about how insurance companies are dealing with his part of the coast. Mr Boyd said that he did not think there had been any special loading of his property, although premiums had increased.

Mayor Lash said she believed that insurance companies were waiting to see the final outcomes of this before they integrate that into their assessments of insurance.

Feedback on Draft Coastal Hazards Variation to the Plan and Recommendation to Proceed with Variation

L. Easton presented to the Committee on the draft Variation and noted that the Variation focuses on mapping only, with no changes proposed to the rules. L. Easton noted that the mapping has been updated by NIWA based on the more accurate LIDAR data.

L. Easton provided information on the consultation process and the feedback from consultation. While almost all the feedback received opposed the Variation, the major points made were about people wanting more time to understand and discuss the issues.

L. Easton noted that people are wanting protection works and support with transition and adaptation, but these are not district plan matters. Some people opposed the methodology used to determine the extent of the hazards.

In terms of the matters raised by Mr Boyd in his verbal presentation, L. Easton noted that these have previously been addressed by staff in one on one discussions with Mr Boyd. The Hannah's Clearing mapping and information provided by Mr Boyd has been checked by NIWA.

If the Variation does not proceed, L. Easton noted that the TTPP will proceed with known inaccurate maps and the new mapping will be introduced through the s42A process without any additional affected people being able to participate. Some people who are currently affected by the inaccurate maps will no longer be affected following the Variation.

L. Easton noted that there are strong signals from government and insurers that more progress on regulation of natural hazards is needed, not less. The proposed NPS for Natural Hazards is being worked on at the moment and is anticipated to come out in the second half of this year.



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

L. Easton explained that the community desire for planning for adaptation/ managed retreat/ more protection works is a non-regulatory process, and not matters for the TTPP. These are part of the wider work programmes that Councils are involved in. While a 1% event happens in theory every 100 years, but Gisborne had two 100 year events in one week last year. Not possible to know when these events will occur. In response to Mr Boyd, L. Easton explained that the reason for using the 100 year event is based on the requirements of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement which the TTPP must implement. Sea level rise requirements are also set out by the Ministry for the Environment. We are taking the approach of being consistent with what is required under the regulations and what is being applied throughout the rest of New Zealand.

Managing the risks of natural hazards is a specific matter that Councils are required to address in District Plans. Ms Easton noted that an Alpine Fault rupture would completely devastate the West Coast. Once that occurs, we would need to update the natural hazards framework for the West Coast. An Alpine Fault rupture is not able to be factored in to the mapping as we have no basis for what this might do to the coast.

D. Lew noted that this coastal hazard matter was one of the most fundamental and difficult that needs to be made in relation to TTPP. He noted that he supports and reinforces Ms Easton's comments. In discussions with regional council chief executives and central government, he notes that this government is even more committed to the NPS for Natural Hazards than ever before as the true cost of Gabrielle and other events are coming to bear. Inline with the insurance council, the government cannot continue to allow new development in hazard prone areas and then pick up the bill after an event. D. Lew noted Mr Boyd's quote from the Chief Executive of GNS that we have to be 'informed by the best science available' and that this work by NIWA represents that.

D. Lew advised the Committee to understand the implications of LGOIMA and LIMs and the requirements to discharge this information which is under a separate process to the TTPP. This, he noted, was more likely to trigger insurance risks that the coastal hazard lines. There is potential liability for the regional and district councils if this information is not discharged.

P. Haddock noted that the updated mapping provided greater accuracy but he thought that there were still some discrepancies. He noted that he didn't want people submitting on hazard lines that weren't quite correct. Cr Gibson noted that at Jackson Bay the sea is causing erosion not sea level rise and agreed that some of the maps needed to be revisited.

Mayor Gibson noted that the Committee still doesn't have the hydrodynamic maps for Grey District, and asked if we have to do a variation to a variation, who pays for that? She also asked the timing of this modelling information. L. Easton said that she will be meeting with natural hazard staff and will look into this further as she hadn't seen the final report. D. Lew said that staff would provide an update in relation to Grey District.

Mayor Cleine noted that he is fairly confident that the science is ok and asked what specifically needs to be looked at? Cr Haddock noted Hannah's Clearing and the other areas raised in submissions to the draft variation.

Mayor Lash noted her concern regarding the pressure of time affecting the review and assessment process of the hazard information.



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

L. Easton said that NIWA have looked specifically at Hannah's Clearing and Mr Boyd's information and did not consider that any changes were necessary, and as such, she is not expecting a different result if this is looked into again.

Mayor Gibson noted that this was affecting peoples' livelihoods and businesses so was important to be correct. Mayor Cleine noted the fairness issue as some people are no longer affected, and as such, they won't have submitted on the variation. He also noted that the Committee had set out at the beginning of the TTPP to take a science based approach to get the best data that they can. He noted the problems with the plan currently before the commissioners, and by delaying notifying the variation the Committee are knowingly approving an inaccurate plan already.

P. Madgwick noted Hokitika and Hannah's Clearing and that a site specific rather than a broad brush approach was needed, that needs to be accurate. He raised the issue of what if the government decided on a 50 year rather than 100 year timeframe for coastal hazards.

D. Lew asked the Committee to identify exactly what information staff should bring back to the Committee

These matters were identified as:

1. An update on the Grey District hydrodynamic modelling
2. Details of how existing coastal protections are affecting the planning provisions
3. What scientific agencies we are relying on for flooding and erosion, and what is the scope of their work
4. Review those places where people have submitted in relation to the draft coastal hazard mapping variation

Mayor Cleine asked who is going to be the source of truth and whether the Committee were going to use the science. F. Tumahai supported this. Mayor Cleine further asked whether the Committee believes in the agreed national position on sea level rise because if not, that was a different conversation. R. Williams noted that the previous Committees had accepted sea level rise, even if some individuals did not.

L. Easton said that she would organise the workshop as part of the next committee meeting and invite NIWA to attend.

Moved (Mayor Gibson/Cr Haddock)

1. *That the Committee receives the report*
2. *That this matter is discussed further at the April Committee meeting with reports covering the four points noted in the discussion.*

Carried

Report - Online attendance with respect to a quorum

M. Conland noted that at the last meeting of the Committee, the meeting was structured as a workshop because the quorum requirements in relation to online attendance were unclear. At that



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

meeting it was requested that a report be brought to this meeting in relation to the quorum for Committee meetings to clarify the situation in relation to members attending in person versus online.

M. Conland stated that until 30 September this year, attendance via an audio link or audiovisual link meets the requirements for a quorum, regardless of what the Committee standing orders say. Following that date, if there is a desire to continue this situation, the standing orders will need to be amended. M. Conland noted that that may be warranted given the area that the TTPP Committee relates to and would save travel and time.

P. Madgwick noted that it would be good if a report could be brought to the next TTPP Committee meeting with draft updated standing orders to be considered to allow for this as it makes sense for the TTPP where the members come from all over the coast. R. Williams said that the standing orders for the committee had been in use for 5 years and should be revised as they may be out of date. S. Bastion noted that the LGNZ provides model standing orders for Councils which would make it easy to revise the standing orders for this committee.

Moved (Cr Gibson/Mayor Lash) *That the Committee receives the report.*

Carried

Project Manager Update

M. Conland noted that this is the last Committee meeting that Ms Mehrtens will be providing assistance at before going on maternity leave. M. Conland also noted that Mr Douglas who had the position of Senior Planner in the TTPP team has also resigned from WCRC. M. Conland thanked them for all their work with the process and wished them well for the future. M. Conland noted that recruitment was underway, with Ms Mehrtens role being advertised as a Planning Technician role to better reflect the position.

M. Conland noted that no changes had been made to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB) and nor had we received any indication that changes were likely to be made soon.

M. Conland noted that the hearing schedule had been amended to delay hearing the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity topic, and the Natural Hazards topic had also been delayed to allow time for the Coastal Hazards Variation to be notified and heard at the same time as the Natural Hazards topic. M. Conland noted that despite these changes, the hearing process was still largely keeping to the original timeframe. She further noted that at a Committee meeting in March 2023 it was noted that the costs would increase the longer the period over which the hearings were held, and so at that time it was agreed to have a fairly tight timeframe for the hearing.

P. Madgwick asked whether it would make sense to move the Natural Features and Landscapes hearing to later in the year, similar to what has been done for Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). L. Easton noted that Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONLs) are not in the same category and that there are unlikely to be any changes to them. She noted that the government has been clear in signaling proposed changes, and that there has been no indication that ONLs would be reviewed. F. Tumahai asked whether it would be worthwhile planning for that. L. Easton replied that it was very unlikely as there had been no proposals for the government to review the requirements of ONLs. R. Williams asked about a possible timing change for this topic. L. Easton replied that the hearing was happening



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

very soon, with the s42A report up on the website, and evidence was being received. She said that it wouldn't be her recommendation to delay that topic.

Mayor Lash asked about the split following decisions and appeals between provisions that are operative vs those that are appealed. L. Easton replied that it was standard planning practice to undertake a weighting exercise which was set out in the law, and that this had also been the same under the Town and Country Planning Act. L. Easton said that the planners were currently doing this exercise, and that as the TTPP progressed through the process more weight would be placed on the TTPP rather than the current operative plans. L. Easton also noted that only some parts of TTPP are likely to be appealed.

Mayor Gibson asked about changing the hearing schedule. D. Lew said that the Committee made decisions about whether to notify variations but that hearing matters have been delegated to the hearing panel and those are decisions for the commissioners.

Cr Haddock asked whether the government's stance on any matters would affect the appeals. L. Easton replied that central government frequently makes changes to planning processes and councils need to adapt to those changes. However, we can only deal with what is in front of us in law. P. Madgwick noted that the pace of change of this government is unprecedented and that there would be no harm in going back to the government to ask.

F. Tumahai and P. Madgwick discussed moving the Mineral Extraction hearing, and noted that preparation for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori hearing is taking up a lot of time. Cr Haddock also suggested that the Committee ask the hearing panel to look at rescheduling the hearings.

Moved (Cr Haddock/P. Madgwick) *That the Commissioners relook at the scheduling of hearings, especially in relation to Mineral Extraction.*

Carried

Moved (Cr Naylor/Cr Gibson) *That the Committee receives the report.*

Carried

Meeting ended at 11.04am

The Chairman thanked Tayla Mehrrens for her work with the TTPP Committee.