



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

## Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee Meeting 19 November 2025

1.30pm

West Coast Regional Council, 388 Main South Rd, Paroa, Greymouth

Livestreamed on YouTube

[@westcoastregionalcouncil5171](https://www.youtube.com/@westcoastregionalcouncil5171)

### AGENDA

<b>1.30pm</b>	Welcome and Apologies	<b>Chair</b>
<b>1.35pm</b>	Conflict of Interest Declaration	<b>Chair</b>
<b>1.40pm</b>	Confirm previous minutes of 24 September 2025	<b>Chair</b>
<b>1.45pm</b>	Matters Arising	<b>Chair</b>
<b>1.50pm</b>	Report and Presentation - Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee Roles and Responsibilities	<b>Project Manager Principal Planner</b>
<b>2.30pm</b>	Report – Next Steps for Appeals and Mediation	<b>Principal Planner</b>
<b>2.45pm</b>	Report – Minor Error Corrections to TTPP Decision Version	<b>Principal Planner</b>
<b>3.00pm</b>	Financial Reports 1 July 2025 to 30 September 2025	<b>Project Manager</b>
<b>3.15pm</b>	Project Manager's Report	<b>Project Manager</b>
<b>3.25pm</b>	In Committee – Confirm confidential Minutes of 24 September 2025	<b>Chair</b>
<b>3.30pm</b>	Meeting ends	

<b>TTPP Committee Meetings for 2025</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Venue</b>
12 December	9.00-12.00	WDC



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF TE TAI O POUTINI PLAN COMMITTEE HELD AT WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 388 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, PAROA, GREYMOUTH FROM 9.00 AM ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2025 CONCLUDING AT 11.43 AM ON 24 SEPTEMBER 2025**

## **Present**

R. Williams (Chairman), Mayor T. Gibson (GDC), Kaiwhakahaere P. Madgwick (Makaawhio), Cr B. Cummings (WCRC), Kaiwhakahaere F. Tumahai (Ngāti Waewae), Cr J. Howard (the appointed alternate representative for BDC, as notified to the Chair), Mayor J. Cleine (BDC), Cr A. Gibson (GDC), Cr P. Haddock (WCRC), Mayor H. Lash (WDC), Cr A. Cassin (WDC)

## **In attendance**

Darryl Lew (WCRC), Jo Armstrong (TTPP Project Manager), Michael McEnaney (GDC), Joanne Soderlund (GDC), Simon Pickford (BDC), Carissa du Plessis (BDC), Rebecca Inwood (BDC), Gina Hogarth (BDC), Lois Easton (Kererū Consultants), Janeen Kydd-Smith (Sage Planning on behalf of WCRC), Lucy de Latour (Wynn Williams), Kate Dickson (Wynn Williams), Olivia Anderson (WDC), Sweta Kumar (WDC), Matt Smith (WCRC), Doug Bray (WCRC), Chu Zhao (WCRC).

## **Welcome**

## **Apologies**

Cr G. Neylon

## **Confirm minutes of the previous meeting held on 26 August 2025**

**Moved** (Chair Williams / Cr Cassin)

That the minutes of the meeting held 26 August 2025 be confirmed.

*Carried*

## **Matters arising from previous meetings**

None raised

## **Decisions Meeting Process**

J. Armstrong explained that this meeting is going to be a multi-day meeting to discuss and make decisions on all of the hearing panel's recommendations. The meetings are set for today, tomorrow, Monday and Wednesday next week. The decision meeting will be on Wednesday next week.

J. Armstrong explained that the Summary Recommendation Reports were not all available by 16 September to be included in the agenda, as some of the hearing commissioners' recommendations reports hadn't been received in time for agenda publication.

## **Moved (Cr Haddock / Cr Gibson)**

1. That TTPP Committee receive the report.
2. That in accordance with clause 4.2 of the Standing Orders, the TTPP Committee agrees that this meeting to make decisions on the recommendations of the Independent Hearing Panel will continue until such time as decisions are made on all recommendations.
3. That in accordance with clause 8.12 of the Standing Orders TTPP Committee resolves to accept late reports as items of business not on the agenda which cannot be delayed.

*Carried*

Against (Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick & Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai) that they had a short time to read reports.

## **Summary of Hearings Recommendations Reports for Information**

L. Easton explained how information will be shared during the multi-day meeting including:

1. An Overview of the Recommendations at a Plan Level
2. Chapter by Chapter Reviews of the Recommendations
  - Identification of any matters of concern to discuss further
  - Confirmation of topics where the Committee is comfortable with recommendations
3. Further discussion as needed based on the early discussions on each topic – particularly where matters of concern were raised.

L. Easton presented the Overview of Recommendations:

1. Recommend changes to be made across all parts of the Plan
2. The overall 'tenor' of the recommendations is:
  - a. Strengthening approach to reverse sensitivity to ensure industry and primary production (mining, farming) are not 'pushed out' by neighbouring development
  - b. Simplifying the Plan and making it easier to use

- c. Providing more explanatory material to help interpretation – definitions, appendices
  - d. Ensuring that Objectives, Policies and Rules sit within the National Direction and are not ultra vires (illegal)
  - e. Keeping the ‘West Coast’ flavour and way of doing things
  - f. As a whole, the recommendations are for a Plan that has less stringent regulation than the Proposed Plan – particularly for urban uses and infrastructure
- L. Easton then moved to the chapter-by-chapter overview of the recommendations.

## **Introduction and General Provisions**

### **Key Hearing Panel Recommendations**

- Retain the Plan and simplify as much as possible within individual topic areas
- Update the explanatory chapters, correct errors, provide more descriptive context
- Add additional definitions that help with interpretation of the Plan e.g. minimise (used widely in policy), site coverage & statutory agency (used in rules)
- Amend some definitions to make them clearer
- Amend and correct the Tangata Whenua Chapter and its appendices

## **Strategic Direction**

### **Key Hearing Panel Recommendations**

- Renaming two of the strategic directions
  - Agriculture – to Rural Production
  - Connections and Resilience – to Climate Change and Resilience
- Redraft the strategic directions so that there are Strategic Objectives and Strategic Policies
  - Many of the objectives were written like policies and covered more ‘policy’ matters
  - Having strategic policies helps in assessing resource consents
- Clarify that Strategic Objectives and Policies have equal weight with other objectives and policies in the Plan
- Include new policies around
  - Climate change and support at a local level for emissions reduction through technology, renewables, low carbon transport
  - Climate change and resilience provided by nature-based solutions

## **Energy, Infrastructure and Transport**

### **Key Hearing Panel Recommendations**

Definition of ‘Regionally Significant Infrastructure’ to Replace ‘Critical Infrastructure’

Used the WCRPS definition as a base but added:

- Turnbull Hydro Power Station and Fox Hydro Power Station,
- Special Purpose Roads as identified on the planning maps; and
- Defence facilities

### **Energy**

- Objectives, Policies and Rules provide for National Grid separately from distribution lines
- Redraft Objectives, Policies to be clearer and more consistent with national direction
- More strongly emphasise renewable electricity generation

- Better provide for day-to-day activities of maintenance, repair, operation and upgrade of electricity transmission, distribution and renewable electricity generation
- Introduce a new Permitted Activity for new electricity distribution lines
- Specifically provide for back-up generators
- Reduce the restrictions on renewable electricity generation
- Introduce a rule that restricts new non-renewable generation

Cr Gibson asked if discouraging development means it's banned.

L. Easton explained that nothing is banned, but it's recommended to be a non-complying activity, therefore requiring a tough resource consent- the activity would have to demonstrate that it was not inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the plan.

### **Infrastructure**

- Redraft Objectives and Policies to be clearer and more consistent with national direction
- Better provide for day-to-day activities of maintenance, repair, operation and upgrade of infrastructure
- Amend rules to make these clearer, easier to understand and address relevant resource management matters

### **Transport**

- Include two new transport policies
- Better provide for day-to-day activities of maintenance, repair, operation and upgrade of transport networks
- Changed approach to high trip generating activities
- Additional standards for sightlines at railway crossings
- Updated transport standards

Cr Haddock asked for clarification on High Trip Generating Activities – limits to movement at mineral & new development areas.

L. Easton said she would bring a response on the following meeting day.

### **Contaminated Land and Hazardous Substances**

Hearing Panel Recommendations:

- Add a policy in relation to used and closed landfills
- Include new definitions of Hazardous Substances and Major Hazard Facility
- Amend policy to make it clear new major hazard facilities should be located outside of natural hazard overlays

### **Historic Heritage**

Definitions, Objectives and Policies

- Amendments to definitions and new definitions – assist in interpretation
- Amendments to Objectives and Policies – main effect is to provide more clearly for regionally significant infrastructure and public safety

Rules

- Make repositioning a Historic Heritage item a Restricted Discretionary Activity (was Controlled)
- Make relocation of a Historic Heritage item a Discretionary Activity (varied in proposed Plan)
- Make demolition or destruction of a historic heritage item or area a Non-complying Activity (was Discretionary)
- List a further seven historical heritage items

A further discussion point was raised regarding whether the demolition of Historic Heritage should be treated as a stringent, non-complying activity.

### **Notable Trees**

Key Hearing Panel Recommendations:

- Better recognise safe operation of infrastructure and energy activities in the Objective, Policies and Rules
- More clearly define role of arboriculturally contractors in certifying activities

### **Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori**

Key Hearing Panel Recommendations:

- Amendments to definitions and new definitions – assist in interpretation
- Inclusion of two new Methods in the Plan to support implementation
- Amendments to Objectives and Policies – to emphasise access to SASM sites is only with landowner consent

Rules:

- Substantial redrafting of Permitted Activity rules to make it easier to understand which SASM site each rule applies to
- Amending the 'approval' process for Permitted Activity to 'certification' – with an additional Schedule outlining how this process will work
- Better providing for quarrying, mineral extraction and infrastructure maintenance, repair and upgrade (reduced stringency)

Mapped Sites

- Removing all SASM sites below Mean High Water Springs
- Correcting the shapes/mapped area where no new landowner is affected
- Not changing shapes/mapped area if it would extend the SASM across an additional landowner's property
- Adding additional SASMs to the Plan where these affect public conservation land or a waterbody only
- Removing two SASM sites where these affect private landowners and the exact location couldn't be clarified at the hearing
- Redrafting Schedule 3 to make it clearer what rules apply which SASM
- Amending the mapped area of the pounamu overlay – essentially pulling it southward

Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick asked if they could change the recommendations.

L. Easton answered no, the committee can say they don't agree, don't accept those recommendations, but the committee cannot substitute their own recommendations. L. Easton suggested accepting the recommendations and appealing could be an option.

Due to mapping errors identified during the discussion, L. Easton suggested triple checking mapping in hard copies.

## **Ecosystems and Biodiversity**

Key Hearing Panel Recommendations:

### Objectives and Policies

- As much as possible, within the scope of submissions, address the requirements of the NPSIB through amendments and new Objectives and Policies
- Also meet the requirements of the WCRPS where these do not conflict with the NPSIB
- Include new definitions and amended definitions to help interpret these and the rules

### Amended Objective ECO- O1

To maintain indigenous biodiversity across Te Tai o Poutini/the West Coast so there is at least no overall loss in indigenous biodiversity, while providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future.

Maintaining indigenous biodiversity requires:

1. the maintenance and at least no overall reduction of all of the following:
  - a. the size of populations of indigenous species;
  - b. indigenous species occupancy across their natural range;
  - c. the properties and function of ecosystems and habitats used or occupied by indigenous biodiversity;
  - d. the full range and extent of ecosystems and habitats used or occupied by indigenous biodiversity;
  - e. connectivity between, and buffering around, ecosystems used or occupied by indigenous biodiversity;
  - f. the resilience and adaptability of ecosystems; and
2. where necessary, the restoration and enhancement of ecosystems and habitats.

### Amended Policy ECO- P1

Identify significant natural areas and include these in Schedule Four through a Plan Change introduced no later than 31 December 2030. The Significant Natural Area identification process will be undertaken in accordance with the criteria and process set out in the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and as outlined in Appendix Thirteen and will include;

- a. Buller and Westland District- wide assessment, identification and mapping of Significant Natural Areas; and
- b. Confirming that areas already identified in Schedule Four, as well as Regionally Significant Wetlands identified in Schedule 1 of the West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan meet the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity criteria.

Mayor Gibson stated that they are waiting for the change to the RMA. She preferred the whole chapter be held or rejected.

Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai agreed with Mayor Gibson and wondered why they can't just stick with the status quo and leave this until the changes are done.

Cr Haddock commented that it is premature to be accepting this one when the central government hasn't come up with their full criteria yet, but the committee should go through and look at all the items and make some notes carefully.

L. Easton pointed out that she wanted to get the committee familiar with all conditions today, they will come back and talk in more detail about where the committee wants to go, and what are the options there.

Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick noted that he doesn't like the recommendation about the vegetation clearance rule, where the hearing commissioners have shrunk it from 5,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 2,000 m<sup>2</sup>.

L. Easton noted that she will bring a late noting paper with some options for recommendations for the committee on this topic, as well as legal advice.

#### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations – Rules

- Split the proposed Plan Permitted Activity rules up on an activity basis to make it easier for plan users
- Redraft the Permitted Activity rules as recommended by the Expert Witness Caucusing
- Reduce the permitted level of clearance to 2000 m<sup>2</sup> (from 5000 m<sup>2</sup>) on any site that has not been assessed for significance
- Have a maximum Permitted clearance of 5000 m<sup>2</sup> on any site that has had a significance assessment – including those already completed in Grey
- Provide exemptions for minimum clearance rules for the national grid, telecommunications, electricity distribution and transmission lines, network utility operations in the main towns, clearance of planted garden vegetation, shelterbelts and plantation forestry

#### Permitted Activity Rules

- Specific Rules for various activities
- Rule 2 – Network Utilities, Renewable Electricity Generation and the National Grid
- Rule 3 – Lawfully Established Activities
- Rule 4 – Urban indigenous vegetation clearance
- Rule 5 – Māori Purpose Zone, Poutini Ngāi Tahu Land, Specified Māori Land
- Rule 6 – other activities, including a general Permitted clearance of non-listed activities
- Rule 7- New Permitted Activity for clearance in an SNA (very limited)

#### Effect of the Recommended Changes to Permitted Activity Rules

In Grey

- Rural landowners outside of ONLs more restricted
- Rural landowners in ONLs less restricted
- Slight reduction in restriction for SNAs

#### In Buller and Westland

- Rural landowners more restricted
- Urban landowners less restricted
- Māori Land less restricted
- Non-listed activities less restricted

A method is recommended to be included which recognizes that once the SNA process is complete a Plan Change to add SNAs is likely to also review the Rules – essentially these are ‘pre-SNA’ rules and could be less stringent once SNAs are identified.

#### Rules where resource consent required:

- Amended to be clearer – and specify the level of ecological assessment required
- Retain the Restricted Discretionary Activity rule for the Grey District (where Permitted standards are not met)

#### Subdivision ‘Bonus Lot’ Rules

- Removing the duplicate set of rules from the ECO chapter and having these only in the subdivision chapter
- Amending matters of control and discretion to be more consistent with other subdivision rules
- Decreasing the minimum size of bonus lots from 4,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 1,000 m<sup>2</sup>
- In practice this means it will be easier to get more bonus lots

#### Maps and Scheduled SNAs

- Reduce the size of four SNAs based on the recommendations of an ecological assessment
- Include Wetlands in the SNA Schedule (the WCRPS says there are SNAs) and show these on the maps

### **Natural Features and Landscapes**

#### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations

- New definition – Minor Upgrade
- Amendments to the objectives and policies to be clearer, better provide for lawfully established buildings and structures, use and development of Māori land and infrastructure
- Addition of a policy and criteria for identifying ONLs
- Amendments to the Rules to be clearer
- Increase in stringency (Controlled to Restricted Discretionary) for Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures and Earthworks not Permitted
- Reduction in stringency for earthworks for mineral extraction where this is in MINZ/BCZ
- Increase in stringency for Plantation Forestry

#### Mapping

- Bridget Gilbert Landscape Architect did comprehensive review of ONL maps

- Panel recommends these are adopted where they reduce the extent of ONLs
- Does mean a reduction in ONL in a range of areas

## Natural Character of Waterbodies

### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations

- Amend definition of riparian margin to exclude wetlands outside of the coastal marine area
- Provide new definitions to help interpretation
- Amend objectives and policies to clarify intent
- Restructure – Policy 5 to public access, vegetation clearance to ECO chapter
- Better provide for more ‘expected’ activities as Permitted Activities
- Align the rules better with the WCRLWP
- Align the rules for Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures with other chapters

## Activities on the Surface of Water

- Minor amendments to clarify objectives, policies and rules
- Make specific provision for the activities of the Māhinapua Aquatic Club
- Provide for maim ai and clarify Permitted rules for whitebait stands
- Standardise matters of discretion with other parts of the plan
- Amend zoning maps so Waterbodies are shown as General Rural Zone

## Noise

### Recommended Amendments

- Changes to clarify Objectives and Policies
- Amend noise standards as per technical expert recommendations – effect is to increase the ‘noisy’ times in some locations, but standardise the rules so they are simpler and easier to monitor
- Significant changes to NOISE – R3 Acoustic insulation
- Replace standard setbacks from State Highways with a modelled Road Noise Overlay – overall effect is reduction in area affected by overlay
- Increase the setback from the rail corridor – but exclude the Hokitika Line
- Identify a Westport Rifle Range Noise Overlay
- Apply the acoustic insulation requirements to additions for sensitive activities not just new buildings
- Provide some guidance in a schedule on how to achieve acoustic requirements

Cr Howard commented that increasing the setback from the rail from 40m to 100m would have a bigger impact on Westport and Buller. Those who are now affected don’t have the ability to input into this plan, because they did not realise they would be affected at the time of submissions. The committee suggested that alterations in the summary report are required.

## Signs

### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations

- Minor changes to the Objective and policies
- New policy for off-site signs for rural and residential areas
- Making the rules clearer
- Reducing a Permitted sign height from 4m to 2.5m
- Additional matters of discretion in rules around sign content and traffic safety

Cr Haddock noted that reducing the Permitted Activity sign height from 4m to 2.5m is nonsense, because people cannot see the sign if a vehicle is parked in front of it. He asked if they could have a minor change.

L. Easton responded that changes cannot be made now, and that a resource consent is required for sign height below 2.5m. Mr McEnaney noted that this rule only applies to temporary signs.

## **Earthworks**

### **Key Hearing Panel Recommendations**

- Clarify that this chapter does not apply to mineral extraction, mineral prospecting or mineral exploration
- Minor amendments to objectives and policies for clarity and consistency
- Amendments to the rules to make these clearer
- Inclusion of an earthwork standard for the Natural Open Space Zone
- Addition of a specific Rule for the National Grid

## **Light**

- Amendments to the Objectives and Policies to better address national direction, improve clarity and interpretation
- Amendments to simplify the Rules and better tailor them to the specific Zones of the Plan in light with recommendations from the technical lighting expert to support the Plan
- Specific lighting standards to protect wildlife from glare and confusion in areas of high natural value and within 15km of the coast
- The understanding of staff is that these requirements are easily met through normal specifications for modern outdoor lighting design

Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai asked why we cannot run a current consent that has been granted to test the 15km rule. The committee was interested in how bright 1 LUX is. These queries will be addressed on the following meeting day.

## **Temporary Activities**

- Minor wording changes to clarify the Objectives and Policies
- Specific reference in Rule TEMP – R1
- Deleting the requirement that temporary buildings ancillary to a construction or demolition activity be located on the same site
- Providing for temporary activities associated with Māori Purpose activities on Māori Purpose Zoned land

- Including additional matters of control in TEMP-R7

## **Subdivision**

### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations

- Amend Objectives to more strongly emphasise regionally significant infrastructure and protect highly productive land
- Amend Policies to more clearly outline requirements in relation to overlay areas, strengthen recognition of infrastructure need, outline how structure plans work for Future Urban Zone, address reverse sensitivity and specifically reference highly productive land
- Amend Rules to clarify the circumstances for Permitted Activities and ensure compliant building platforms for Controlled activities
- Add a range of additional matters of control and discretion
- Separate out national grid corridor into separate rules from subdivision for other infrastructure
- Clarify the subdivision standards for infrastructure

## **Financial Contributions**

### Key Recommendations

- Removal of Objective/Policy/Rule reference to offsetting and compensation – these are addressed in the ECO rules
- Amend the policies and rules to make it clearer how financial contributions are assessed and calculated and when they are able to be taken

## **Public Access**

### Key Recommendations

- Add a new policy to make it clear that it is intended to provide for public access to and along the coastal marine area and other waterbodies but that public safety is a key consideration

L. Easton noted that the first two parts of the Plan have been discussed, zones and variations will be discussed tomorrow.

Moved (Cr Gibson / Mayor Gibson) that the committee adjourns the meeting until 9am on 19 September 2025 at Arahura Marae.

Meeting was adjourned at 4.08pm



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

THE MEETING WAS RECONVENED AT ARAHURA MARAE,  
1 OLD CHRISTCHURCH RD, ARAHURA  
AT 9.00AM ON 19 SEPTEMBER 2025

## Welcome

## Apologies

Cr B. Cummings, Cr G Neylon

## Open Space Zones

Key Hearing Panel Recommendations:

- Amendments to Policies to specifically identify mineral extraction, prospecting and exploration electricity transmission and distribution and renewable electricity generation
- Including a new policy and method specifically around the reclassification of stewardship land
- Change definition of camping grounds to include ancillary activities and exclude nohoanga

Natural Open Space Zone (National Parks)

- Temporary Camping Grounds, Residential Activities and Retail Activities move from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary Activities
- Adding an 'Any Other Activity' Discretionary Activity Rule

Open Space Zone (most DOC and Council Reserve Lands)

- Adding references to the Rifle Range Protection Area
- Deleting duplicate rules
- Changing escalation rule for Park Facilities and Furniture to Restricted Discretionary (from Controlled) and providing for impacts on the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor to be assessed
- Amending the 'Any Other Activity' rule to be a Discretionary Activity rather than Non-complying

Sport and Recreation Zone

- Deleting duplicate rules
- Changing escalation rule for Park Facilities and Furniture to Restricted Discretionary (from Controlled) and providing for impacts on the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor to be assessed
- Amending the 'Any Other Activity' rule to be a Discretionary Activity rather than Non-complying

## Zoning Maps

- Rezoning 7 parks to more appropriate types of Open Space Zone
- Rezoning 4 privately owned properties that were incorrectly zoned Open Space Zone

## Industrial and Commercial Zones

### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations – Commercial Zones

- Addition of a new objective specifically around managing adverse effects on activities within and adjoining commercial areas
- Addition of a new objective that outlines the purpose of the zones
- Amendments to other objectives and policies to better recognise cycling, and functional and operational needs
- Restructuring and rewording Permitted Activity rules to make them clearer and simplifying some rules
- Amending the 'Any Other Activity' rule to be a Discretionary Activity rather than Non-complying
- Increasing the height limit in the Commercial Zone to 15m
- Including a 1.5m setback from the Railway Designation

### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations – Industrial Zones

- Deleting the requirement for stormwater treatment and associated Policy
- Amendments to better target management of visual amenity and zone boundary effects
- Restructuring rules to make them clearer – separating buildings from activities and simplifying some rules
- Amending the 'Any Other Activity' rule to be a Discretionary Activity rather than Non-complying

## Residential Zones

### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations:

#### General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone

- Amending the density provisions within Buller District to provide for a maximum of two residential dwellings per allotment
- Specifically providing for accessory buildings within the Permitted Activities
- Simplifying some rules
- Amendments so that only homestay visitor accommodation is Permitted in Westland District
- Reducing the stringency of the rule for fences, walls and retaining structures not meeting Permitted Activity standards from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary

#### Large Lot Residential Zone

- Specifically providing for accessory buildings within the Permitted Activities
- Simplifying some rules
- Reducing the stringency of the rule for fences, walls and retaining structures not meeting Permitted Activity standards from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary

## Zoning Maps

- Rezoning the Alma Road terrace area in Westport to a mix of zones
- Rezoning the road reserve adjacent to the O'Connor home in Westport to General Residential Zone (from General Rural)
- Amending 4 neighbourhood Centre Zone areas in Reefton to General Residential Zone
- Rezoning a property at Sturge Street Cobden to General Rural Zone (from General Residential)
- Amending the Kaiata Park Zoning in relation to the outline development plan area
- Rezoning 5 properties on the Seaview Terrace in Hokitika adjacent to Silver Fern Farms from General Residential to Rural Lifestyle Zone
- Rezoning the Medium Density Residential Zone along the Revell St beach frontage in Hokitika to General Residential Zone

## General Rural, Rural Lifestyle Zones, Settlement Zone and its Precincts

### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations – Objectives and Policies:

- Overall stronger emphasis on supporting primary production values
- New objective specially about reverse sensitivity Additional policy specifically about the General Rural Zone and its importance for primary production
- Additional policy to support a new Westport Radio Mast Overlay
- Amendments to policies to make it clearer which zone(s) they apply to
- Specifically recognizing regionally significant infrastructure as being appropriate in these zones

### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations – Rules

- Including a setback from the rail corridor
- A maximum size for a permitted building of 1000m<sup>2</sup> or 500 m<sup>2</sup> for a residential building in the General Rural Zone
- Requirements for firefighting water to be provided for residential and pakakāinga development
- Simplifying and standardising rules in line with other zones
- Deleting rules for relocated buildings
- Changing home business Permitted Activity standard to number of off-site workers rather than a traffic generation standard
- Deleting duplicate rules
- Amending the 'Any Other Activity' rule to be a Discretionary Activity rather than Non-complying

### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations – Highly Productive Land Precinct

- Replacement of the Highly Productive Land Precinct as mapped with the areas within Land Use Capability 3 on the West Coast in line with the NPS – HPL
- Alongside this the Objectives and Policies are recommended to be amended to better reflect the requirements of the NPS-HPL

Ms Easton commented that this changes the nature of the Precinct from one focussed primarily on retaining the productive capacity of large farming units to one focussed on retaining the intrinsic productive values of better-quality land. The main impact would be seen in Buller and Grey.

## Key Hearing Panel Recommendations – Rezoning

- Correcting a range of zoning errors and making minor zoning changes sought by landowners
- Rezoning 13 ha of land at Waipuna as Rural Lifestyle
- Rezoning 135 Ruatapu Road as Rural Lifestyle
- Rezoning the CMP Koriri Site, T Croft, Hindeman Sawmill and International Panel and Lumber Sites as Light Industrial Zone

## Settlement Zone Key Recommendations:

### Policy amendments to:

- Recognise Jackson Bay Port and to support visitor and worker accommodation at Punakaiki in the Coastal Settlement Precinct
- Recognise industrial, commercial and rural activities and infrastructure in the Rural Residential Precinct
- Restructuring, simplifying and standardising some rules to make them easier to interpret and consistent with other zones
- Better reflecting local differences across the three districts in the rules
- Specifically requiring provision for firefighting water
- Recognising the Westport Radio Mast and the potential risk of electromagnetic coupling with tall buildings.

## Key Hearing Panel Recommendations – Rezoning:

- Significant rezoning at Moana North – from Settlement Zone Rural Residential Precinct to a mix of zones within an Outline Development Plan  
-This has also involved drafting specific standards across several zones and the subdivision rules to support the development plan
- Rezoning land at Te Kinga from Settlement Zone Rural Residential Precinct to Settlement Zone

## Special purpose Zones

### Airport Zone

- Addition of Haast Airfield into the zone – including Noise Contours and Flight Path Overlay
- New policy and Permitted Activity for events at Greymouth Aerodrome

### Hospital Zone

- Addition of Ngakawau Medical Centre
- Allowing helicopter landing at all sites

### Port Zone

- New Policies to better recognise as regionally significant infrastructure and protect them from reverse sensitivity

#### Stadium Zone

- Including educational facilities as Permitted

#### Future Urban Zone

- Amending policy to clarify how structure plans work

#### Māori Purpose Zone

- Amendments to policies and rules consistent with other zones
- Changes to the definitions of iwi/Papatipu Rūnanga Management Plan, Papakāinga and Papatipu Rūnanga
- Clarifying the alternative regulatory pathway of no iwi/ Papatipu Rūnanga Management Plan is in place
- Rezoning Lake Moeraki Reserve as Māori Purpose Zone

#### Scenic Visitor Zone

- Amendments to the policies and rules to better recognise worker and visitor accommodation and Poutini Ngāi Tahu values
- Standardisation of some rule wording and matters of discretion to be similar to other zones

#### Franz Josef Gondola Proposal

- Providing for this possibility through a Precinct in the Natural Open Space Zone with a specific policy and Discretionary Activity Rule, and some definition changes

### Designations

#### Key Hearing Panel Recommendations:

- Include changes sought by Requiring Authorities to correct schedule and maps
- Fix Minor Errors
- Include a change to the NZTA Designation for their State Highways
  - A detailed schedule and list of affected parcels was provided by NZTA and a mapping tool developed to show the change
  - Most additions to the designation are within a road parcel
  - If the Committee adopts the recommendation to alter the designation these become recommendations to NZTA – they are the decision-making authority on this matter

#### NZTA Designation

The main changes to the NZTA Designation affecting land not currently within a road parcel are:

- North of Punakaiki (National Park)
- North of Rapahoe (layby)
- Ahaura – in the location of the new bridge
- Taramakau River – in the location of the new bridge, with designation being uplifted from the railway bridge

## Variation 1 – Activities on the Surface of Water

L. Easton noted that five submissions were received on Variation 1 and all of them were in favour, and the recommendation from the panel was to accept the variation.

L. Easton presented follow-up information on matters raised in the meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup>. The following information was discussed:

- Transport Chapter – High Trip Generating Activities
- Outstanding Natural Landscapes – Number of private properties affected
- Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies- changes in bridge width allowances
- Activities on the Surface of Water- Whitebait Stands in the Arahura and Makaawhio Rivers
- Noise – implications of the changes in Noise Limit

Moved (Mayor Lash / Mayor Cleine) that the committee adjourns the meeting until 22 September 2025 at West Coast Regional Council.

Meeting was adjourned at 2.25pm



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

THE MEETING WAS RECONVENED AT WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL,  
388 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, PAROA, GREYMOUTH  
AT 8.00AM ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2025

## Apologies

Cr Neylon

Lois Easton presented the key commissioners' recommendations for four topics.

## Coastal Environment

L. Easton noted that the changes from the hearing panel recommendations impacted the:

- Extent of the Coastal Environment as set out in (very wide) criteria in the NZCPS
- Extent of the Coastal Environment – reduces area around Hokitika and Greymouth but increases at Westport
- TTPP rules which apply to the non-urban areas – predominantly Open Space and Recreation and Rural Zones, rather than the urban areas.

Recommendations:

- NZCPS sets up a dual framework – areas of significant natural character (our Outstanding and High Coastal Natural areas) and the rest of the coastal environment
- Like the Landscape topic a review of the extent of the OCNC (Outstanding Coastal Natural Character) and HCNC (High Coastal Natural Character) was undertaken
- Similarly, the commissioners have recommended that this review be adopted – but only where it reduces the extents of these areas
- Additionally specific areas submitted on are also recommended to be removed from HCNC or OCNC – Areas in Cobden, North Beach, Rapahoe, Karamea, Hannah's Clearing, Okuru, Chesterfield Terraces

Hearing Panel Recommendations

- Better recognise regionally significant infrastructure and mineral extraction in objectives – but also cumulative adverse effects
- Better align the policies with the NZCPS requirements
- Effect is to strengthen policy in relation to outstanding areas, but be less restrictive in areas of high natural character

- Policies also amended to better support expansion of settlements and regionally significant infrastructure
- A range of rule changes to implement the policies – key effect is a reduction in stringency of rules outside of outstanding areas and an increase in stringency within outstanding areas.
- Most significant change is new building setback of 25m from the coast for Permitted Activities – was not in proposed Plan – but currently wider setbacks than this are required in the three Operative Plans

## Natural Hazards

Key Hearing Panel Recommendations:

Fundamental Changes Recommended

- Removal of hazard overlays for which there is insufficient technical and planning justification;
- Simplification of the frameworks – including the objectives, policies and rules and particularly as related to the earthquake hazard overlays; and
- Using consistent terms throughout the chapter in order to assist plan users.

Mapping

- Delete three overlays – maps and all associated policies and rules
- Remove the Flood Susceptibility overlay from Haast, Karamea, Inangahua, Ngakawau, Mokihinui, Waimangaroa, Waitakere River and the Waiho River – now only a subdivision specific rule – Flood Alert Overlay
- Reduce the extent of the Land Instability overlay at Granity, Ngakawau, Hector and Punakaiki
- Reduce the extent of the Coastal Alert Overlay north of Hector, at Mitre 10 Greymouth and at 1298D Kumara Junction Highway
- Change the approach to mapping and rules for the Earthquake Hazard Overlay
  - Delete the 20m, 50m, 100m, 150m, and 200m buffers
  - Replace with two overlays – Earthquake Severe and Earthquake Susceptibility
  - Base the mapping on the latest most accurate GNS data
- Introduction of New Definitions to reflect risk
  - Hazard Sensitive Activities,
  - Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities
  - Less Hazard Sensitive Activities
- Objectives and Policies
  - Substantial redrafting to focus on a risk-based approach
  - Reframe to reflect the new definitions and more standardised approach to the rules
- Rename 3 coastal hazard overlays
  - Coastal Severe = Coastal erosion and inundation overlay
  - Coastal Alert = Coastal inundation overlay 1
  - Coastal Setback = Coastal inundation overlay 2
- Rename earthquake hazard overlays
  - Earthquake Susceptibility
  - Earthquake Severe

Rules for Flood and Coastal Hazards

- Substantial reduction in complexity by standardising the approach to levels of risk

- Retaining the approach of allowing a longer time to rebuild than set in the RMA if a building is destroyed
- Setting minimum floor levels in Permitted Activities, incl. 1m of sea level rise in coastal hazard areas
- If minimum floor levels are not met in Non-complying for Hazard Sensitive Activities
- Generally providing for Less Hazard Sensitive Activities as Permitted without restriction
- Redrafting the Flood Severe, Flood Susceptibility and three Coastal Hazard Rules to be simpler – general effect is similar to proposed Plan but easier to follow
- Adding a new Restricted Discretionary Activity for a dwelling on a vacant site

#### Land Instability Rules

- Redrafting to reflect the new definitions
- Requirement for restricted discretionary consent added for additions not just new build

#### Earthquake Hazard Rules

- Redrafting to reflect two levels of risk, not five and use the new definitions
- TTPP staff assessment is that the rules are not more restrictive but are much easier to follow

#### Hokitika and Westport Hazards

- Redrafting to reflect the new definitions. Similar effect to the proposed Plan.

Ms Easton commented that overall the changes:

- Make the natural hazard rules less stringent for some lower risk hazards
- Standardise the approach to serious natural hazards – with an increase in stringency in 1 rule
- Are much simpler and easier to follow
- Are more consistent across the chapter

### **Mineral Extraction**

Key Hearing Panel Recommendations:

Rezoning the following MINZ areas as General Rural Zone

- MINZ 1 – Barrytown
- MINZ 2 – Dunganville
- MINZ 5 – Kumera Greenstone
- MINZ 9 – Ianthe Forest
- MINZ 11 – Rimu Channel
- MINZ 12 – Ross Gold Fields
- MINZ 17 – Karamea Quarry
- Buller Coalfield – MINZ 22 Te Kuha

Amend MINZ Zone boundaries

- MINZ 8 Camelback Quarry – increase the area of MINZ to include all quarrying activity
- MINZ 10 Okuru Quarry- increase the area of MINZ to include all quarrying activity
- MINZ 14 Giles Creek- reduce the area of MINZ to only include the area covered by mining authorisations
- MINZ 16 Karamea Lime Quarry – increase the area of MINZ to include all quarrying activity

MINZ and Buller Coalfield Zone (BCZ)

- Amendments to the Objectives and Policies to clarify the purposes of the zones and where they have been applied
- Deleting MINZ-P5 and BCZ-P5 as this matter is dealt with in the ECO chapter
- Make new mineral extraction a Restricted Discretionary Activity (was Controlled)
- Simplify MINZ – R1
- Delete MINZ – R2 as unnecessary
- MINZ – R3 – include ancillary mineral processing as a Permitted Activity

Overall, the intent for very enabling zones is retained.

Mineral Extraction in the RURZ Rural Zones (General Rural, Rural Lifestyle, Settlement) and OSZ – Open Space Zone

- Minor amendments to Objective and Policies – specifically providing for prospecting and exploration
- Amend the Permitted Activity Rule for mineral prospecting and exploration so is a maximum 5,000m<sup>2</sup> earthworks/site/year
- Amending the Restricted Discretionary Activity Rule for Mineral Extraction to a full Discretionary Activity
- In the General Rural Zone retain the Permitted Activity for small scale mineral extraction

### Outstanding Matters

- Recommendations are ‘tidy ups’ of some areas
- The main recommendation relates to the recession rules – recommendations are both a standardisation of these and an overall reduction in stringency – targeting the rule rather than broad brush
- Additional amendment to the definition of papakāinga to reflect caucusing agreement between Poutini Ngāi Tahu and Te Tumu Paeroa
- Also recommend that staff be able to fix typographic errors in the recommended amendments

### Issues Raised by Committee

Signs – reduction in height from 4m to 2.5m

- Only applies to temporary signs and community signs

Light

- Is measured at the site boundary not at the location where the light is emitted
- The rules require all light to be directed towards the area within the site that is intended to be illuminated
- Examples of different brightnesses of light
  - Good moonlight is 0.5 Lux
  - Rural roads are commonly lit at 5 lux
  - Urban roads are 15 – 30 lux
- ‘Normal’ outdoor lighting has a colour corrected temperature of 2700 – 3000 k

135 Ruatapu – Ross Road Rezoning

- Small area of Coastal Hazard Alert (Coastal Inundation Overlay 1) but has no other overlays – but is adjacent to SASM 111 and SASM 119
- Is 42.3 hectares so rezoning as Rural Lifestyle could result in 42 lots being created

#### Airport Zone – helicopter controls

- No controls within the zone rules
- Airport Zone noise levels are set based on meeting the Noise Contours in the Plan (regardless of aircraft type)

#### Designations

- St Mary's Church Hokitika – why removed?
- Ministry of Education sought removal as is not part of the integrated school

Chair Williams suggested adjourning the meeting until 8am on 24 September at Grey District Council.

**Moved** (Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick / Cr Haddock)

Meeting adjourned at 11.15am.



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

THE MEETING WAS RECONVENED AT GREY DISTRICT COUNCIL,  
105 TANUI STREET, GREYMOUTH  
AT 8.15AM ON 24 SEPTEMBER 2025

Welcome

Apologies

Cr Neylon

Chair Williams explained that the focus of this session of the meeting was to consider the resolutions circulated in the agenda paper *Decisions on Submissions and Adoption of Decisions on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan, Variation 1 and Variation 2*.

**Resolutions passed by TTPP Committee**

**Decisions on Submissions and Adoption of Decisions on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan, Variation 1 and Variation 2**

**Moved** (Mayor Cleine / Cr Haddock)

*That the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee:*

- 1. Receives the Recommendation reports and appendices of the Independent Hearing Panel on the provisions of and submissions on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (including Variations 1 and 2).*
- 2. Notes the contents of this report*

*Carried*

**Recommendations for individual topics 1 to 26**

**Variation 1**- Accepted- Moved (Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai / Cr Haddock)- Carried

**Variation 2** – Accepted- Moved (Mayor Cleine / Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai) – Carried

**Introduction and General Provisions**- Resolves to correct any typographic and numbering errors in the Hearings Panel recommendation reports appendices prior to making changes to the Decisions Version of the Plan (Recommendation 4)- Accepted – Moved (Cr Haddock / Cr Gibson) – Carried

Mayor Gibson left the meeting from 8.28am to 8.33am

**Strategic Direction** - Accepted – Moved (Mayor Lash / Cr Howard) – Carried

**Energy, Infrastructure and Transport** – Accepted – Moved (Mayor Cleine / Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai) – Carried

**Contaminated Land and Hazardous Substances** – Accepted – Moved (Cr Haddock / Chair Williams) – Carried

**Historic Heritage** – Accepted – Moved (Mayor Lash / Cr Cassin) – Carried

**Notable Trees** – Accepted – Moved (Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick / Cr Howard) – Carried

**Sites of Significance to Māori (SASM)** – Accepted – Moved (Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai / Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick) – Carried

Cr B. Cummings – arrived at 9.10am

### **Ecosystems and Biodiversity**

Mayor Gibson requested a motion that the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter be rejected and deferred, and an extension requested from the Minister of the Environment until there is clarity around RMA reform in this area. Cr Gibson supported Mayor Gibson.

Cr. Haddock was against deferring the whole chapter because it would have an effect on the whole plan, but he supported the clarification on items such as SNAs until the committee gets the direction from the central government. Mayor Cleine, Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick, Mayor Lash & Cr Cassin agreed with Cr. Haddock.

Mayor Gibson's moved *That the decision on the Ecosystems and Biodiversity Chapter are deferred and that Committee seek approval from the Minister for the Environment to extend the timeframe for this decision. The reasons for this decision are to enable the Committee to gain greater certainty about the changes to the Resource Management Reform and the future identification of Significant Natural Areas.*

Moved (Mayor Gibson / Cr Gibson), against (Cr Haddock, Mayor Lash, Mayor Cleine, Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick, Cr Howard, Chair Williams, Cr Cassin, Cr Cummings), resolution failed.

After the discussion, the committee returned to the recommended resolutions.

- Adopts the Independent Hearings Panel recommendation report as the Committee's decision on the provisions of and submissions on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (including Variations 1 and 2), in accordance with clauses 10(1), 10(2) and 10(4)(aaa) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, as relates to all parts of Te Tai o Poutini Plan except in relation to the dates within Policy ECO – P1.
- Adopts the following wording for Policy ECO – P1

**ECO – P1** *Identify significant natural areas and include these in Schedule Four through a Plan Change introduced no later than ~~August 2028~~ **31 December 2030**. The Significant Natural Area identification process will be undertaken in accordance with the criteria and process set out in the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and as outlined in Appendix Thirteen and will include:*

1. ~~Grey, Buller and Westland District - wide assessment, identification and mapping of Significant Natural Areas, which will be undertaken and completed by June 2027;~~ and
  2. *Confirming that areas already identified in Schedule Four, as well as Regionally Significant Wetlands identified in Schedule 1 of the West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan meet the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity criteria.*
- Notes the following reasons for the Decision on Policy ECO – P1:
    - a. That the Grey District Council has already undertaken an SNA identification process.
    - b. That there is insufficient time to do the SNA assessment in accordance with the principles in the NPSIB Clause 3.8 (2) by June 2027
    - c. That the Committee considers that the date in the recommendation is not practicable or reasonably achievable
  - That amending the timeframe in ECO-P1 will still 'give effect to the NPSIB as soon as reasonably practicable', as required under the NPSIB Clause 4.1(1).
  - That the RPS does not specify a date by which areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna must be identified in district plans
  - That amending the timeframe in ECO-P1 will still give effect to Objective 1 and Policy 1(a) in Chapter 7 of the RPS; and
  - That scope for this change is provided by the following submission points
    - Peter Langford S615.041
    - Karamea Lime Company S614.041
    - John Brazil S360.093
    - Koiterangi Lime Company S577.028, S577.032
    - Catherine Smart-Simpson S564.025
    - William McLaughlin S567.169
    - Steve Croasdale S516.032

- Geoff Volckman S563.021
- Chris and Jan Coll S558.086
- Chris J Coll Surveying S566.086
- Laura Coll McLaughlin S574.086

Moved (Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick / Cr Howard)

Against (Mayor Gibson, Cr Gibson, Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai)

*Carried*

The meeting moved to public excluded session for the Committee to take legal advice at 9.18am

Cr Haddock left the meeting from 9.18am to 9.21am

Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick left the meeting from 9.30am to 9.32am

Moved (Mayor Cleine/ Chair Williams) that the committee readmit the public.

The Public were readmitted to the meeting at 9.45am

Following a break the meeting resumed at 10.18am.

**Natural Features and Landscapes** – Accepted- Moved (Cr Cassin / Cr Cummings)

Against (Mayor Gibson, Cr Gibson)- Carried

**Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies** – Accepted – Moved (Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick / Cr Gibson)- Carried

**Subdivision** – Accepted – Moved (Mayor Gibson, Cr Haddock)- Carried

**General District Wide Matters Part 1** – Accepted – Moved (Mayor Lash / Mayor Cleine)- Carried

**Signs** – Accepted – Moved (Chair Williams / Cr Haddock)- Carried

**Noise** – Accepted- Moved (Mayor Lash / Mayor Cleine), Against (Cr Howard)- Carried

Cr Gibson left the meeting from 10.41am to 10.43am

**Open Space Zones** – Accepted – Moved (Mayor Cleine / Cr Haddock)- Carried

**Industrial and Commercial Zones** – Accepted – Moved (Mayor Gibson / Cr Cummings)- Carried

**Residential Zones** – Accepted – Moved (Cr Cassin / Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai)- Carried

**Special Purpose Zones** – Accepted – Moved (Cr Cummings / Mayor Lash)- Carried

**Settlement Zone and its Precincts** – Accepted – Moved (Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai / Chair Williams)- Carried

**General Rural and Rural Lifestyle Zones** – Accepted – Moved (Mayor Cleine / Cr Howard)- Carried

**Designations** – Accepted – Moved (Cr Haddock / Cr Gibson)- Carried

**Natural Hazards including Coastal Hazards** – Accepted – Moved (Cr Cummings / Chair Williams)- Carried

**Coastal Environment** – Accepted – Moved (Chair Williams / Mayor Cleine), against (Cr Gibson)- Carried

**Mineral Extraction** – Accepted – Moved (Mayor Cleine / Cr Cummings), against (Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai)- Carried

**Outstanding Matters** – Accepted – Moved (Cr Haddock / Mayor Lash)- Carried

#### **Resolution to adopt the Independent Hearings Panel recommendation report**

Adopts the Independent Hearings Panel recommendation report as the Committee’s decision on the provisions of and submissions on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (including Variations 1 and 2), in accordance with clauses 10(1), 10(2) and 10(4)(aaa) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, as relates to all parts of Te Tai o Poutini Plan except in relation to the changes within Policy ECO – P1 pursuant to Resolution 4.

**Moved** (Mayor Cleine / Cr Haddock)

*Carried*

Following the resolutions made on the individual Plan topics, the remaining recommended resolutions from the staff report *Decisions on Submissions and Adoption of Decisions on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan, Variation 1 and Variation 2* were made.

Mayor Cleine suggested that the remaining recommendations be moved as one. This suggestion was unanimously accepted by TTPP Committee.

Text which is highlighted in yellow denotes changes to the original recommendations made in the report.

Resolves to correct any typographic and numbering errors in the Hearings Panel recommendation reports appendices prior to making changes to the Decisions Version of the Plan **including correcting the name of Aotearoa me te Waipounamu.**

Resolves to publicly notify the Committee's decision on 10 October 2025, in accordance with Clause 10(4)(b) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Resolves to correct minor errors and make changes of minor effect in accordance with Clause 16(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA, as identified in the Independent Hearing Panel's Recommendation reports.

Directs staff to alter the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions and mapping application to reflect the Independent Commissioners recommended changes (subject to the further amendments made to Policy ECO – P1 by Resolution 4) and to correct minor errors and changes of minor effect in accordance with clause 16 (2) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Notes that adopting the Recommendation reports of the Independent Hearing Panel as the Committee's decision means the Committee also adopts the independent hearing panel's reasons for those decisions on submissions as set out in the recommendation reports (subject to the reasons provided in Resolution 5 in relation to the further amendments to Policy ECO – P1)

Notes that adopting the Recommendation reports of the Independent Hearing Panel as the Committee's decision does not mean the Committee has formed a view on possible future plan changes mentioned in the reports and recommendations.

Adopts and notifies the recommendations of the Independent Hearing Panel on the notices of requirement included in the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan as the Committee's recommendations on the notices of requirement, in accordance with clause 9 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Moved** (Mayor Cleine / Cr Haddock)

*Carried*

L. Easton listed areas identified by staff and the Committee as requiring monitoring by the incoming TTPP Committee following local body elections and recommended:

That the Committee provide close monitoring of the implementation of the Plan in the following matters, with consideration for the development of future Plan Changes:

- NOISE – R3 and acoustic requirements particularly as relates to the Railway Corridor
- Bridge widths Permitted rules in the Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies Chapter
- Outstanding Natural Landscapes and effects on private landowners
- Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity and effects on private landowners
- Coastal Environment – and in particular Outstanding Coastal Natural Character and High Coastal Natural Character
- Mineral Extraction – volume of Permitted Activity for mining in the General Rural Zone
- Historic Heritage
- Natural Hazards in Greymouth
- Coastal Natural Hazards north of Hector and south of Hannah's Clearing

- Flood hazards in the Flood Alert areas e.g. Seddonville, Mokihinui, Karamea and Franz Josef
- Light and Rule 4A in relation to restrictions on lighting within 15km of the coast
- Firefighting water and the implementation of the requirements of FENZ in this regard

**Moved** (Chair Williams / Mayor Gibson)

*Carried*

J. Armstrong spoke about next steps, explaining that hard copies of the TTPP Decision Version and the online plan and maps will be available on the 10<sup>th</sup> of October. The appeals period then begins from that date for 30 working days. Following that, the staff and legal team will be analysing the appeals received and working with Environment Court staff to set up mediations.

Meeting ended at 11.43am.



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

Prepared for: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee

Prepared by: Jo Armstrong, Project Manager

Date: 19 November 2025

Subject: **Te Tai o Poutini Plan – Committee Roles and Responsibilities**

---

## SUMMARY

This report provides information on the legal establishment of TTPP under an Order in Council in 2019, and the processes that have been undertaken to reach public notification of the TTPP decisions version on 10 October 2025.

Explanation about the current appeals stage and the Committee's role both during appeals and in the future are also discussed.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee receive the report.

Jo Armstrong

**Project Manager**

## **BACKGROUND**

1. In 2015 some members of the West Coast community made a local government reorganisation application to the Local Government Commission. The Commission then ran a 'regional efficiency' collaborative process with the four West Coast councils and other parties to determine the best option.
2. In 2018 the Local Government Commission released its proposal, and an Order in Council detailing the formal reorganisation scheme was signed by the Governor General on 17 June 2019, coming into force on 19 July 2019. The content of the Order in Council is reproduced at Appendix 1.

## **OUTCOMES OF REORGANISATION**

3. The main outcome of the Order in Council is that there must be a combined district plan for the whole of the West Coast, replacing the current Buller, Grey and Westland District Plans.
4. Clause 6 of the Order in Council transfers the obligations to prepare, hear, adopt, monitor and amend the Plan from the district councils to West Coast Regional Council. This is followed in clause 8(3) by a direction that the regional council must then delegate these obligations to Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee.
5. The order establishes a permanent joint decision-making Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP) Committee, which cannot be discharged by its member bodies.
6. The membership of TTPP Committee is also directed to be the Mayor or Chair and one other councillor from each of the four West Coast councils, representatives from the two Poutini Ngāi Tahu rūnanga and an independent Chair.
7. As the TTPP Committee is not a financial body, the Order in Council directs that the responsibility for raising a regional rate to fund TTPP falls to the West Coast Regional Council (WCRC). This means that WCRC employs TTPP staff and administers contracts on behalf of TTPP Committee.

### **Appointing Committee members**

8. A Deed of Agreement (Appendix 2) has been signed between the six Committee parties. Point 13 in the Deed of Agreement sets out the process and timing for appointing members to Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee following an election, as follows:  
"The four West Coast councils will appoint their second elected member to Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee (i.e., other than the regional council chairperson/district mayor) at their first meeting after each triennial election. The councils will appoint, if necessary, a replacement member for a particular triennium as soon as practically possible."
9. It has been the practice of previous TTPP Committee's to also identify an alternate or replacement member, should one become necessary, at the first meeting following a triennial election.
10. The Order in Council and Deed of Agreement also identify the meeting quorum as one representative of four of the six parties comprising membership of the Committee.

## **ROLES IN THE TTPP PROCESS**

### **Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee**

11. Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee is charged with preparing, approving, monitoring the implementation of and amending a combined West Coast district plan, Te Tai o Poutini Plan. It has full decision-making powers to achieve these objectives.
12. The Committee are responsible for providing best practice governance which ensures high quality district planning outcomes for the West Coast.
13. As elected officials, Committee members also have responsibilities to represent their communities' interests, keep them informed about TTPP decisions, and to advocate with central government and local entities to help support and resource TTPP.

### **Independent Committee Chair**

14. The Committee Chair is a full voting member of the Committee.

15. The Order in Council states that the inaugural Chair should remain in office until the Plan becomes operative.
16. After a competitive selection process run by members of the TTPP Committee Rex Williams was appointed as the independent Committee Chair. The role of Chair is key to achieving Committee effectiveness. To achieve this the Chair should:
  - guide the committee to ensure high quality governance processes are followed to achieve best possible district planning outcomes for the West Coast.
  - meet with the Project Manager before each meeting to discuss and agree the business for the meeting.
  - take ownership of, and have final say in, the decisions about what business will be pursued at any particular meeting.
  - ensure that after each meeting appropriate reports (minutes) are prepared
  - act as the Committee's media contact
  - encourage good, open relationships between the Joint Committee, and the Project team and advisors.

### **TTPP Planning Team**

17. The TTPP Planning team comprises a project manager, Jo Armstrong, and Principal Planner, Lois Easton who both work part time on TTPP as required. Both are contracted for specified roles during the ongoing planning process, including managing the upcoming appeals process and representing TTPP Committee at mediation and court proceedings throughout 2026.
18. Project manager responsibilities also include oversight for project outcomes including budgets, management of the project team, responding and reporting to TTPP Committee and undertaking stakeholder communications and engagement.
19. A permanent TTPP Senior Planner, Doug Bray, and fixed term Planning Technician, Chu Zhao, complete the TTPP Planning Team. These roles have been crucial during the hearings, although both currently work part time on TTPP and are otherwise employed by WCRC teams, with their time being charged to those cost centres.
20. All TTPP staff time is charged to the project only as work is required.

### **Technical Advisory Team**

21. A Technical Advisory Team (TAT) comprising senior planners from each of the four councils and Poutini Ngāi Tahu has been the technical support advising the Committee during Plan development and the hearings process. They have worked with the planning team to form provisions that reflect the needs of the individual communities while delivering outcomes that work across the entire West Coast.

### **Steering Group**

22. Under the Deed of Agreement, a Steering Group comprised of the four council Chief Executives plus two Runanga Chairs, is established to support the work of the TAT and provide operational and planning advice to the TTPP Project Manager.

### **West Coast Regional Council**

23. As well as having responsibility for raising an annual rate to fund development and eventual maintenance of TTPP, WCRC also provide staff input to TTPP including IT, Communications, Administration, Finance, and GIS. TTPP pay WCRC an annual overhead fee for this and other assorted support.
24. A separate TTPP budget is maintained, in which the overhead is included as a monthly expense. TTPP financial reports are presented at each monthly meeting of the TTPP Committee.

## FORMAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT PLAN MAKING PROCESS

### Resource Management Act

25. The Resource Management Act (RMA) is the primary legislation under which all councils are required to have an operative district plan. The overriding purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The RMA sets out rules that must be given effect to by regional and district plans, and National Planning Standards dictate how a plan must look, including chapters required and naming conventions standardized across the country.

### RMA Schedule 1 Consultation Process

26. Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act sets out the formal statutory process for preparation, change and review of plans by local authorities. The process is very prescriptive. The timeline below shows the progress of TTPP development through the Schedule 1 process.



### Development of Te Tai o Poutini Plan

27. The TTPP Team spent just over three years developing the Proposed TTPP. During that time numerous workshops with councillors, council staff, stakeholder groups and the public were held.

28. A lot of engagement took place from March 2019 once the Project Manager was employed. Many face- to-face meetings were held with stakeholder groups to inform them of the TTPP process and to build relationships. This was ongoing throughout Plan development.
29. In 2020 the planners travelled throughout the region holding public drop-in sessions to raise awareness about the TTPP planning process and answer any questions. Meetings and workshops continued throughout 2020 and 2021 to get broad input on Plan provision development.
30. In January 2022 the TTPP Exposure Draft was published as a way of getting feedback to inform the Proposed Plan provisions. This was followed in April by eight drop-in sessions on a Draft Coastal and Land Instability Hazards Document.
31. A series of consultation meetings and drop-in sessions for the Exposure Draft were undertaken over late February as well as a series of online Zoom topic related workshops. There was a high degree of interest and engagement from both stakeholders and the wider public. The drop-ins were attended by 102 people, and 73 stakeholders attended the topic related workshops.
32. In general, the planning team made minor and technical updates to the draft Plan and took information on larger and more contentious topics back to the Committee for decisions.
33. A variety of research was contracted to inform the development of numerous sections of the Plan. Technical reports both existing and produced from this research are available on the TTPP website [Technical Reports - Te Tai o Poutini Plan | West Coast District Plan](#) .

### **Public Notification of the Proposed TTPP**

34. On 14 July 2022 the proposed Plan was publicly notified. A proposed Plan includes the objectives, policies and rules that the decision-making body (TTPP Committee) recommend.
35. As versions of TTPP are notified the planning team ensures that engagement requirements, including the availability of appropriate documents, are met as required by RMA Schedule 1. All necessary actions at notification including having a public notice in local papers, sending information to all ratepayers, contacting identified landowners with new provisions as stipulated in Schedule 1, and informing local iwi, some government Ministries and bordering local authorities were undertaken.

### **From Proposed Plan Notification to TTPP Decisions Version Notification**

36. Notification of the Proposed TTPP marked the beginning of the formal RMA Schedule 1 process. This included:
  - A required period for receiving public submission and further submissions
  - Submissions and further submissions were summarised and notified.
  - Planners reviewed each submission point and made recommendations as to whether change was required in the Plan.
  - Some Pre-hearing submitter meetings were held.
  - To avoid any perception of bias TTPP Committee decided that independent hearing commissioners would be nominated by the district councils and Poutini Ngāi Tahu to hear TTPP submissions. The 5 strong hearings panel, including an independent Chair selected by Committee and Steering Group members, was approved by TTPP Committee in 2023.
  - The TTPP Committee Notified Variations 1 and 2 to the proposed TTPP in 2024.
  - Submitters who requested to be heard in support of their submission attended hearings where Hearing Commissioners considered the submissions and any evidence supporting the submissions.
  - Hearing Commissioners prepared their recommendations in a report to TTPP Committee in September 2025.
  - TTPP Committee made its decision on the Commissioner recommendations, and this Decision Version of the Proposed TTPP was publicly notified on 10 October 2025.

## PROCESS MOVING FROWARD

37. TTPP is currently in the appeals stage, which opened when the decision version of the Plan was notified on 10 October 2025. The Appeals period is open for 30 working days, closing on 25 November 2025.
38. An application to extend the appeals period by two weeks has since been received by the Environment Court.
39. Submitters now have the right to lodge appeals on Plan decisions with the Environment Court for any matter or content raised in a submission.
40. Although reform of the RMA is currently underway, the Government has directed that all notified plans, such as TTPP, must continue with the Schedule 1 processes. This stage of the Schedule 1 process includes:
  - Mediation meetings being held between TTPP staff and appellants to try to resolve appeals. TTPP Committee have an important role in directing staff on what position to take in mediation. The role of staff is to advise the Committee on risks regarding appeals, and the legal and financial implications of their decisions.
  - Any unresolved appeals following mediation will proceed to Court for resolution.
  - Parts of the Plan that are 'beyond challenge' (because no appeals were lodged on them) are treated as operative even if the whole plan is not fully operative.
  - The Proposed Plan becomes fully operative after all appeals have been resolved.
  - Throughout this process, and also once the TTPP becomes fully operative, the ongoing consenting and compliance functions for TTP remain the responsibility of individual district councils.

This is a long process, and the plan is not expected to be fully operative until at least 2027.

## TIME REQUIREMENT FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS

41. Over the three years of Plan development the time commitment for Committee members was high. The collaborative process was new, and there were large volumes of papers to be read for discussion at monthly meetings.
42. During the hearings process the number and length of meetings were reduced. This was followed by an increased time commitment during decision-making in September 2025.

## Timeline for Committee Input Post 2025 Elections

43. Main activities which are anticipated for the Committee over the next three years include:
  - Regular meetings to update progress, set budgets and review financial statements etc.
  - Confidential workshops to set the Committee's position for negotiations at appeals mediation and court proceedings
  - Commencing amendments to TTPP as either plan changes or variations. According to cl13.2 of the Order in Council, *The Tai Poutini Plan Committee may agree that the relevant West Coast district council or councils, or their district or districts, is to be responsible for funding work relating to a particular amendment to the operative combined district plan which will have only, or predominantly, a localised impact.*
  - Some anticipated Variations include fixing any mistakes in the plan that were not submitted on, updating the Historic Heritage Schedule, and a plan change for a Greymouth Hazards Area which includes both flooding and coastal hazards.

An indication of the Committee’s role and time required for these activities is produced in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 TTPP Committee Activities 2025-2028**

Activity	Committee Role	Time Commitment
TTPP Meetings	Reading agenda papers and attendance at meetings to discuss and make decisions on staff recommendations	2-4 hours bi-monthly
Mediation Workshops	For each appeal read the TTPP Chapter and the appeals received to understand the changes sought. Discuss options and advise staff on the position to take at mediation/hearings. Be available during mediation/hearings to further direct staff as necessary.	8 hours per topic appealed
Plan amendments	Additional reading and meetings as amendments occur. Papers and decision making will be at TTPPC meetings. Accredited TTPP Committee members may be called upon to hear submissions and write recommendations for decision-making.	2 hours bi-monthly  As hearing commissioners several weeks of work per plan change or variation.

- 44. The Committee will be involved in assessing appeals in late 2025/early 2026, with both mediation and plan amendments expected to begin in 2026.
- 45. Once the Plan is fully operative, the Committee’s role will be focused on implementation and review of the Plan including deciding on rolling plan changes.

## **Appendix One:**

### **Local Government Reorganisation Scheme (West Coast Region) Order 2019 Order in Council**

At Wellington this 17th day of June 2019 Present:

THE RT HON PATSY REDDY, GNZM, QSO, Governor-General

Presiding in Council

Pursuant to section 25(4) and Part 4 of Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002, the Governor-General, acting by and with the advice of the Executive Council and at the request of the Local Government Commission, makes the following order.

Order

#### **1. Title and Purpose**

(1) This order is the Local Government Reorganisation Scheme (West Coast Region) Order 2019.

(2) This order:

(a) Gives effect to the reorganisation scheme adopted by the Local Government Commission on 23 May 2019 which completes the final reorganisation proposal given effect to by the Local Government Reorganisation (West Coast Region) Final Proposal Order 2018 made on 5 November 2018;

(b) is prepared under Part 4 of Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002; and

(c) is prepared to promote good local government in a way that meets the needs and preferences of affected communities.

#### **2. Commencement**

This order comes into force on the date that is 28 days after the date on which the order is notified in the New Zealand Gazette.

#### **3. Interpretation**

The following terms have their meaning in this order as follows:

**Act** means the Local Government Act 2002

**combined district plan** means a combined district plan for the Buller, Grey and Westland districts under section 80 of the RMA

**party** means each of the four West Coast councils, Te Rūnanga o Ngati Waewae and Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio

**RMA** means the Resource Management Act 1991

**four West Coast councils** means the Buller, Grey and Westland district councils and the West Coast Regional Council

### **CONTENTS OF REORGANISATION SCHEME FOR THE WEST COAST**

#### **4. Affected local authorities continue in existence**

As provided for in the Local Government Reorganisation (West Coast Region) Final Proposal Order 2018:

(a) The four West Coast councils as presently constituted and with their current boundaries, continue in existence; and

(b) The four West Coast councils as referred to in clause 4(a), with the exception of their district plan statutory obligations transferred by clause 6 of the Local Government Reorganisation (West Coast Region) Final Proposal Order 2018, continue to have all their current roles, powers and responsibilities by or under law.

## **5. Areas of interest of iwi and hapū in West Coast**

As provided for in the Local Government Reorganisation (West Coast Region) Final Proposal Order 2018 there are no changes to the extent to which areas of interest for Ngai Tahu and Te Rūnanga o Ngati Waewae and Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio in particular, are included in Buller, Grey and Westland districts.

## **6. Transfer of Statutory Obligations**

By clause 6 of the Local Government Reorganisation (West Coast Region) Final Proposal Order 2018:

a. The obligations of each of Buller, Grey and Westland district councils under section 73 and Schedule 1 of the RMA for there to be a district plan at all times for each district and for the preparation, notification, adoption, periodic amendment and review of the district plan, are transferred to the West Coast Regional Council; and

b. The transferred obligations under subclause 6(a) for the preparation, notification, adoption, periodic amendment and review of new district plans will be met by the preparation, notification, adoption, periodic amendment and review of a combined district plan for the Buller, Grey and Westland districts under section 80 of the RMA; and

c. Subclause 6(b) will not prevent the preparation, notification, adoption, periodic amendment and review of a document that meets the requirements of both the combined district plan and a regional plan, or a regional policy statement, or both, under section 80 of the RMA.

## **7. Further provisions of Reorganisation Scheme**

The following provisions give effect to the Reorganisation Scheme which completes (and is prepared and issued in accordance with) the final proposal given effect to by the Local Government Reorganisation (West Coast Region) Final Proposal Order 2018.

## **8. Establishment of Tai Poutini Plan Committee**

(1) A joint committee is created between the four West Coast councils and local iwi known as the Tai Poutini Plan Committee.

(2) The Tai Poutini Plan Committee is a permanent joint committee, and is not subject to powers of discharge or reconstitution by the four West Coast councils under the Act.

(3) The West Coast Regional Council must delegate to the Tai Poutini Plan Committee its combined district plan obligations under clause 6(1) of the Local Government Reorganisation (West Coast Region) Final Proposal Order 2018.

(4) The purpose and terms of reference for the Tai Poutini Plan Committee are to:

a. prepare and notify a combined district plan;

b. hear and consider (including through subcommittees as necessary and appropriate) all submissions received on the draft combined district plan;

c. adopt a final combined district plan;

d. monitor implementation of the combined district plan and the need for any amendments; and

e. undertake amendments and reviews of the combined district plan, or ensure these are undertaken, as required.

(5) The initial membership of the Tai Poutini Plan Committee, until at least such time as the combined district plan becomes fully operative, comprises:

a. an independent chairperson;

b. the chairperson of West Coast Regional Council and one other elected member from and appointed by West Coast Regional Council;

c. the mayor of Buller District and one other elected member from and appointed by Buller District Council;

d. the mayor of Grey District and one other elected member from and appointed by Grey District Council;

e. the mayor of Westland District and one other elected member from and appointed by Westland District Council;

f. one representative appointed by Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae; and

g. one representative appointed by Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio.

#### **9. Independent chairperson of Tai Poutini Plan Committee**

(1) There shall be an independent chairperson of the Tai Poutini Plan Committee who is a permanent member of the Committee.

(2) The first independent chairperson of the Tai Poutini Plan Committee appointed by the Local Government Commission is Robert Rex Williams.

(3) Subject to clause 9(5), the term of appointment of the first independent chairperson of the Tai Poutini Plan Committee is until at least such time as the combined district plan becomes fully operative.

(4) Any subsequent appointment of an independent chairperson and their term of appointment will be made by the Tai Poutini Plan Committee.

(5) Clauses 1 to 4A of Schedule 7 of the Act apply to the Tai Poutini Plan Committee in relation to the independent chairperson as if it were a local authority.

#### **10. Sub-committees of Tai Poutini Plan Committee**

(1) In the conduct of the Tai Poutini Plan Committee business as set out in this order, the Tai Poutini Plan Committee may appoint subcommittees, including to hear and consider submissions received on the draft combined district plan.

(2) Any such subcommittee is appointed for the purpose and for the period identified by the Tai Poutini Plan Committee and is then discharged.

(3) The Tai Poutini Plan Committee may appoint to any subcommittee a person who is not a member of a local authority if, in the opinion of the Committee, that person has the skills, attributes or knowledge that will assist the work of the subcommittee.

#### **11. Procedure for Tai Poutini Plan Committee**

(1) To the extent consistent with the provisions of this order:

a. The Tai Poutini Plan Committee must adopt its own standing orders governing matters relating to Tai Poutini Plan Committee meetings and how these are conducted, and clauses 19, 20, 25A, 27 and 28 of Schedule 7 of the Act apply to the Tai Poutini Plan Committee as if it were a local authority; and

b. The Tai Poutini Plan Committee may from time to time enter and, as necessary, amend a further deed of agreement governing the workings of the Committee including (but not limited to) matters such as meeting venue, media publicity regarding Committee decision-making, and provision of administrative support for the Committee.

(2) At the meetings of the Tai Poutini Plan Committee:

a. the quorum consists of at least one member of four of the six parties to the Tai Poutini Plan Committee;

b. voting is to be by majority of the members in attendance (whether in person or by audio link or audiovisual link);

c. each party to the Tai Poutini Plan Committee may, for a specified meeting or meetings, appoint a deputy member in place of (as appropriate) that district's mayor, the chairperson of West Coast Regional Council or a member they have otherwise appointed who may perform all the functions, responsibilities, duties, and powers of the member for that meeting or meetings. The party must give notice to the other members (or the chairperson) of the appointment of a deputy for a specified member prior to the meeting or meetings concerned;

d. in any case where the independent chairperson is unable to attend a meeting or meetings, the Tai Poutini Plan Committee may, for the specified meeting or meetings, appoint one of the members present to preside at that meeting who may perform all the functions, responsibilities, duties, and powers of the independent chairperson for that meeting; and

e. the independent chairperson does not have a casting vote.

(3) Except as otherwise provided in this order, the provisions of Schedule 7 of the Act will apply (with all necessary changes) to the Committee and its meetings as if the Tai Poutini Plan Committee were a joint committee constituted under that Schedule 7.

## **12. Technical Advisory Team**

(1) The West Coast District Plan Technical Advisory Team (the Technical Advisory Team) is established and will provide technical advice to the Tai Poutini Plan Committee as requested by the Committee.

(2) Membership of the Technical Advisory Team will be agreed by the Tai Poutini Plan Committee as needed from time to time following nominations by the parties comprising the Committee.

## **13. Funding**

As provided for in the Local Government Reorganisation (West Coast Region) Final Proposal Order 2018:

(1) Subject to clause 13(2), the costs for there to be a combined district plan and for preparing, notifying, adopting, periodically amending and reviewing the combined district plan will be funded by the West Coast Regional Council by a rate set in relation to all rateable land within the West Coast Region; and

(2) The Tai Poutini Plan Committee may agree that the relevant West Coast district council or councils, or their district or districts, is to be responsible for funding work relating to a particular amendment to the operative combined district plan which will have only, or predominantly, a localised impact.

14. Clauses 45 and 46 of Part 4 of Schedule 3 of the Act not to apply

As provided for in the Local Government Reorganisation (West Coast Region) Final Proposal Order 2018 clauses 45 and 46 of Part 4 of Schedule 3 of the Act do not apply to this order.

Dated this 17th day of June 2019.

MICHAEL WEBSTER, Clerk of the Executive Council.

## Appendix 2 Te Tai o Poutini Plan Deed of Agreement



BULLER DISTRICT COUNCIL

GREY DISTRICT COUNCIL

WESTLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

TE RŪNANGA O NGĀTI WAEWAE

TE RŪNANGA O MAKAAWHIO

### Te Tai o Poutini Committee Deed of Agreement

THIS DEED is made this 30 day of July 2020

## **Parties**

**BULLER DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**GREY DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**WESTLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**TE RŪNANGA O NGĀTI WAEWAE**

**TE RŪNANGA O MAKAAWHIO**

## **Background**

In October 2018 the Local Government Commission issued a final reorganisation proposal relating to district plan responsibilities on the West Coast. It involves transfers of statutory obligations and a delegation to a joint committee, comprising members of the Buller, Grey and Westland district councils, the West Coast Regional Council and local iwi, to be responsible for preparing and approving a new combined district plan for the West Coast. This initiative followed receipt by the Local Government Commission of a local government reorganisation application and then extensive consultation and investigation work on the West Coast from 2015 to 2018.

In November 2018 an Order in Council was signed giving effect to the Commission's proposal. This enabled a transition period to take place for making a number of detailed decisions prior to the joint committee beginning its work on the combined district plan. This work has been completed and the contents of the required reorganisation scheme agreed. The reorganisation scheme was given effect to by a further Order in Council on 17 June 2019.

In addition to the reorganisation scheme, the parties have agreed to the contents of a further document (Deed of Agreement) to assist the parties meet their formal obligations set out in the reorganisation scheme.

This Deed of Agreement sets out both the main provisions of the reorganisation scheme as well as the further detailed and procedural matters agreed by the parties on how the joint committee will operate.

## **Provisions of reorganisation scheme**

### **Transfer of district plan obligations**

1. The obligations of each of Buller, Grey and Westland district councils, under section 73 and Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, for there to be a district plan at all times for each district and for the preparation, notification, adoption, periodic amendment and review of these district plans, are transferred to West Coast Regional Council.
2. The transferred obligations for the preparation, notification and adoption of new district plans and for the periodic amendment and review of those plans will be met by the preparation, notification, adoption, periodic amendment and review of a combined district plan for the Buller, Grey and Westland districts under section 80 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
3. For the avoidance of doubt, clause 2 will not prevent the preparation, notification, adoption, periodic amendment and review of a document that meets the requirements of both the combined district plan and a regional plan or regional policy statement, or both, as authorised under section 80 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

### **Delegation of transferred obligations to joint committee**

4. There is to be a permanent joint committee between all four West Coast councils and local iwi (the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee).
5. The West Coast Regional Council is to delegate to Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee the district plan obligations transferred to it.

### **Role and membership of joint committee**

6. The purpose and terms of reference for Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee are to:
  - a) prepare and notify the proposed combined West Coast district plan (combined district plan)
  - b) hear and consider (including through subcommittees as necessary and appropriate) all submissions received on the proposed combined district plan
  - c) adopt a final combined district plan
  - d) monitor implementation of the combined district plan and the need for amendments
  - e) undertake amendments and reviews of the combined district plan, or ensure these are undertaken, as required.

7. The initial membership of Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee, to at least such time as the combined district plan becomes fully operative, is to comprise:
  - a) an independent chairperson
  - b) the chairperson of West Coast Regional Council and one other elected member from and appointed by West Coast Regional Council
  - c) the mayor of Buller District and one other elected member from and appointed by Buller District Council
  - d) the mayor of Grey District and one other elected member from and appointed by Grey District Council
  - e) the mayor of Westland District and one other elected member from and appointed by Westland District Council
  - f) one representative appointed by Te Rūnanga o Ngati Waewae
  - g) one representative appointed by Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio.
8. The first appointment of the independent chairperson of Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee will be made by the Local Government Commission on the recommendation of the transition board, with all subsequent appointments made by the committee.

#### **Technical Advisory Team**

9. A technical advisory team is to provide technical advice to Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee.
10. The membership of the technical advisory team will be agreed by Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee following nominations by the parties comprising the committee.

#### **Funding**

11. Subject to clause 12, the costs for there to be a combined district plan and for preparing, notifying, adopting, periodically amending and reviewing the combined district plan will be funded by West Coast Regional Council through a rate set in relation to all rateable land within West Coast Region.
12. Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee may agree that the relevant district council or councils, or their district or districts, is to be responsible for funding work relating to a particular amendment to the operative combined district plan which will have only, or predominantly, a localised impact.

## **Further provisions relating to operation of joint committee**

### **Membership and meetings of Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee**

13. The four West Coast councils will appoint their second elected member to Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee (i.e. other than the regional council chairperson/district mayor) at their first meeting after each triennial election. The councils will appoint, if necessary, a replacement member for a particular triennium as soon as practically possible.
14. Responsibility for hosting Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee meetings will rotate around the six parties making up the committee.
15. The quorum for Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee meetings will comprise one representative of four of the six parties comprising the committee.
16. Media publicity relating to Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee meetings will be the responsibility of the chairperson but be undertaken after liaising with the regional council chairperson and district mayors as appropriate. Proposed media releases will generally be an agenda item for committee meetings.
17. Remuneration of council members of Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee will be the responsibility of each council. Remuneration of the chairperson and iwi representatives will be agreed by Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee and be funded by West Coast Regional Council.
18. Administrative support for Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee and its meetings will be provided by West Coast Regional Council in conjunction with the organisation hosting a particular meeting as agreed by the parties.

### **Membership of West Coast District Plan Technical Advisory Team**

19. Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee will be supported by a technical advisory team comprising planners with expertise from across the four councils and local iwi.
20. The team will work with the project manager to ensure that Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee receives technical support throughout the process. The team's contribution in kind to the district plan development process will be supported by their reporting organisation.
21. Each party to this agreement is expected to make contributions of staff time and technical expertise "in kind".

### **Steering group**

22. In addition to the technical advisory team, a steering group comprising the council chief executives and Iwi representatives will meet regularly with the project manager to ensure the project is supported and progressing as planned.

### **Administration of existing district plans**

23. The Buller, Grey and Westland district councils will continue to administer and be responsible for their own district plans in accordance with the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991, until such time as there is an operative combined West Coast district plan.



SIGNED by  
**WESTLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
by its authorised signatory  
in the presence of:

)   
) \_\_\_\_\_  
) Authorised Signatory  
)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness signature

Edith Bretherton  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness name

Senior Planner  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness Occupation

Greymouth  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness Town of Residence

SIGNED by  
**WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL**  
by its authorised signatory  
in the presence of:

)   
) \_\_\_\_\_  
) Authorised Signatory  
)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness signature

Edith Bretherton  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness name

Senior Planner  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness Occupation

Greymouth  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness Town of Residence

SIGNED by  
**TE RŪNANGA O NGATI WAEWAE**  
by its authorised signatory  
in the presence of:

)  
)   
) Authorised Signatory  
)



Witness signature

Edith Bretterton

Witness name

Senior Planner

Witness Occupation

Greymouth

Witness Town of Residence

SIGNED by  
**TE RŪNANGA O MAKAAWHIO**  
by its authorised signatory  
in the presence of:

)  
)   
) Authorised Signatory  
)



Witness signature

Edith Bretterton

Witness name

Senior Planner

Witness Occupation

Greymouth

Witness Town of Residence



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

Prepared for: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee  
Prepared by: Lois Easton, Principal Planner  
Date: 19 November 2025  
Subject: **Te Tai o Poutini Plan – Next Steps for Appeals and Mediation**

---

## **SUMMARY**

This report provides information for Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee on the next steps for the planning process to finalise Te Tai o Poutini Plan.

## **GLOSSARY FOR THIS REPORT**

**Proposed Plan** means the version of the Plan that was publicly notified for submissions on 14 July 2022.

**Decision Plan** means the version of the Plan released including the changes in response to submissions as outlined in the Decisions of the TTPP Committee. The Decision Plan was publicly notified on 10 October 2025.

**Legal Effect** means that the provision must be complied with. All rules in the TTPP Decision Plan have legal effect.

**Operative** means that the TTPP has become operative in terms of clause 20 of Schedule 1 or under section 86F of the RMA. Once operative, it replaces all parts of the previous district plans for Buller, Grey and Westland.

**Part Operative** means that parts of the TTPP (which have not been appealed or where appeals have been settled) are operative. For those matters only the TTPP is considered for resource consent applications. For matters under appeal, the relevant parts of the operative Buller, Grey and Westland District Plans are also considered.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Committee receive the report.

Lois Easton

**Principal Planner**

## **BACKGROUND**

1. Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP) was publicly notified as a Proposed Plan on 14 July 2022.
2. Hearings of submissions were heard by independent hearings commissioners over 2023-2025 with the final hearing – Variation 2, held in March 2025.
3. Recommendations on the submissions and amendments to TTPP were presented to the Committee in September 2025.
4. The Committee adopted the Recommendation reports from the Hearings Panel (except in relation to one policy) and made Decisions on TTPP.
5. The Decision Plan was publicly notified on 10 October 2025.
6. Submitters to TTPP are able to lodge appeals and the appeals period ends on 24 November 2025. This date may be extended by two weeks.
7. Appeals must relate to the submission(s) made by the appellant and the decisions on that/those submission(s). Appeals on the whole plan (e.g. “get rid of the plan”) are not legally possible.
8. Following the submission period, a 15 working-day period is provided whereby other people can become “s274 parties to the appeal”. This means a party can join an appeal – in support or opposition to it. They must have submitted on that matter, be a local authority, or be a person/entity that has an interest in that matter “greater than the general public”.
9. No new points of appeal can be raised when a s274 party joins an existing appeal and those parties can only address issues within the scope of the original appeal. If the party was a submitter, they can also only address matters within the scope of their original submission.
10. The appeals process is run by the Environment Court but assisted by TTPP staff. Once appeals are received, the Environment Court normally orders mediation, to avoid the need for unnecessary court hearings.
11. Mediation is run by the Environment Court, who will appoint a mediator and set the location. However, this will be held on the West Coast.
12. The TTPP legal counsel will work with the Environment Court staff to seek a process that is likely to resolve appeals as quickly and easily as possible.
13. The TTPP Committee is the respondent to the appeals as it is the Committee’s decisions that have been appealed.

14. As the respondent, staff and legal counsel representing the TTPP Committee will participate in the Court ordered mediation.
15. Only appellants/s274 parties (and their legal counsel) and the TTPP Committee staff representatives (and their legal counsel) are able to be present at the Environment Court mediation – this process is not open to participation by the general public.
16. Any matter not resolved at mediation will proceed to Environment Court hearing, most likely in late 2026 or early 2027.

### **THE TTPP COMMITTEE'S ROLE AS RESPONDENT TO THE APPEALS**

17. The Decisions on TTPP are the TTPP Committee's Decisions, hence the TTPP Committee is the respondent on all appeals.
18. The Committee will therefore agree a position that they wish to put forward in response to each of the appeals.
19. Appeals will be broken up into points and grouped (like submissions were) and mediation held around topics. Ideally simple matters will be dealt with first, so that as many of the appeals as possible can be settled as quickly as practicable.
20. For each topic, staff will prepare a "position paper" for the Committee, outlining the matters appealed, and suggesting an approach, and bottom-line positions for the Committee.
21. This will be presented to and discussed in a confidential session of the Committee with final positions agreed by the Committee, prior to mediation.
22. The position will need to be that of the TTPP Committee – not the individual Council's and Rūnanga who may be appellants or s274 parties in their own right.
23. If Councils or the Rūnanga appeal or become s274 parties their representatives will not be able to participate in the decisions on the TTPP Committee position in relation to that matter (as they cannot be both appellant and respondent). Legal advice around this has been provided by the Committee's legal counsel Wynn Williams and is appended to this report. Staff at the Councils and Rūnanga will support Committee members through the complexities of this process should this situation arise.
24. Staff and TTPP legal counsel will represent the Committee's position at the mediation sessions.
25. Because mediation requires the agreement of all parties in a timely manner, delegation of agreement to the mediated outcome will need to be provided to a

staff member, or sole member of the Committee, who will be available during the mediation period. This could be, for example to the Chair of the Committee. The person will have to be able to physically sign the mediation agreements, preferably on the same day as any mediation agreement is reached.

- 26. If no agreement can be reached at mediation the matter will proceed to Environment Court hearing.
- 27. TTPP staff and legal Counsel will be required to support the Environment Court hearing process, which can be costly, so as a general approach it is considered preferable to try and resolve as much as possible at mediation.
- 28. At this stage it is expected that the Environment Court mediation might commence in the second quarter of 2026 and be completed within 3-6 months. This means any Environment Court hearings on matters that have not been able to be resolved at mediation might occur at the end of 2026/early 2027.

**CURRENT LEGAL STATUS OF TTPP**

- 29. Currently, all TTPP objectives, policies and rules have legal effect. However, because TTPP is not yet fully operative, the existing operative Buller, Grey and Westland District Plans also have to be considered during resource consent decision making, but the “weight” of the policy assessment goes onto TTPP. Matters such as rezoning are able to be implemented using zones as updated in the TTPP Decision Plan.
- 30. When the appeals period is ended, any part of TTPP not appealed will become operative and the former Buller, Grey and Westland District Plans will no longer be considered in relation to that matter. TTPP at that time will become a “part operative” Plan.
- 31. Staff will produce an annotated version of TTPP which identifies what parts of TTPP have been appealed and what parts are operative.
- 32. The table below sets out the different planning environment that is in place now, when appeals are lodged and when appeals are settled.

<b>Decisions Plan in place (until the end of the appeal period)</b>	<b>When the appeal period is closed</b>	<b>When the appeals are settled.</b>
<b>All</b> rules in the TTPP have legal effect, as per the	<b>Some</b> rules that have not been appealed will be considered beyond	<b>All</b> rules in the TTPP will be operative.

Decisions version of the text.	challenge and treated as operative.	
<b>All</b> rules in the TTPP are required to be complied with.	<b>Some</b> rules that have been appealed will continue to have legal effect, as per the Decision version, and are required to be complied with.	
<b>All</b> rules of the existing operative Buller - Grey - Westland District Plans are still operative and required to be complied with.	<b>Some</b> rules of the existing operative Plans will be replaced by the TTPP provisions that are treated as operative.  <b>Some</b> rules corresponding to those appealed will continue to apply.	The Buller, Grey and Westland District Plans will no longer apply.

## **NEXT STEPS**

33. Appeals on TTPP close on or within 10 working days of 24th November 2025 and the closing date for s274 parties to join (or oppose) appeals is 15th December or 19 January 2026 if an extension is granted by the Environment Court.
34. Staff will provide information to the next TTPP Committee meeting on 12 December outlining what matters have been appealed.
35. Position papers on each topic will be brought to the Committee at its February and March 2026 meetings.
36. Environment Court ordered mediation is expected to be undertaken in the second quarter of 2026.



### MEMORANDUM

**Date:** 13 August 2025  
**To:** Jo Armstrong  
**From:** Lucy de Latour | Kate Dickson

---

#### Options to address TTPP Committee position during mediation

1. The hearings of submissions on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (pTTPP) have concluded, and a decision on the Hearing Panel's recommendations is anticipated ahead of this year's local body elections.
2. A question has been raised regarding the TTPP Committee's position during potential mediations, in the event that appeals are lodged in the Environment Court following the TTPP committee's decisions on the Independent Hearing Panel recommendation. We understand that the TTPP Committee and the Buller, Grey and Westland District Council as well as the West Coast Regional Council and Ngāi Tahu lodged submissions both in respect of the pTTPP as notified and its respective variations.
3. The West Coast has led the way in developing a combined district plan through the joint TTPP Committee. While this has strengthened the decision making process, it raises questions for the Committee members during the appeals process. In particular, you have asked:
  - (a) How the councils / Poutini Ngāi Tahu that are members of the TTPP Committee could make a decision to appeal the Committee's decision on the pTTPP; and
  - (b) How the Committee can determine its position on the appeals if members of the Committee are also representatives of parties that have appealed the decisions on the pTTPP.

#### Executive summary

4. Because the TTPP Committee's membership comprises of representatives from each of the four West Coast councils, along with Ngāi Tahu, a TTPP Committee member participating in any decision of each individual organisation to lodge an appeal on the pTTPP could give rise to an allegation of a conflict of interest, predetermination or bias.
5. Likewise, those members participating in future decisions of the TTPP Committee on those appeals (or similar appeal points) may also give rise to a conflict of interest or allegation of predetermination or bias. Any such allegation creates a risk of legal challenge against the relevant decision (which would be brought by way of judicial review).
6. A detailed summary of the principles of decision making (including conflicts of interest and bias) is included in Appendix 1 to this advice.
7. While issues of conflict of interest and bias are ultimately for individual members to consider, and to decide how to respond (e.g. by standing aside from decision-making if necessary) our recommendation is that where one of the organisations represented on the TTPP Committee may wish to appeal (or join another appeal on) the decisions on the pTTPP, is that either:
  - (a) Those members recuse themselves from any discussions or votes on whether to appeal the TTPP Committee's decision, or join another party's appeal; or
  - (b) That organisation delegate the power to decide whether to appeal against the TTPP Committee's decision / join an appeal to staff, rather than this decision being made at a council / whole organisation level.
8. Both options ensure that members of the TTPP Committee are not seen to be appealing their own decision or making decisions in their own cause. With appropriate confidentiality procedures, these options will also help ensure that members can continue to participate in

future decision making on the TTPP Committee (other than on their own organisation's, or related, appeal points).

9. Although Poutini Ngāi Tahu decisions are not subject to judicial review as the councils are, a similar approach should be taken for separation in discussions and decision-making by the iwi representatives in respect of any prospective appeal. This will reduce the risk of members not being able to participate in future TTPP Committee decisions on appeals and the associated legal risks of those decisions.
10. Matters of conflict will also need to be considered when forming the TTPP Committee's position for mediation (e.g. deciding what parts of an appeal are or are not negotiable through mediation). The options available are likely to include:
  - (a) The TTPP Committee forming the position on the appeals and for mediation, with the representatives of the appellant member organisation recusing themselves (standing aside) from any discussion or voting on matters associated with their organisation's appeal (noting that this requirement for recusal may extend to other related appeal points); or
  - (b) Delegating the full decision-making on mediation to staff or the Committee's independent chair.
11. Both options limit bias which protects the TTPP Committee. Therefore, the preferred option will likely depend on which is more practical.
12. In our experience, option (a) maintains the TTPP Committee's ability to discuss and consider the position it wants for the objectives, policies and rules of the pTTPP, as the outcome from mediation. Further, this option means members who are part of organisations with appeals do not have to be entirely excluded from any further decision-making on the pTTPP; they will only have to stand aside from discussions on the topics relevant to their organisation's appeal points. There will still need to be some delegations to staff to manage the mediation process, for reasons of efficiency.
13. We recommend that a similar approach be taken in relation to any decision of the TTPP membership organisation to join other appeals as a s274 party.
14. Given that the role of the TTPP Committee is to represent the member organisations, and the potential need to stand aside from future decision-making on the TTPP Committee, lodging an appeal or s274 notice may dilute the organisation's role in that regard. Accordingly, we strongly encourage each of the organisations to consider whether it would be desirable for them to lodge or join an appeal. If all member organisations lodge an appeal or join an appeal as a section 274 party, this means that it may only be the independent chair of the TTPP Committee that is able to represent the TTPP Committee in setting this desired outcome through mediation (at least in relation to certain topics).
15. Our detailed advice follows.

#### **Should the member Councils or organisations lodge or join appeals?**

16. At the outset, we note that member Councils or other organisations that are represented on the TTPP Committee should carefully consider whether it would be desirable to appeal the decision made on their submissions (or join another party's appeal).
17. As outlined later in this advice, lodging an appeal may limit the ability of member Councils or member organisations to be represented on the TTPP Committee in respect of setting positions on mediation. Councils / member organisations (and individuals) will need to carefully consider whether their interests are best progressed by:
  - (a) lodging / joining appeals if dissatisfied with the decision, or
  - (b) being represented on the TTPP Committee on the appeals on an ongoing basis, as in some situations the two interests may be incompatible.

#### **Risks to TTPP Committee of bias or perceived bias**



18. As the pTTPP proceeds beyond decisions and onto determination of appeals, the risk of bias and perceived bias may occur in situations where:
  - (a) The Councils (and Poutini Ngāi Tahu) that are represented on the TTPP Committee seek to appeal the decision of the TTPP Committee on their submissions (or join another party's appeal); and
  - (b) The TTPP Committee needs to take a position on a member Council or iwi appeal.
19. For example, this could arise if the TTPP Committee makes determinations on outcomes that they would like from mediation which, if known, could benefit member appellant's negotiations.
20. We understand that the member Councils and iwi have all made submissions on the pTTPP. There will accordingly be an appeal right to the Environment Court that arises from the TTPP Committee making decisions on the submissions on the pTTPP.<sup>1</sup> In the event that a member Council or iwi wishes to lodge an appeal against the TTPP Committee's decision, this may give rise to a conflict of interest or perception of bias for the representative on the TTPP Committee, as the appellant is also represented by the decision-maker on the matter that it wishes to appeal against. The principles of bias and conflict of interest are explained in more detail in **Appendix 1**.
21. Each appeal that is lodged with the Environment Court is likely to first proceed to mediation, to see if it can be resolved by agreement without the need for a Court hearing. Mediation will require the TTPP Committee to form a position on mediation (e.g. the ultimate outcome desired for the objectives, policies and rules of the TTPP), to be able to discuss this with the appellants and determine whether an agreement can be reached.
22. The TTPP Committee will need to determine how it intends to form a position ahead of mediations. However, if an appellant is also represented on the TTPP Committee, this also gives rise to a risk of bias or predetermination (as members of the organisation that is the appellant are also on the TTPP Committee, which would be responding to the appeal). Confidentiality considerations are also likely to arise. For example, if the TTPP Committee receives legal or other technical advice on appeals.
23. We have also considered whether this risk is reduced if member organisations sought to join other appeals under section 274 of the RMA, rather than lodge their own appeals. In our opinion, the same perception could arise as a result of seeking to join an appeal. Section 274 parties are afforded broad rights of participation in the Environment Court, allowing them to take an active role in supporting or opposing the appeal. This means that the member organisation could still take an active role on an appeal, even if it had not appealed the decision itself.
24. The TTPP Committee will need to consider how to protect itself against these risks in making decisions, and throughout the appeals process, on the pTTPP.

## Options

### *Regarding decisions to appeal the pTTPP*

25. In terms of the decision to appeal the pTTPP, the area that would create the most risk is where the decision to appeal is made by the full Council or organisation. This is because the same councillors/representatives who represent the council/other organisations on the TTPP Committee would then be part of the decision to appeal that decision. This creates a risk for both the decision making on the appeal, but also may preclude the member's participation in future TTPP Committee meetings, or create additional legal risk in relation to those decisions.
26. The options for the member organisations in this regard include:
  - (a) Councillors or other members of the TTPP Committee recusing themselves from any discussions or votes on whether to appeal the TTPP Committee's decision; or

<sup>1</sup> RMA, Schedule 1, cls 10 and 14.

- (b) Delegating the power to decide whether to appeal against the TTPP Committee's decision to staff, rather than this decision being made at a council level.
27. Both of these options ensure that the councillors or organisation representatives that are also members of the TTPP Committee are not seen to be challenging their own decision, or making decisions in their own cause. To the extent that a TTPP Committee member is not involved in its Council's/organisation's decision to appeal, then it is less likely that an issue of bias or predetermination will arise in relation to that member's later involvement as part of the TTPP Committee. However, it will still be necessary to consider whether there could be a perception of bias, as discussed further below.
  28. Recusal as referred to in the first option means that those councillors or representatives should not participate in any meetings or discussions on this topic.
  29. If the first option is selected, the councils will need to ensure that the standing aside of those members would not affect the council's quorum to make a decision – if this is the case then the second option of delegation to staff would be preferable.
  30. We recommend that similar approaches should also be taken by the iwi representatives on the TTPP Committee – they should ensure that they are not involved in any discussions or decisions on whether to appeal the TTPP Committee's decision so as to avoid any allegations of bias or conflict of interest in relation to any future participation on determining the position on appeal as part of the TTPP Committee.

*Regarding mediations on member council / iwi appeals*

31. The options in relation to forming the position on mediation for any member council / iwi appeals are similar. These include:
  - (a) The TTPP Committee forming the position on the appeals and for mediation, with the representatives of the appellant member council / iwi recusing themselves from any discussion or voting on matters associated with that council's / iwi's appeal when the TTPP Committee decides upon it (noting that depending on the nature of the appeal points, this requirement for recusal may also extend to other related appeal points); or
  - (b) Delegating the full decision-making on mediation to staff or the TTPP Committee independent Chair.
32. We have also considered whether, having recused themselves on decision-making on lodging the appeal, representatives of councils or organisations that have appealed could fully participate in pTTPP decision-making throughout mediation (including on their own appeal(s)). While this may technically be an option, we consider that it carries legal risk. Such an approach would be open to challenge on the basis that there would be at least a perception that the member would only vote in favour of an option that was preferable to their own Council / organisation. For this reason, we do not recommend this approach is taken.
33. In our experience, option (a) retains the TTPP Committee's ability to set its own preferred position to be pursued through mediation, while ensuring that this process is perceived to be as fair as possible. Taking this approach would also allow members of the TTPP Committee from parties that have also appealed the decision to recuse themselves from discussions on the topics relevant to their appeal points (noting that depending on the nature and extent of any appeals lodged, this could extend to other related appeals), without being excluded from decision-making on the pTTPP as a whole.
34. In the event that all member organisations of the TTPP Committee lodge or join appeals on a particular point, this will leave the TTPP Committee in a difficult position. In that situation, it may be that all members of the TTPP Committee that are also members of an organisation that have joined or lodged appeals need to stand aside from discussions on that appeal point. This may leave only the independent chair able to make decisions on the appropriate position for the Committee to take as respondent to the appeals. This may also require a delegation from the Committee to the independent chair to perform this role, to avoid any necessary quorum requirements.

35. The TTPP Committee will also need to consider practicality as part of the appeals management process. Based on our experience in other district plan reviews, and the issues that have arisen over the course of the pTTPP hearings, we anticipate there being multiple appeals lodged. It would be very time-intensive for the TTPP Committee to meet and determine its position on each individual appeal point ahead of mediation, and impractical for the entire TTPP Committee to then make decisions as to whether to settle an appeal through mediation.
36. The TTPP Committee will need to delegate at least some decisions to staff, in order to be able to effectively participate at mediation (e.g. the delegation to settle at mediation). The delegation to staff is simply a practical measure to ensure the TTPP Committee's position can be reflected through mediations, without needing the entire Committee's approval to agree to specific drafting changes (for example).
37. The TTPP Committee will also have to consider, as a whole, whether it should set its policy position for mediation, or whether it would be appropriate to delegate this power to a smaller subcommittee of TTPP Committee members. This will largely depend on matters of practicality (i.e. the number and variety of appeals, and the availability and willingness of all TTPP Committee members to meet to discuss the Committee's position on a regular basis).

**Conclusion**

38. We trust that our advice assists. We are happy to meet with you to discuss this advice, or to answer any questions.

**Wynn Williams**

## Appendix 1: Principles of conflicts of interest, predetermination and bias

39. The TTPP Committee (and its members) must avoid predetermining any decision and approach all decisions with an open mind, even where a disposition to a certain position may legitimately exist. To do otherwise risks giving rise to allegations of conflict, bias or predetermination.
40. The courts have developed principles of natural justice to control the procedures by which decisions are made. The rules of natural justice require discretionary decision-making powers to be exercised in a way that is "procedurally fair". Procedures under the RMA are subject to rules of natural justice as well as the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002.<sup>2</sup>
41. The principles of natural justice require impartiality in decision-making in order to uphold public confidence in the administration of justice. Natural justice requires persons not to be 'judges in their own cause' – meaning a decision maker, including one with a delegated authority, should not have a stake in the outcome of the decision.<sup>3</sup>
42. Conflicts of interests which do not involve a pecuniary interest are often dealt with under the common law rules about bias. These rules operate to ensure no actual bias, but also no appearance of bias.<sup>4</sup> Apparent bias is concerned with public perceptions as to impartial decision-making and predetermination is concerned with "closed mind" decision-making.<sup>5</sup> Related to this is the well-established principle that a person should not be the judge of their own case.<sup>6</sup> Essentially, a decision-maker should not have an interest in the outcome.
- (a) Bias and conflicts of interest may arise due to the existence of a relationship or role, separate to the role of being a Mayor / Chair / Councillor or Committee member, or as a result of things that a person has said or done, either prior to, or while in the role of a Mayor / Chair / Councillor (or Committee member).
43. The principles of actual or apparent bias provide that a decision-maker should not impartially favour one side over another. The test for establishing bias centres on whether or not a fair-minded lay observer might reasonably apprehend that the decision-maker will not bring an impartial mind to the resolution of the case in the sense that he or she may unfairly regard with favour (or disfavour) the case of a party.<sup>7</sup>
44. Preconceived views have also been found to disqualify a decision-maker if there is a reasonable suspicion or likelihood of bias, particularly when statements reveal prior judgment or personal hostility towards a party, and statements made by decision-makers prior to a hearing have been held to illustrate bias.<sup>8</sup> However, generally public statements of opinion or policy do not alone establish bias unless the public statements are binding upon the decision-maker.<sup>9</sup> Existing opinions alone are not usually sufficient to prove bias if the decision maker retains a commitment to act with an "open mind" to address the issues,<sup>10</sup> unless such an opinion would establish bias under the test set out above.

<sup>2</sup> Local Government Act 2002, s 39; New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, s 27.

<sup>3</sup> *Nga Puawaitanga (Meremere) Ltd v Waikato District Council* (1998) 4 ELRNZ 480.

<sup>4</sup> We note for completeness that a third category of bias, presumptive bias, involves the principle that it is improper for a decision-maker who has an interest (usually pecuniary) in the outcome of a case, no matter how small, to decide that case. See *Anderton v Auckland City Council* [1978] 1 NZLR 657 at 680. As pecuniary interests are not relevant in the present circumstances, we have not dealt with this further.

<sup>5</sup> *Save Chamberlain Park Incorporated v Auckland Council* [2018] NZHC 1462 at [180].

<sup>6</sup> *Muir v Commissioner of Inland Revenue* [2007] 3 NZLR 495 (CA) at [62]; *Saxmere Company Limited v Wool Board Disestablishment Company Limited* [2009] NZSC 72.

<sup>7</sup> *Richardson v Board of Governors of Wesley College* [1999] 2 ERNZ 199 at 22.

<sup>8</sup> *English v Bay of Islands Licensing Committee* [1921] NZLR 127.

<sup>9</sup> "Local Authorities Law in New Zealand", Kenneth Palmer, Thomson Reuters, 37.2.3 (12) citing *Turner v Allison* [1971] NZLR 833 (CA); *Whitford Residents and Ratepayers Association Inc v Manukau City Corporation* [1974] 2 NZLR 340 (SC).

<sup>10</sup> *Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc v Wellington City Council* [2018] NZCA 541, [2019] 2 NZLR 501 at [88].

45. Councillors are entitled to have political or party affiliations and may therefore be committed to certain policies, but any such affiliations should be set aside when participating in quasi-judicial roles,<sup>11</sup> including making decisions on proposed plans (or plan changes). Commenting specifically on predetermination in local authority decision-making, the Court has previously stated:<sup>12</sup>

There is nothing objectionable about councillors holding preliminary or “in principle” views on decisions, provided when it comes to making the actual decision, they do so with an open mind to other alternatives. Indeed it is always likely to be the case that members of local authorities will hold particular views on certain issues. The effect of local body democracy is that persons are voted into office holding certain views. What is important is that when they come to make decisions they follow a thought process that recognises a change of mind may eventuate.

46. We note also that the Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968 covers pecuniary / financial interests. In general, this Act provides that a member of a local authority or a committee of a local authority shall not vote or take part in the discussion of any matter in which that member has (directly or indirectly) a pecuniary interest, other than an interest in common with the public.<sup>13</sup> However, there is an exception to this rule for matters surrounding the preparation, recommendation, approval or review of a district plan,<sup>14</sup> so we have not considered it further for the purposes of this advice.

---

<sup>11</sup> “Local Authorities Law in New Zealand”, Kenneth Palmer, Thomson Reuters, 37.2.3 (13).

<sup>12</sup> *Whakatane District Council v Bay of Plenty Regional Council* [2009] 3 NZLR 799 (HC) at [117]; *Save Chamberlain Park Incorporated v Auckland Council* at [177].

<sup>13</sup> Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968, s 6(1).

<sup>14</sup> Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968, s 6(3)(e).



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

Prepared for: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee  
Prepared by: Lois Easton, Principal Planner  
Date: 19 November 2025  
Subject: **Te Tai o Poutini Plan – Minor Errors Rectified**

---

## **SUMMARY**

This report brings back the information to Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee on the minor errors rectified in the Decision Plan since the last Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee Meeting.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Committee receive the report.
2. That the Committee resolves to retrospectively approve the correction of minor errors and make changes of minor effect in accordance with Clause 16(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA, as identified in the table within this report and as publicly notified on 12 November 2025.

Lois Easton

**Principal Planner**

## BACKGROUND

1. The Decisions version of Te Tai o Poutini Plan was publicly notified on 10 October 2025.
2. As is normal, once the Decision Plan was notified, staff of the three Councils and other users of the Plan, started picking up minor errors within the Decision Plan. The Resource Management Act has provision for minor errors to be fixed outside of the consultation process prescribed in Schedule One of the Act.
3. Because one of the minor errors picked up is significant in terms of its impact – the Decision maps of the NZTA Designation were not included in the Decision Plan, in the absence of the new Committee being formed, staff sought the approval of the Chair to undertake a Minor Error correction on 12 November.
4. These changes were notified by public notice and on the TTPP website.
5. This report seeks retrospective approval from the Committee for the correction of the Minor Errors undertaken.
6. The following table indicates the minor errors that were corrected.

Error	Why this is a Minor Error
<b>Mapping</b>	
NZTA Designation Maps Incorrect – Notified Plan rather than Decisions version used.	Decision Plan mistakenly includes the notified Proposed Plan layer – however the Committee Decision was to adopt new NZTA Designation. NZTA are able to address this through a different part of the RMA as they are the Requiring Authority, but this will result in a time delay and it would be preferable to immediately correct the maps
"Future Urban Zone" identification incorrectly applied to the corner of a property at Alma Road – should be General Residential Zone	Is a very small part of the parcel – has no actual effect on development capacity of the property
Kaiata Park zone map – incorrect identification of the location of the open space zone	The E- Plan map is not the same as the Decision Plan – the Open Space is in the wrong location. This affects only one property – moving the location of the open space zone within the property.
The gym and field of the Grey High School have been included in the Stadium Zone. Given that the parcel is included in the High School Designation and is owned and operated by the school it should have the same zoning as the school (GRZ).	Site is Designated so no actual effect in terms of Plan provisions that apply
Incorrect site references on maps for Chorus Designations - in the designations chapter the site references are to <b>CNZ</b> numbers (national planning standard abbreviation), but in the maps the references are <b>CHOR</b> numbers.	Typographic correction
Legend on maps refers to "Hokitika Hazard Overlay" rather than "Hokitika <b>Coastal</b> Hazard Overlay"	Typographic correction

Error	Why this is a Minor Error
<b>e-Plan Text</b>	
Numbering error - Activities on Surface of Water Rules – there is a rule numbered ASW – R4A in the Plan – this should be amended to ASW – R5 and all subsequent rules consequently renumbered	Renumbering makes the rules coherent. No effect on any property.
Numbering error Large Lot Residential Zone Rules – there is a rule numbered LLRZ – R14A in the Plan – this should be amended to LLRZ – R15 and all subsequent rules consequently renumbered	Renumbering makes the rules coherent. No effect on any property.
Numbering error Medium Density Residential Zone Rules – there is a rule numbered MRZ – R14A in the Plan – this should be amended to MRZ – R15 and all subsequent rules consequently renumbered	Renumbering makes the rules coherent. No effect on any property.
Missing spaces in Objectives, Policies and Rules – there are multiple instances, particularly in the Special Purpose Zone rules where spaces are missing from the formatting.	No impact on the Plan. Formatting only.
SUB - R5 standard 3 (iv) refers to notified plan hazard overlays rather than the Decision Plan Natural Hazard Overlays. Also Activity Status Where Compliance not Achieved section directs people to the wrong rules.	Does not reflect the Decisions of the Committee – the new names of the overlays should be used. Correct reference makes the rules coherent. No effect on any property.
SUB – R6 “Activity status where compliance is not achieved” incorrectly directs people to a non-complying rule for 4 (i) and (ii) and 5	Correct reference makes the rules coherent. No effect on any property.
TRN - R16 - title says Any Transportation Activity <b>'no'</b> provided for in another rule - should say <b>'not'</b>	Typographic correction
Numbering error in Rule NOISE-R2. The advice note should reference R2.11 not R2.12. The one Advice Note is meant to be re: Aircraft under 2.11, not Watercraft under 2.12.	Error is in Advice Note (no legal implications as is advice only not the rule)
EW - R5 - performance standards from old rule not deleted	Incorrect information relating to a deleted rule left in the Plan. Does not reflect Committee Decision.
NCZ - R16 Rule Title should be "not provided" for	Typographic correction
Noise R3.1.ii refers to "a." Should be "i."	Numbering correction
NH - R4 Rule Title unclear - commas missing, extra "or". Should be corrected to "New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structure and Repairs, Maintenance and Operation of any Minor Upgrades to, or Demolition of, Existing Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures <del>or</del> not meeting Permitted Activity Standards	Typographic correction
EW - R3 does not direct the reader to a defaulting activity status for standard 4 if not complied with (only 1, 2 and 3).	Does not affect rule, but makes it easier for the plan user to know where to look for the escalation
Objective RURZ – O2 missing an "s" - The Rural Lifestyle Zone provide <u>s</u> for low-density rural lifestyle living on the outskirts of settlements where this will support settlement viability and not lead to conflicts with productive rural land use or rural character	typographic correction

BCZ – R5 missing an “and” before “Ancillary Activities” in heading	typographic correction
Appendix Four – reference to “New Zealand Policy” should be corrected to “New Zealand Police”	typographic correction

## **NEXT STEPS**

7. Further minor errors have been identified since the Minor Error correction outlined in this report and more will no doubt come to light as the Plan is used. A report is expected to be brought to the next Committee meeting in December seeking approval of the correction of further minor errors.



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

Prepared for: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee

Prepared by: Jo Armstrong, Project Manager

Date: 19 November 2025

Subject: Financial Report 1 July to 30 September 2025

---

## SUMMARY

This report includes the statement of financial performance for the first quarter of the 2026 financial year to 30 September 2025. An explanation of the budget items is also provided.

## RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Committee receive the report

## REPORT

1. The September statement shows that costs for the financial year are tracking ahead of those expected in the budget, with a reported deficit of \$560,341 compared with a budgeted deficit of \$247,206. This was due to the Hearing Commissioner expenditure being greater than originally anticipated. The resulting unfavourable variance against budget is \$312,830.
2. The largest negative variance is in the Hearings Commissioner Fees item. This occurred as a number of changes were made by the Commissioners to the delivery date of their recommendations report. Originally the report was due before 30 June 2025, with costs falling in the 2025 financial year. When a delay to July was first identified, the Hearings item was increased to a budget of \$125,000. The expected delivery was then pushed out to early September, and the report was finally delivered in full on 21 September 2025. As a full plan change for a new combined district plan, TTPP ended up being more complicated than anticipated, and many of the Commissioners worked fulltime on TTPP for several months. Expenditure in the first three months of the 2026 financial year was \$379,246 greater than budgeted for the full year. However, no further costs will be incurred on this item.
3. The only other significant item above budget for the three months is Meals, Travel and Accommodation, with a deficit of \$4,463. This reflects the extended nature of some of

hearings panel deliberations, plus travel for Technical Advisory Team and TTPP Committee meetings.

4. A number of positive variances are recorded for the financial year to date. Employee, Consultant and Legal costs are the most substantial of these. It is anticipated that consultant and legal costs will increase during the mediation and possible court hearings of appeals on the TTPP decision version.
5. Details of the anticipated inputs and expenditure for each budget item are identified in the table below.

**Table 1 - Description of TTPP budget items for year ending 30 June 2026**

Employee costs	180,000	Permanent TTPP staff costs
Consultant Planners and Contractors	549,996	Planning, project management and expert witnesses for meetings and appeals, updating Decision and Part Operative plan and maps, support for appeals module platform.
Chair and iwi representatives	66,000	Remuneration
Governance	3,996	Meeting expenses
Poutini Ngai Tahu	15,000	Technical Advisory Team input and advice
TTPP Website	12,000	TTPP decisions version and page updates, notices, plan changes
Isovist e-plan Platform	9,000	Web maintenance, updates for plan versions
Meals, Travel & Accom	31,992	Appeals and meeting attendance legal and planning
Workshops & Events	15,396	Plan change public engagement, appeals venue hire, consumables
Media Costs	20,004	Notices, advertising, plan changes
Legal Fees	300,000	Decision advice and appeals representation
Hearings – Commissioner Fees	125,004	Recommendations report deliberations, writing and delivery. Liaison with TTPP Staff and contractors
Interest Payments	140,829	Loan servicing for expenditure above income from targeted rate
Overhead costs	163,608	CE, GM and staff time, administrative services, facilities
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>1,632,825</b>	

6. The main variances in the 2025 financial year were for Hearings fees, Contractors and Travel. All of these items were flagged early to the TTPP Committee as expenditure greater than that budgeted for was anticipated.
7. Appeals on the decision version of TTPP are currently being sought. Once the appeals are analysed, and the number of mediation meetings are determined, forecast costs for the appeals can be brought back to the Committee.
8. The Financial Statement for the period 1 July to 30 September 2025 is at Table 2.
9. The Life of the Project to 30 June 2025, Table 3, shows income and expenditure totals for each financial year of the project to date. The right-hand column Total Project Cost to Date is updated each month to show total Income and Expenditure and includes figures for the current financial year to 30 September 2025.

10. Funding for TTPP is through a regional rate. Costs which exceed the annual rate are funded by a loan over a 10-year period. The loan is identified as the Net Surplus/Deficit figure for the life of the project which is currently \$4,868,324.

**Table 2**

**Te Tai o Poutini Plan**

<b>Statement of Financial Performance to 30 September 2025</b>						
	<b>Year to date</b>			<b>Full year</b>		
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>INCOME</b>						
Targeted Rates	160,696	160,696	-		642,783	482,087
General Rates Contributions						
Grants & Subsidies						
Other Contributions						
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>160,696</b>	<b>160,696</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>642,783</b>	<b>482,087</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>						
Employee costs	30,642	45,000	14,358		180,000	149,358
Consultant Planners and Contractors	82,158	137,499	55,342		549,996	467,839
Chair and iwi representatives	16,500	16,500	-		66,000	49,500
Governance	1,100	999	(101)		3,996	2,896
Poutini Ngai Tahu	-	3,750	3,750		15,000	15,000
TTPP Website	-	3,000	3,000		12,000	12,000
Isovist e-plan Platform	-	2,250	2,250		9,000	9,000
Meals, Travel & Accom	12,461	7,998	(4,463)		31,992	19,531
Workshops & Events	-	3,849	3,849		15,396	15,396
Media Costs	2,136	5,001	2,865		20,004	17,868
Legal Advice	30,888	75,000	44,112		300,000	269,112
Hearings – commissioner fees	504,250	31,251	(472,999)		125,004	(379,246)
Interest Payments	-	35,207	35,207		140,829	140,829
Overhead costs	40,902	40,902	-		163,608	122,706
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>721,037</b>	<b>408,206</b>	<b>(312,830)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,632,825</b>	<b>911,788</b>
<b>NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>(560,341)</b>	<b>(247,510)</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>(990,042)</b>	

**\*The Column 4 Full Year Forecast will be populated in Q3**

**\*\*The Column 6 Variance is the difference between the full year budget and the actual income and expenditure to date**

**Table 3**

**Te Tai o Poutini Plan**

Life of Project 1 July 2019-30 June 2025										
	Prior Year -2025			2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	TOTAL PROJECT COST TO DATE
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	
<b>INCOME</b>										
Targeted Rates	324,176	324,176	-	1,244,713	482,497	494,868	255,156	400,000	-	3,362,106
General Rates Contributions				-	-	-	150,000	-	-	150,000
Grants & Subsidies				-	-	-	30,000	200,000	-	230,000
Other Contributions				-	-	-	-	50,000	-	50,000
										-
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>324,176</b>	<b>324,176</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,244,713</b>	<b>482,497</b>	<b>494,868</b>	<b>435,156</b>	<b>650,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,792,106</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>										
Employee costs	163,574	303,358	139,784	205,577	183,472	279,060	268,762	199,591	67,022	1,397,700
Consultant Planners and Contractors	901,333	674,400	(226,933)	695,112	172,899	420,035	231,931	108,885	-	2,612,353
Chair and iwi representatives	61,669	66,000	4,331	60,000	60,000	60,000	54,500	55,000	-	367,669
Governance	1,007	1,400	393	-	747	1,949	-	-	-	4,802
Poutini Ngai Tahu	50,004	50,000	(4)	41,371	42,000	50,000	-	-	-	183,375
TTPP Website	4,592	12,000	7,409	5,354	27,560	5,781	-	5,000	-	48,287
Isovist e-plan Platform	7,500	8,000	500	7,463	11,273	9,425	3,713	-	-	39,373
Meals, Travel & Accom	82,981	69,150	(13,831)	78,466	9,568	17,680	17,164	19,585	5,372	243,276
Workshops & Events	5,225	8,400	3,175	13,384	3,298	3,246	840	14,000	-	39,993
Media Costs	21,529	18,000	(3,529)	6,494	71,088	25,536	5,878	4,950	-	137,611
Legal Advice	101,049	120,000	18,951	100,854	27,289	27,343	4,689	907	-	293,018
Hearings – commissioner fees	1,226,042	214,000	(1,012,042)	419,581	6,647	-	-	-	-	2,156,520
Interest Payments	139,165	139,165	-	-	40,090	-	-	-	-	179,255
Overhead costs	66,198	66,198	-	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	100,098	957,198
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>2,831,866</b>	<b>1,750,071</b>	<b>(1,081,796)</b>	<b>1,783,656</b>	<b>805,930</b>	<b>1,050,055</b>	<b>737,477</b>	<b>557,917</b>	<b>172,492</b>	<b>8,660,429</b>
<b>NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>(2,507,690)</b>	<b>(1,425,895)</b>			<b>(323,434)</b>	<b>(555,187)</b>	<b>(302,320)</b>	<b>92,083</b>	<b>(172,492)</b>	<b>(4,868,324)</b>

\* Please note that the total cost to date column also includes the current YTD figures (1 July - 30 September 2025)



# Project Manager Update

**1 September 2025 – 31 October 2025**

Prepared By: **Jo Armstrong**  
Date Prepared: **31 October 2025**

## Accomplishments this Period

- A TTPP Committee meeting was held on four days between 18 and 24 September 2025. Each TTPP topic featured in the Hearings Panel's recommendations report was discussed individually during the meeting. On 24 September 2025 the TTPP Committee adopted the recommendations and reasoning of the Hearings Panel as their own, with two amendments to Policy 1 of the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter.
- Undertaking all notification requirements including public notice, printing and distributing hard copies of TTPP Decision Plans, updating the online e-plan and maps, sending emails or letters to all submitters and government departments and bodies with an interest in TTPP was achieved by the deadline of 10 October 2025.
- The decisions and notification processes were a huge undertaking for TTPP Principal Planner Consultant Lois Easton and TTPP staff Doug Bray and Chu Zhao. The previous TTPP Committee expressed their gratitude for Ms Easton's input from development of TTPP through to her pivotal role at hearings and during decision-making, and a vote of thanks was expressed for the team's hard work.
- TTPP has a dedicated website at [tppp.nz](http://tppp.nz) to ensure all information is readily accessible to the public. Keeping the website up to date with current information and documentation has been a major focus this period. The website includes background information about TTPP including foundation documentation, all submissions and hearings reports, technical reports and information sheets, and information about the appeals process currently being run. The landing page contains links to online and pdf versions of the decision plan, the public notice, Committee resolutions and the appeals page. Familiarising yourself with the website, and how to access the different versions of the plan is recommended.
- We have received a letter from Transpower confirming that they accept the TTPP Committee recommendations of 10 October 2025, as they pertain to Transpower designations in TTPP.
- A similar letter from Spark NZ has identified some changes.

## Plans for Next Period

- Receipt and analysis of appeals on the TTPP decision version
- Liaison with the Environment Court

## Key Issues, Risks & Concerns

Item	Action/Resolution	Responsible	Completion Date
Decision makers can't reach agreement	Workshop issues prior to mediation and Plan changes	Chairman	Ongoing
Budget insufficient for timely plan delivery	Work with TTPPC to recommend budget, and with WCRC to raise rate to achieve deliverables	Project Manager TTPP Committee CE WCRC	Annually Jan/Feb
Changes to national legislation	Planning team keep TTPP Committee updated on changes to legislation and the implications for TTPP	Project Manager Planning Team	Ongoing
Staff safety at public consultation	Committee members to proactively address & redirect aggressive behavior away from staff	TTPP Committee	Ongoing
National emergencies such as Covid-19 lock-down and weather events	Staff and Committee ensure personal safety and continue to work remotely as able.	Project Manager TTPP Committee	Ongoing
Time and Cost of Appeals Process	A realistic budget was set for best case costs. Awareness that contentious issues such as SNAs, natural hazards, mineral extraction and landscape provisions could see an extended appeals process, increasing costs to reach operative plan status	TTPP Committee TTPP Steering Group Project Manager	Ongoing
Community concerns over TTPP Decision version content	Respond to queries by phone, email and public meetings. Update information.	TTPP Committee Project Manager	Ongoing

## Status

<b>Overall</b>		
Schedule		Met 10 October 2025 decision notification
Resources		Future budgets required to cover the appeals and Plan amendment processes
Scope		Schedule 1 processes leading to updates to Plan to achieve operative status

## Schedule

Stage	Target for Completion	Comments
Appeals/Mediation	2026	Indicative time only. Any parts of TTPP not appealed are operative from the end of the Appeals Period.
Environment or High Court	2026 onward	Indicative time only.
Ongoing Decision Making for TTPP some	2025 onward	TTPPC is a permanent Committee. Once the Plan is adopted the ongoing Committee role includes monitoring implementation and the need for any amendments, undertaking plan changes and reviews, or ensuring these are undertaken as required.