



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

## Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee Meeting

10 February 2026

9.00AM

Buller District Council, Clocktower, Palmerston St, Westport

Livestreamed on YouTube

[@westcoastregionalcouncil5171](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...)

### AGENDA

<b>9.00am</b>	Welcome and Apologies	<b>Chair</b>
	Conflict of Interest Declaration	<b>Chair</b>
<b>9.05am</b>	Confirm previous minutes of 12 December 2025	<b>Chair</b>
	Matters Arising	<b>Chair</b>
<b>9.10am</b>	Analysis of Appeals Received	<b>Principal Planner</b>
<b>9.25am</b>	Verbal update on s274 Parties Joining Appeals	<b>Principal Planner</b>
<b>9.40am</b>	Legal update on Mediation Process	<b>Legal Counsel</b>
<b>9.55am</b>	Report – Appeals Position-Setting Process and Delegated Authority	<b>Project Manager Legal Counsel</b>
<b>10.25am</b>	Report – Draft 2027 Budget	<b>Project Manager</b>
<b>10.45am</b>	Financial Report to 31 December 2025	<b>Project Manager</b>
<b>11.00am</b>	Meeting ends	

<b>TTPP Committee Meetings for 2026</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Venue</b>
4 March	9.00-12.00	Grey District Council
10 April	9.00-12.00	West Coast Regional Council
11 May	9.00-12.00	Westland District Council
11 June	9.00-12.00	Buller District Council
14 July	1.00-4.00	Grey District Council
11 August	9.00-12.00	West Coast Regional Council
17 September	9.00-12.00	Westland District Council
15 October	1.00-4.00	Buller District Council
12 November	9.00-12.00	Grey District Council
15 December	9.00-12.00	West Coast Regional Council



# 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 WESTLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 36 WELD STREET, HOKITIKA AT 9.00 AM ON 12 DECEMBER 2025

### Present

R. Williams (Chairman), Mayor T. Gibson (GDC), Mayor H. Lash (WDC) (left at 9.21 am), Mayor C. Russell (BDC), Cr A. Cassin (WCRC), Kaiwhakahaere P. Madgwick (Makaawhio) (joined at 9.20 am), Kaiwhakahaere F. Tumahai (Ngāti Waewae) (joined at 9.14 am), Cr L. Webb (BDC), Cr A. Gibson (GDC), Cr G. Maitland (WDC)

### In attendance

Matt Smith (WCRC), Darryl Lew (WCRC), J. Armstrong (TTPP Project Manager), Joanne Soderlund (GDC), Carissa du Plessis (BDC), Olivia Anderson (WDC), Lois Easton (TTPP Principal Planner), Doug Bray (WCRC), Chu Zhao (WCRC).

### Welcome

### Apologies

Cr C. Smith (WCRC)

### Confirm minutes of the previous meeting 19 November 2025

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

*That the minutes of the meeting held 19 November 2025 be amended as discussed and confirmed.*

*Carried*

### Matters arising from previous meetings

None raised

## **Verbal update on Appeals Received**

L. Easton noted that the appeals closed on Monday 8 December and that 36 appeals were received against the plan – 7 of them are in relation to specific zoning matters on particular properties, 6 of which are in relation to specific mapping matters on individual properties, and 23 of them are against specific objectives, policies and rules of the plan. She noted that Section 274 notices, to become a party to proceedings on appeals on the TTPP, are now being sought and these must be lodged with the Environment Court by 19 January 2026.

L. Easton noted that she will be producing a marked-up version of the Plan that shows which provisions are under appeal and which are now fully operative.

## **Report – Confirming TTPP Standing Orders and Code of Conduct**

J. Armstrong noted that each new Committee should confirm the Standing Orders and Code of Conduct following discussion and identification of potential changes. She noted that the report includes tracked changes versions of the Standing Orders and Code of Conduct which identify changes recommended by staff.

### **Moved (Mayor Gibson / Cr Cassin)**

1. *That the Committee receive the report.*
2. *That the Committee discuss and approve updates to the TTPP Standing Orders and Code of Conduct to take effect from 12 December 2025.*

*Carried*

## **Report – Plan Change 1- Application to Minister and Approval to Proceed to Draft the Plan Change**

L. Easton presented on the requirement for Minister for RMA reform approval of any plan change and requested approval to progress the plan change once MFE approval is gained. She outlined a number of matters including incorrect designations, the change of building coverage to site coverage, and provisions for natural hazard mitigation structures which have been identified for inclusion in the plan change with input sought from the Technical Advisory Team members from the three district councils.

L. Easton previously suggested updating the heritage schedule in plan change 1, including for items identified for de-listing due to poor descriptions of the extents of heritage items transferred over from district plans. This can now be addressed through a later plan change. P. Madgwick asked for the list of heritage items identified by the heritage specialists and for information on the specialist's experience and qualifications.

L. Easton noted there are a few mapping errors, including incorrect zoning of some parks and reserves which can be fixed under Clause 16 of Schedule 1 of the RMA. However, zoning errors such as Future Urban Zone being erroneously identified in a range of locations cannot be rectified through the minor errors mechanism and will need to be addressed through a plan change.

**Moved** (Mayor Gibson / Cr Webb)

1. *That the Committee receive the report.*
2. *That staff be directed to seek the approval of the Minister for RMA Reform to proceed with Plan Change 1 (Inefficient or Unworkable Provisions) for Te Tai o Poutini Plan under the provisions of the Resource Management (Consenting and Other System Changes) Amendment Act 2025.*
3. *That staff be directed, subject to approval to proceed from the Minister for RMA Reform, to draft Plan Change 1 (Inefficient or Unworkable Provisions), undertake the associated Section 32 analysis, and undertake iwi and stakeholder consultation with a view to proceeding with the Plan Change as soon as is practicable.*

*Carried*

#### **Report – Further Minor Errors Corrections**

L. Easton noted that a series of minor errors were rectified on 12 November and this was reported to the 19 November meeting of the Committee. Further minor errors have been identified since that time and Committee approval to rectify these is sought. Changes to the plan will be made next week. A second minor errors correction public notice and updates on the TTPP website will be published.

**Moved** (Cr Cassin / Mayor Gibson)

1. *That the Committee receive the report*
2. *That the Committee resolves to 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.*

*Carried*

#### **Financial Report to 31 October 2025**

J. Armstrong noted that everything is tracking as anticipated. She provided further explanation of Table 2, and how the total income and expenditure to date was calculated.

D. Lew commented that he would like to know how much the appeals process is going to cost as a subtotal of Table 1 and be able to track start time and costs of plan changes.

**Moved** (Mayor Russell / Cr Webb)

1. *That the Committee receive the report*

*Carried*

### **Project Manager's Report**

Mrs Armstrong explained the work being undertaken by the TTPP Planning Team during the appeals period. She highlighted the number of queries and LGOIMAs that were received, and explained that one appellant had been sent a letter asking them to withdraw their appeal, as they had not made a valid submission on TTPP.

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

1. *That the Committee receive the report.*

*Carried*

Meeting ended at 10.03 am.



# 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: 10 February 2026  
Subject: **Te Tai o Poutini Plan – Update on Appeals**

---

## **SUMMARY**

This report updates Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee on the number and extent of appeals lodged on the Decision Plan. Because there are several very wide-ranging appeals, only 2 chapters of the Plan have provisions which can be considered to be fully operative – Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land.

There are no appeals on the Designations and advice has been returned from most of the Requiring Authorities that they accept the Decisions of the Committee in relation to the Designations chapters so the Designations in the Plan can also be considered to be Operative.

In relation to the mapping, all the natural environment, historic and cultural and natural hazard overlays have been appealed, however there are limited appeals on the zone provisions. Most of the rezoning undertaken as part of Te Tai o Poutini Plan therefore is now operative.

## **GLOSSARY FOR THIS REPORT**

**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 Decisions Plan was publicly notified on 10 October 2025.

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

**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.

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

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Committee receive the report.

Lois Easton

**Principal Planner**

## BACKGROUND

1. Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP) Decisions were publicly notified on 10 October 2025.
2. The Appeal period has now closed, and 36 appeals have been lodged. These are summarised further down in this report.
3. The period whereby other people can become "s274 parties to the appeal" was extended based on application by Grey District Council to the Environment Court and closed on 2 February 2026.
4. 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".
5. 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.

## SUMMARY OF APPEALS

6. The Appeals on the TTPP fall generally into three groups:
  - Appeals in relation to a specific property – either it's zoning or overlay(s) that affect the property
  - Appeals in relation to relatively narrow matters in specific provisions
  - Wide ranging appeals that cover large parts of the Plan.
7. The appeals in these three groupings are outlined in the table below.

Appellant Reference	Appellant	Outline of Appeal
<b>Appeals on Specific Properties</b>		
A1	John Currie	Industrial zoning in Westport, Buller District
A5	Scenic Hotel Group	Permitted Activity Rules in the Scenic Visitor Zone and Settlement Zone as apply at Punakaiki, Buller District
A6	Barnabas Young	Natural Hazard overlays on his property at Franz Josef, Westland District
A7	CMP Kokiri	Zoning of site in Arnold Valley, Grey District
A8	Vance and Carol Boyd, and Michael Elford and M W and S J Elford Trustees Ltd	Natural Hazard overlays at Hannah's Clearing, Westland District
A10	Tauranga Bay Holdings Limited	Zoning of property at Cape Foulwind, Buller District
A11	Lyn McIntosh	SASM as affects her property in Westland District
A12	Te Kinga Estates Limited	Zoning of property at Moana, Grey District
A13	Nicholas Johnston	SNA as affects his property in Grey District
A15	Murray Stewart	ONL as affects his property in Grey District
A17	Stephen and Pauline Tranter	Natural Hazard overlays on their property at Westport, Buller District
A19	Russell Robinson	Zoning and associated Outline Development Plan of property at Moana, Grey District
A20	Ridgeline 3 Investments Limited	SASM and associated provisions as affect their properties in Westland District

A22	Gordon Bradley	Zoning of adjacent property and associated rules to mitigate neighbour effects in Arnold Valley, Grey District
A35	Gavin Molloy	Zoning at his property at Franz Josef, Westland District
<b>Appeals relating to relatively narrow matters in specific provisions</b>		
A2	Chorus/Spark	Appeal largely in relation to Infrastructure Chapter and provisions in the District Wide Matters chapters that affect Telecommunications.
A16	Department of Conservation	Ecosystems and Biodiversity Rules, Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures
A18	Federated Farmers	Appeals in relation to a specific provision in the District Wide Matters and Rural zones chapters
A21	Buller District Council	Appeal points in relation to specific provisions in the Noise, Light, Natural Hazards, Ecosystems and Biodiversity and Coastal Environment chapters.
A23	Grey District Council	Appeal points in relation to specific provisions in the Noise, Light, Natural Hazards, Ecosystems and Biodiversity, Coastal Environment and General Rural Zone chapters and Definitions
A24	Haddock Group Properties Limited	Appeal point in relation to Ecosystems and Biodiversity permitted activity rules
A25	Manawa Energy Limited	Appeal points in relation to the Energy chapter and the Natural Environment chapters
A26	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Appeal points in relation to Noise, Temporary Activities, Infrastructure, and Natural Environment chapters, and setbacks from the rail corridor in zones.
A29	Westland District Council	Appeal point in relation to stormwater in Rural Zones
A33	Transpower	Appeals in relation to specific provisions in District Wide Matters chapters
A34	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae, Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Appeals in relation to specific provisions in the District Wide Matters chapters and the treatment of Poutini Ngāi Tahu values in zone chapters.
<b>Wide Ranging Appeals</b>		
A3	New Zealand Coal and Carbon	Plan wide appeal points that affect many provisions
A4	Birchfield Coal Mines	Plan wide appeal points that affect many provisions
A9	Tāiko Critical Minerals Limited	Appeals across a range of District Wide Matters and zones as relate to mineral extraction
A14	WMS Group (HQ) Limited	Appeals across a range of District Wide Matters and zones as relate to mineral extraction
A27	Buller Conservation Group	Plan wide appeal points in most chapters and against many provisions
A28	Nikau Deer Farm Ltd	Specific provisions and mapping in relation to their properties plus District Wide Matters and Overlays that arise out of Section 6 of the RMA

A30	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc	Appeal points mainly across the Energy, Natural Environment, Open Space and Recreation Zones, Mineral Extraction Zone and Buller Coalfield Zone Chapters
A31	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Appeals across a range of District Wide Matters and zones as relate to mineral extraction
A32	Westpower Ltd	Plan wide appeal points in most chapters and against many provisions
A36	Groundswell NZ	District Wide Matters and Overlays that arise out of Section 6 of the RMA

### **CURRENT LEGAL STATUS OF TTPP**

8. 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 Decisions Plan.
9. Now that the appeals period is ended, the parts 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 is now a “part operative” Plan.
10. Because of several very wide-ranging appeals, in practice at the moment only two parts of TTPP can be regarded as being operative – the objectives and policies (there are no rules) in the Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land Chapters. While there are appeals on the Overview of the Hazardous Substances chapter, the Overview is not a statutory provision, therefore the appeals do not affect the operative status of the objectives and policies in this chapter.
11. There are no appeals in relation to Designations and advice has been returned from most of the Requiring Authorities that they accept the Decisions of the Committee in relation to the Designations chapters. The Designations in the Plan can also be considered to be Operative.
12. In relation to the maps, there are wide ranging appeals from several parties that mean all the natural environment, historic and cultural heritage and natural hazard overlays are under appeal. There are also appeals on specific overlays in relation to individual properties.
13. In the case of the zones however, the only zone A mapping which is fully under appeal are the Buller Coalfield Zone and the Mineral Extraction Zone. With the exception of specific locations where there are zoning appeals, most of the rezoning undertaken as part of TTPP is now able to be considered operative.
14. Staff have produced an annotated version of TTPP which identifies what parts of TTPP have been appealed and what parts are operative. This is now available on the TTPP website.

### **NEXT STEPS**

15. The closing date for s274 parties to join (or oppose) appeals was 2 February 2026 and no new matters can be appealed.
16. Another paper on this agenda outlines the process in relation to moving into Environment Court mediation and makes recommendations to the Committee about jurisdictional matters in relation to appeals and the next steps to mediation.



# Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

Prepared for: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee

Prepared by: Alice Balme (Legal Counsel – Wynn Williams)

Date: 10 February 2026

Subject: **Legal Update on Mediation Process**

---

## **SUMMARY**

The purpose of this paper is to provide an update on the TTPP appeals process, including next steps and how the appeals are likely to be managed by the Environment Court. Direct discussions with appellants and mediations will be the next step, to attempt to resolve as many matters as possible without requiring an Environment Court hearing.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee Resolve to:

1. Receive this report.
2. Note that the next steps towards resolution of the appeals involves direct discussion with appellants and mediation, with the mediation process supervised by the Environment Court.
3. Note that now that the appeals have been lodged with the Environment Court, all final decisions on appeals sit with the Environment Court (so any mediated outcomes still need to be approved by the Environment Court).
4. Note that the TTPP Committee's (and any delegated decision-makers) role as part of direct discussions and mediations is to provide guidance regarding the overall acceptable position to the Committee as part of a negotiated outcome.

Jo Armstrong

**Project Manager**

## **BACKGROUND**

1. The TTPP Committee's decisions on the TTPP (following the hearing process and recommendations provided by the Independent Hearing Panel) were publicly notified on 10 October 2025.
2. Any appeals were required to be lodged with the Environment Court by 8 December 2025. 36 appeals were received (although one appeal is yet to be accepted as complete by the Environment Court).
3. Notices for other submitters to join various appeals under section 274 of the RMA have also now been lodged with the Court. The deadline for these notices was 2 February 2026.
4. Filing a section 274 notice allows these people to also be a party to the appeals (either in support or opposition to the appeal), including being part of any discussions as to their resolution or hearing.
5. The appeals process is run by the Environment Court. The Court will ask the TTPP staff for support with administrative matters from time to time.
6. The normal course of matters is for appeals to proceed to mediation, to attempt to resolve by agreement, such that a Court hearing would then be unnecessary. This helps reduce time and cost of the appeals process.

## **MEDIATION PROCESS**

7. There are 36 appeals on the TTPP, all covering broad and different issues. TTPP staff and legal counsel have separated the the appeals into separate appeal points, and then those points have been grouped into related topics. This is to create efficiencies where multiple appeal points overlap and might be able to be dealt with by the same overall solution. These topics will be the subject of direct discussion or mediation.
8. Some appeals in relation to minor matters may be able to be resolved directly with appellants, without the assistance of an Environment Court commissioner. Legal counsel and TTPP staff will identify which appeals may be suitable for this route, and look to initiate these discussions where appropriate. One example is an appeal point by Buller Conservation Group who challenged the definition of Site in the TTPP. Staff asked the appellant for further information which has ultimately resulted in the appellant indicating that they will withdraw this appeal point.
9. Environment Court Mediations are conducted by Environment Court Commissioners. Commissioners assist in mediations by helping the parties consider the important issues and how a solution could be achieved. Mediations are all likely to be on the West Coast, but the Court will determine and make arrangements for the specific locations (and in some cases parties may seek to appear at the mediation virtually). The cost of venue hire and commissioners is paid by the Court.
10. All parties that have appeals in each topic group are invited to the mediation to discuss how their appeal might be resolved (i.e. what changes could be made to the TTPP that would resolve the appellant's concerns, while also being acceptable to all of the other parties). Parties generally bring all experts they anticipate calling evidence from at a hearing to a mediation to help explain their position. Parties attending mediation must confirm at the outset that they have authority to enter into a settlement at the mediation should one be reached.
11. Mediations involve compromise on all parties' initial positions in order to be successful. If a mediation is successful, a mediation agreement is signed on the day of mediation containing the general content of any amendments the parties have agreed to. The parties then collaborate to prepare documentation to record that agreement for the Court. Once submitted to the Environment Court, the Environment Court judge considers the agreement reached, and whether it is consistent with the law. If so, usually consent orders are issued, which is effectively a decision of the Environment Court approving the mediated outcome (and resolving the appeal).

12. If mediation is unsuccessful, the next step is to proceed to an Environment Court hearing. This involves parties calling evidence (often provided by experts) in support of their position, and having a hearing before an Environment Court judge to decide the appropriate outcome.

## **ROLE OF THE TTPP COMMITTEE IN THIS PROCESS**

13. The TTPP Committee is the respondent to all appeals on the TTPP as it is the Committee's decisions that have been appealed. This means the TTPP Committee is automatically a party to every appeal that has been lodged. Staff/contractors (staff) and legal counsel representing the TTPP Committee will participate in the Court ordered mediation.
14. In order to prepare for mediation, the TTPP Committee (or any delegated decision-making body, such as a Positions Subcommittee) will need to give consideration to the appropriate position to take into mediation.

### *Role of legal counsel*

15. The TTPP Committee's legal counsel will attend mediation. Our job is to represent the Committee's position in the mediation and to ensure that any agreement reached is consistent with the law.
16. Any mediated outcome must be authorised by an Environment Court judge so it is important that the position reached is lawful. If an outcome is agreed but not consistent with the law, then the Court cannot approve it and the amendments to the TTPP cannot be made. We can provide advice on this when the Committee is setting its position on each topic.

### *Role of TTPP Staff*

17. TTPP staff (or other representatives) will provide technical input at mediations. To do so, the representatives will need to be provided direction from the Committee or other delegated body as to the outcome considered appropriate. Legal counsel will then rely on the technical input in order to reach an agreement consistent with the Committee's preferred position.
18. Prior to mediation, TTPP staff will make recommendations to the Committee or any such subcommittee to set the parameters for the Committee's position at mediation. They will make these recommendations having considered the appeal points and the overall integration of the TTPP itself.
19. Subject to what the Committee decides in relation to its delegations, TTPP staff and/or the TTPP Committee Chair will ensure that overall outcomes reached at mediation are consistent with the position of the TTPP Committee as expressed to staff in the position reports.
20. Technical experts (i.e. landscape, acoustic, heritage etc) may also be required to attend certain topic mediations in support of the TTPP Committee's position (particularly if the TTPP Committee is taking a different position to its previous decisions). Staff and legal counsel will consider the need for experts in each case.



# 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

Date: 10 February 2026

Subject: **Appeals Position Setting Process and Delegated Authority**

---

## SUMMARY

This paper seeks approvals from Te Tai Poutini Committee (TTPP Committee) to enable the efficient and effective resolution of the appeals on the Te Tai Poutini Plan (TTPP), whether by direct discussions with the parties, Court assisted mediation, or hearing and determination by the Environment Court.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee Resolve to:

1. Receive this report.
2. Approve Position setting Option 2:
  - a. Appoint a Positions Subcommittee to make decisions on the position setting for resolution of any appeals to the Environment Court on the TTPP; and
  - b. Appoint all members of the TTPP Committee to the Positions Sub-committee; and
  - c. Each Positions Subcommittee shall be made up of at least two members and exclude any members where the Council or Runanga that they represent is a party to an appeal on a relevant topic;
  - d. The quorum for the Positions Sub-committee shall be two members; and
  - e. The Chair of the Positions Sub-committee shall be the Independent Chair of the TTPP Committee; and
  - f. Adopt the Terms of Reference for the Positions Sub-committee attached as Appendix 2.
3. Delegate the authority to make decisions to settle any Environment Court appeals on the TTPP to both the TTPP Independent Chair and the TTPP Project Manager (acting severally).
4. Delegate to the TTPP Project Manager the power to carry out all actions for the general administration and efficient conduct of the TTPP Committee's response to the appeals to the Environment Court on the TTPP.
5. Note that now that appeals have been lodged with the Environment Court, the ultimate decision on the process and the outcome of that appeal will be determined by the Court and is not for the TTPP Committee to decide.

Jo Armstrong

**Project Manager**

## **BACKGROUND**

1. The Decisions Version of the TTPP was publicly notified on 10 October 2025.
2. Submitters on the TTPP were required to lodge any appeals with the Environment Court by 8 December 2025. Thirty six appeals were received.
3. Following the appeals period, a 15 working-day period was provided whereby other people could file notice under s274 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) that they wish to become parties to the appeal if they submitted on the TTPP or have an interest that is greater than the public generally.
4. An application to extend the s274 period from 19 January 2026 to 2 February 2026 was made to the Environment Court and was approved on 13 January 2026.
5. The appeals process is run by the Environment Court. Once appeals are received, the Environment Court normally orders mediation, to avoid the need for unnecessary court hearings if matters can be resolved by agreement.
6. Appeals will be broken up into points and grouped into topics for direct discussions or mediation. Ideally simple matters will be dealt with first, so that as many of the appeals as possible can be settled as quickly as practicable.
7. Mediation is run by the Environment Court, who will appoint a mediator. Mediators are Environment Court Commissioners, with expertise in RMA mediation. The Environment Court will also set the location for the mediation meetings. However, this will likely be held on the West Coast.
8. The TTPP staff and legal counsel will work with the Environment Court to seek a process that will resolve appeals as quickly and easily as possible.
9. At this stage it is expected that the Environment Court mediation may commence in the second quarter of 2026 and be completed within approximately 6 months. This means any Environment Court hearings on matters that have not been able to be resolved at mediation may occur at the end of 2026/early 2027. This indicative timeframe will however be impacted by a number of factors including the availability of parties and scheduling of mediation and any Court time.

## **THE TTPP COMMITTEE IS RESPONDENT TO THE APPEALS**

10. The TTPP Committee is the respondent (and a party) to all appeals on the TTPP, as it is the Committee's decisions that have been appealed.
11. As the respondent, the starting point for the TTPP Committee is that it will defend its decisions on the TTPP in the Environment Court. However, it is possible for the TTPP Committee to agree to take a different position, in response to points made in appeals, through direct discussions or a mediated settlement with the parties (or even later in a hearing before the Environment Court).
12. The TTPP Committee is not the decision maker on appeals, the Court is. Any agreements reached between the parties as a result of direct discussions or mediation will need to be submitted to the Environment Court for approval (by way of consent order).
13. If no agreement can be reached through direct discussions or at mediation, the appeal will proceed to an Environment Court hearing, where a judge will decide the outcome.
14. 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 through direct discussions or at mediation.

## **PRINCIPLES FOR TTPP COMMITTEE POSITION SETTING**

15. In developing position recommendations TTPP staff recommend using the following overall principles:
  - The starting point is that the TTPP Committee will defend its decisions on the TTPP.
  - Any position taken must be consistent with the RMA and the hierarchy of planning documents which District Plans need to comply with. Recommendations made cannot be contrary to this in any way.

- Where possible positions should be “future proofed”. This means being aware of proposed legislation (where this is drafted and has been released as a bill), and proposed national direction (where this is drafted and has been released) – while recognising that until a bill becomes an Act and national direction is gazetted they have no status in law. This can only be done within the scope of existing appeals, and to the extent that it is consistent with national direction that is currently in force.
- Prioritise positions which will minimise impacts on private property owners in terms of additional regulatory burden. This has been a strong direction from previous TTPP Committees.
- Be pragmatic. If the appeal has reasonable merit and will not have a major impact on the implementation of the Plan support the appeal points. Once finalised the TTPP will be monitored by the Committee and future Plan Changes remain a mechanism to amend aspects of the Plan that are found to not be working properly.
- On matters with specific technical requirements generally take an approach which is defensible based on supporting technical expert advice.

### **TTPP POSITION SETTING PROCESS**

16. To enable direct discussions or mediation to progress efficiently, it is recommended that the TTPP Committee agree a position in response to each appeal point (grouped by appeal topics), that can then be represented by officers with delegated authority to conduct negotiations and attempt to resolve appeals on its behalf.
17. In setting a position on each appeal point, the Committee would be identifying the broader policy outcomes or bottom lines that it would like to achieve. It is important to be pragmatic about position setting and provide some flexibility for the officers seeking to negotiate agreements. Specific, hard line positions may be difficult to achieve and may be more likely to result in the need for hearings by the Environment Court, with greater time and financial burden.
18. For each topic, staff would prepare a ‘position setting’ report outlining the matters appealed and a recommended position in response. The position setting meetings would be confidential and the public would be excluded.
19. The position set for each appeal point on each topic must be that of the TTPP Committee – not the individual Councils and Rūnanga who may be appellants or s274 parties in their own right.
20. There would be risk of perception of bias and possible legal challenge if Councils or the Rūnanga representatives on the TTPP Committee participate in discussions or decision making on positions in response to appeals that their organisations are a party to (either as an appellant or s274 party). Even if the representatives themselves were not involved in the decision of their Council or Runanga to appeal or join an appeal, they may still be seen as having a conflict of interest that may influence their view on responding to the appeal points.
21. The full TTPP Committee is not required to determine the Committee’s position on each appeal.
22. As a result of individual organisations choosing to lodge appeals or join other appeals as section 274 parties, the committee members representing those organisations can no longer participate in TTPP Committee decisions to set positions on the topics affected by those appeals (as they cannot act as both party to the appeal and respondent). To the extent that representatives of those organisations wish to influence the outcomes reached through the appeal process, that will have to be achieved through their individual organisations involvement in the mediation / appeals process rather than through participation on the TTPP Committee. Regardless of this, the Court is still the final decision maker on all appeals, not the Committee.
23. Legal advice on this issue (provided to member organisation CEs or Chairs in October and included in the TTPP Committee 19 November 2025 agenda) includes the following options:
  - (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.

24. A practical issue with option (a) (now that appeals and s274 notices have been lodged) is that the Local Government Reorganisation Scheme (West Coast Region) Order 2019 requires a quorum consisting of at least one member from four of the six parties to the TTPP Committee. Based on individual Council and Runanga appeals and s274 notices, recusals would result in the Committee being unable to meet this quorum requirement for decision making on some topics. Appendix 1 to this report lists the topics that TTPP Committee members are a party to (either as an appellant or s274 party). The one topic where no TTPP Committee members are a party is Notable Trees. This illustrates that there will be some topics where recusals would result in failure to achieve the quorum for a position setting meeting.

### **APPOINTMENT OF POSITIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

25. Staff recommend that the TTPP Committee appoint a Positions Subcommittee to set the position for any resolution of appeals, topic by topic. All members of the TTPP Committee would be appointed to this sub-committee and the Positions Subcommittee for each topic would be made up of at least two members and exclude any members whose Council or Runanga are party to an appeal on that topic.
26. In some cases the majority of members of the TTPP Committee may be able to sit on the subcommittee (e.g. where few of the Councils or Runanga have appealed or joined an appeal on the relevant topic as set out in Appendix 1). However this option also ensures that the quorum can be met when all the District Councils and Runanga have either appealed or joined an appeal on the topic and only the Independent Chair and representatives of the West Coast Regional Council do not have any potential conflict of interest (as they have not lodged or joined any appeals).
27. The reduced quorum of two for the subcommittee would also enable greater flexibility for scheduling of meetings, taking into account Court timetabling and availability of members.
28. Alternative options to the above are:
- Appointing all of the members to the Positions Subcommittee and dealing with any conflicts of interest for members whose organisations have lodged or joined an appeal on a topic by way of recusals meeting by meeting. While this enables the smaller quorum for a subcommittee to be applied, it provides less certainty that the risk presented by conflicts of interest will be adequately managed.
  - Appointing a Positions Subcommittee with a fixed membership, such as the members whose organisations have not lodged or joined any appeal (i.e. the Independent Chair and the representatives of the West Coast Regional Council) or some other fixed sub-set of members. The main disadvantage of this option is that the members who are not appointed to the Positions Subcommittee would not be able to participate in decision making on position setting for any topics, even where their organisation is not a party to an appeal on the topic.
  - Delegating decision making on all position setting to the Independent Chair (as referred to in the previous legal advice). This option would avoid any risk of perception of conflict of interest, but would also be the most restrictive in terms of participation in the position setting process by TTPP Committee members.
29. A summary of the options for position setting and their advantages and disadvantages is provided in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 – Options for position setting**

Option 1: Position setting by TTPP Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enables potential participation by all members</li> <li>• Risk of perception of conflicts of interest</li> <li>• Requires members to consider recusals meeting by meeting</li> <li>• Risk that quorum for TTPP Committee meeting will not be met</li> </ul>
Option 2: Appoint Positions Subcommittee with 'rolling' membership consisting of at least two members and excluding any members whose organisations are an appellant or s274 party to an appeal on the relevant topic to make decisions on position setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enables all members to participate in position setting for all topics where their organisations have not lodged an appeal or s274 notice</li> <li>• Removes risk of perception of conflicts of interest</li> <li>• Removes need to manage recusals at each meeting (except where other conflicts of interest arise)</li> <li>• Removes risk that quorum for meetings will not be met</li> <li>• Enables flexibility for attendance taking into account Court timetabling and member availability</li> </ul>
Option 3: Appoint Positions Subcommittee consisting of all members of TTPP Committee to make decisions on position setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enables potential participation by all members</li> <li>• Risk of perception of conflicts of interest</li> <li>• Requires members to consider recusals meeting by meeting</li> <li>• Risk that quorum for meeting will not be met is removed (due to quorum of two applying to subcommittee meetings)</li> </ul>
Option 4: Appoint Positions Subcommittee with fixed membership consisting of some subset of members (such as non-appellants) to make decisions on position setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May remove risk of perception of conflict of interest and need to manage recusals depending on membership</li> <li>• May remove risk that quorum for a meeting will not be met, depending on availability of appointed members</li> <li>• Restricts members who can participate in position setting on any topic to appointed members</li> </ul>
Option 5: Delegate decision making on position setting to the Independent Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoids risk of perception of conflict of interest</li> <li>• No need for meetings and quorum requirements do not apply</li> <li>• Most restrictive in terms of participation by TTPP Committee members in position setting</li> </ul>

30. Staff recommend Option 2 for position-setting. If the TTPP Committee decides to approve this option, staff recommend that the attached Terms of Reference for the Postions Subcommittee are also adopted to ensure that the purpose and scope of the appointment and delegation are clear (Appendix 2).

**DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO ENTER AGREEMENTS TO RESOLVE APPEALS**

31. Following position setting on topics, the TTPP Committee’s legal counsel, Principal Planner (for each topic), Project Manager and possibly other technical experts or staff will participate in direct discussions and attend Court assisted mediation with parties to attempt to settle appeals points without the need for a hearing. In doing so, these representatives will seek to give effect to the positions that have been set through the position setting process.
32. The Environment Court requires that each party must have at least one representative attending any mediation who has authority to make decisions to settle the appeal (including giving instructions to legal counsel to sign any mediation agreement or consent order). Council respondents usually delegate this authority to a Council officer.

33. Staff are seeking that the TTPP Committee make such a delegation to enable direct discussions and mediation to proceed efficiently. As the TTPP Committee is made up of six parties, options for delegating this function could be to a sole member of the Committee (such as the Independent Chair), or to TTPP staff. The person(s) must be available throughout the mediation period, be familiar with the content of the TTPP, be able to represent the TTPP Committee's position and be available to provide instructions to legal counsel to sign any mediation agreements on the same day as any mediation agreement is reached. It is recommended that more than one person is delegated this authority to ensure their availability as required.
34. Taking into account these considerations, staff recommend that the TTPP Committee delegate this authority to enter into any agreements to settle any appeals generally in accordance with the positions that have been set through the TTPP position setting process to the TTPP Chair and Project Manager (with any one of them being able to make the decision).

#### **DELEGATION TO ENABLE ADMINISTRATION OF APPEALS**

35. For completeness, staff also seek a delegation to enable efficient administration of the appeal and mediation processes. This is for matters such as liaising with parties on scheduling of meetings, mediation and other appeal processes and providing instructions to legal counsel on procedural matters for the conduct of the appeals with the Court.
36. Staff recommend that this delegation be made to the TTPP Project Manager.

#### **CONSIDERATIONS UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002**

37. Staff consider that the decisions recommended within this paper are of low significance, because they relate to the TTPP Committee's processes regarding the management of appeals rather than the substance of the issues the appeals raise. Additionally, the appeals have been lodged through a participatory RMA process, where interested parties have the ability to participate in the appeals if they choose to do so.

## Appendix 1

### Topics to Which TTPP Committee Member Organisations are Appellants or s274 Parties

<b>Topic</b>	<b>TTPP Committee Member Organisation Parties (Appellants and/or section 274 parties)</b>
<b>Strategic Directions</b>	Buller District Council Grey District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Introduction and General Provisions</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council Grey District Council
<b>Energy</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council
<b>Infrastructure</b>	Buller District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Transport</b>	Buller District Council
<b>Historic Heritage</b>	Buller District Council
<b>Hazardous Substances</b>	Buller District Council
<b>Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies</b>	Buller District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Natural Features and Landscapes</b>	Buller District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Activities on the Surface of Water</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council
<b>Coastal Environment</b>	Buller District Council Grey District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu Westland District Council
<b>Commercial and Industrial Zones</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council
<b>Earthworks</b>	Grey District Council Buller District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity</b>	Buller District Council Grey District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Light</b>	Buller District Council Grey District Council
<b>Mineral Extraction (General)</b>	Grey District Council Buller District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Mineral Extraction (Buller Coalfield Zone)</b>	Buller District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Mineral Extraction (Mineral Extraction Zone)</b>	Buller District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu

	Grey District Council
<b>Natural Hazards</b>	Buller District Council Grey District Council Westland District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Noise</b>	Buller District Council Grey District Council Westland District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu
<b>Rural Zones and Activities</b>	Westland District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu Grey District Council Buller District Council
<b>Settlement Zone</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council
<b>Open Space and Recreation Zones</b>	Buller District Council
<b>Port Zone</b>	Grey District Council
<b>Future Urban Zone</b>	Buller District Council
<b>Scenic Visitor Zone</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council
<b>Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council Westland District Council
<b>Subdivision</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council Grey District Council
<b>Temporary Activities</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council
<b>Transport</b>	Buller District Council Grey District Council
<b>Zone Mapping</b>	Poutini Ngāi Tahu Westland District Council
<b>Whole Plan – various cross plan provisions</b>	Grey District Council Poutini Ngāi Tahu Buller District Council Westland District Council

## **Appendix 2**

### **TTPP POSITIONS SUBCOMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Positions Subcommittee is a subcommittee of the TTPP Committee and is governed by the Local Government Reorganisation Scheme (West Coast Region) Order 2019 and the TTPP Committee Standing Orders.

1. Area of responsibility
  - a. Considering staff advice and making decisions on the general parameters of the TTPP Committee's position on appeals against the TTPP Committee's decision on the TTPP to guide negotiations and potential resolution of appeal points by TTPP Committee delegated representatives.
2. Powers to decide
  - a. The general parameters of the TTPP Committee's position on TTPP appeal points and topics.
3. Membership
  - a. All members of the TTPP Committee are appointed to the Positions Subcommittee.
  - b. Each Positions Subcommittee meeting to consider and decide on an appeal topic or group of topics shall be made up of at least two members and shall exclude any members where the Council or Runanga that they represent is a party to an appeal on a relevant topic.
4. Quorum
  - a. The Quorum for the Positions Subcommittee shall be two members.
5. Chairperson
  - a. The Chairperson of the Positions Subcommittee shall be the Independent Chair of TTPP Committee.
  - b. If the Independent Chair is absent or vacates a meeting, clause 13.1 of the TTPP Standing Orders applies.



# 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: 10 February 2026

Subject: **TTPP 2027 Draft Budget Expenses**

---

## **SUMMARY**

This report includes the draft budget for anticipated expenses 1 July 2026 to 30 June 2027 for discussion and approval to present to West Coast Regional Council for funding.

The paper identifies the uncertainties inherent in this budgeting process and the assumptions used to aid calculations.

Three options are provided for consideration.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Committee receive the report
2. That the Committee acknowledge the uncertainty inherent in setting this budget and confirm and approve the 2027 draft budget expenses as set out in Option 2 totalling \$1,080,500 for presentation to West Coast Regional Council for funding.

Jo Armstrong

**TTPP Project Manager**

## **BACKGROUND**

1. Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP), the combined district plan for the West Coast, was legally established under a central government Order in Council in June 2019. The Local Government Reorganisation Scheme (West Coast Region) Order 2019 sets out the role and membership of the TTPP Committee and, under clause 13(2), directs that funding will be by way of a regional rate.
2. Clause 8(4) of the Order in Council states that the purpose of the TTPP Committee is to prepare, notify, hear, consider and adopt a final combined district plan. Following that it is charged with the ongoing role of monitoring implementation and undertaking amendments and reviews.
3. Each year the TTPP Committee is responsible for developing and approving a budget to support these functions. The budget covers the expected staffing and resourcing requirements but leaves West Coast Regional Council (WCRC) to calculate the overheads expense that they charge for their services, the level of annual income to be raised by rates and the amount of loan required for the year.
4. The Committee provides its budget to WCRC for inclusion in council financial decision-making and to arrange funding.

## **BUDGETING TO DATE**

5. Expenditure in the first four TTPP budgets (2020-2023) covered the TTPP development. This included known staff costs, minimal legal input, in-house stakeholder engagement run by TTPP staff, a consistent overheads expense, well-understood GIS and plan hosting requirements and costs, and anticipated research components. These budgets were largely accurate.
6. The 2024 budget included the first seven months of hearings and was the first budget to incorporate a higher level of uncertainty in its development. This was mainly due to uncontrolled factors such as the number of submitters attending hearings, and the time required by the hearings panel to hear and deliberate on submissions. As the start of hearings was delayed until late October 2023 there was a budget surplus that year.
7. Both the 2025 budget and the current 2026 budget have met with high levels of uncertainty around the costs of hearings, including expert input required, and the time necessary for the hearings panel to produce its recommendations report. This resulted in a significant budget deficit in 2025, and increased Hearing Commissioner costs this financial year due to the delayed report delivery.

## **2027 BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS AND RATIONALE**

8. The 2027 financial year will be another with a high level of uncertainty surrounding expenses. This is due to the lack of TTPP Committee control over mediation and court costs during this period.
9. The Environment Court has complete control over the number, timing and outcomes of mediation and court processes until the final version of TTPP is approved.
10. TTPP staff and legal counsel have the opportunity to provide input to the Court on suggested topic groupings and timing that works best for appellants, but the Court has the final say on dates and length of mediation and court hearings.
11. A number of TTPP expenses are reasonably easy to predict, such as website updates and maintenance, Plan hosting platform, governance disbursements and media costs. However, expenses related to the mediation/court processes will be determined by the

number and length of the proceedings and the corresponding staff, expert witness, consultant planner and legal input required. The extent of travel, meals and accommodation expenses are also directly related to the number of days in mediation/court.

12. To keep you informed about how the budget is tracking, staff will bring financial reports to your regular meetings updating the level of expenditure to date and highlighting any anticipated exceedances.
13. Some assumptions have been made about the length and timing of the mediation/court proceedings to enable staff to calculate expenses for the 2027 financial year. The assumptions appear in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 Assumptions and Rationale to Guide Budget Expenses Setting for 2027**

<b>Assumption</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
Some early meetings with appellants will resolve some appeals points ahead of mediation. This will reduce some time and costs of mediation and enable more parts of TTPP to become fully operative sooner.	Some appeals points are on matters already resolved and approved by TTPP Committee under RMA Schedule 1 s16.  Others could be easily agreed to between parties or are a matter of misunderstanding.
Approximately three weeks will be required for mediation.	This estimate is based on the number and complexity of topics appealed, and the number of appellants and others joining the appeals as RMA s274 parties per topic.
At least one week of mediation will occur in the 2027 financial year.	Extensions granted by the Court to both the appeals and s274 periods have extended the final closing date by 6 weeks. This increases the likelihood of some appeals being heard in the 2027 financial year.
At least two topics will proceed to court hearings, both in the 2027 financial year.	Some topics have been appealed by parties with diametrically opposed positions and are unlikely to reach a mediated outcome.
Legal Counsel will have a high level of input before, during and following proceedings.	Legal counsel has an established role following receipt of appeals through to the final Plan decision. This includes staff/Committee liaison and advice, liaising with the Court, correspondence with appellants and preparation for and attendance at proceedings.
Expert witnesses will be required to support the TTPP Committee as the respondent to the appeals.	Experts will be required to support their research and advice given during Plan development and hearings.
Additional consultant planners will be required to represent the TTPP Committee in proceedings.	The TTPP Principal Planner will represent the Committee in most of the proceedings. At least two complex topics that they have not developed or supported at hearings will require additional more expensive contract planner representation.

Further research may be required to support TPPP Committee's case.	TPPP Committee may request further research to support their position.
Travel, meals and accommodation will be required for planning, legal, expert and delegated representation.	Mediation is expected to occur on the West Coast, and representatives not domiciled there will need these costs covered.

**BUDGETED EXPENSES FOR 2027**

- 14. Due to the high level of uncertainty staff are presenting three options (best-case, mid-range and worst-case scenarios) for the 2027 budgeted expenses for Committee consideration in Table 2 below.
- 15. A description of each budget item plus any assumptions considered are also included in the table for Committee discussion and decision.
- 16. TPPP income and loan figures will be determined by the WCRC for inclusion in the final version of the 2027 budget.

**Table 2 TTPP 2027 Draft Budget Expenses Options**

<b>Expense Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>	<b>Option 1 Best case</b>	<b>Option 2 Mid-range</b>	<b>Option 3 Worst case</b>
Employee costs	Permanent TTPP staff costs		120,000	150,000	180,000
Consultant Planners and Contractors	Planning and project management for meetings and appeals mediation or court processes, Decision Plan updates. Expert witness representation at proceedings. Research	Appellant meetings, 1 week of mediation, 2 or 3 hearings, additional experts and planners required. Some research	350,000	450,000	550,000
Chair and iwi representatives	Remuneration		66,000	66,000	66,000
Governance	Meeting expenses/attendance		4,000	4,000	4,000
Poutini Ngai Tahu	Technical Advisory Team Plan change input and advice		-	5,000	5,000
TTPP Website	Updates and notices as appeals are settled		2,000	4,500	5,500
Isovist e-plan Platform	Hosting service of TTPP and related maps, technical support, updates of plan versions as appeals are settled		8,000	9,000	10,000
Meals, Travel & Accom	Appeals and meeting attendance for legal, planning, experts, delegate	Appellant meetings, 1 week of mediation and 2 or 3 hearings	24,000	36,000	48,000
Workshops & Events	Plan change 1 engagement, appeals venue hire, consumables		1,800	2,500	3,000
Media Costs	Notices and advertising		3,000	3,500	4,000
Legal Fees	Appeals advice, liaison and representation at mediation and court proceedings	Appellant meetings, 1 week of mediation and 2 or 3 hearings	300,000	350,000	400,000
Interest Payments	Loan servicing		TBA	TBA	TBA
Overhead costs	CE, GM and staff time, administrative services, facilities		TBA	TBA	TBA
<b>EXPENDITURE ex interest and overheads</b>			<b>878,800</b>	<b>1,080,500</b>	<b>1,275,500</b>

17. Staff recommend Option 2, the mid-range budget of \$1,080,500 be confirmed and approved on the understanding that WCRC will increase the budget to also cover interest and overhead costs.

18. Once you confirm and approve your budget option this will be provided to West Coast Regional Council to include in their annual plan decision making.



# 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: 10 February 2026  
Subject: **Financial Report to 31 December 2025**

---

## SUMMARY

This report includes the statement of financial performance for the financial year to 31 December 2025.

## RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Committee receive the report

## REPORT

1. The Financial Statement for the period 1 July to 31 December 2025 is at Table 1.
2. The December statement shows that expenses for the financial year are tracking ahead of those expected in the budget, with a reported deficit of \$690,347 compared with a budgeted deficit of \$495,022. This was due to the Hearing Commissioner expenditure being greater than originally anticipated. The resulting unfavourable variance against budget is \$195,327.
3. 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 of appeals on the TTPP decision version.
4. The Life of the Project to 30 June 2025, Table 2, 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. A column headed Current YTD has been added to show figures for the current financial year to 31 December 2025 from Table 1.
5. 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 \$4,998,330.

**Table 1**

**Te Tai o Poutini Plan**

<b>Statement of Financial Performance to 31 December 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	321,392	321,392	-		642,783	321,391
General Rates Contributions						
Grants & Subsidies						
Other Contributions						
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>321,392</b>	<b>321,392</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>642,783</b>	<b>321,391</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>						
Employee costs	66,962	90,000	23,038		180,000	113,038
Consultant Planners and Contractors	165,691	274,998	109,307		549,996	384,305
Chair and iwi representatives	33,000	33,000	-		66,000	33,000
Governance	1,100	1,998	898		3,996	2,896
Poutini Ngai Tahu	-	7,500	7,500		15,000	15,000
TTPP Website	3,633	6,000	2,367		12,000	8,367
Isovist e-plan Platform	-	4,500	4,500		9,000	9,000
Meals, Travel & Accom	18,703	15,996	(2,707)		31,992	13,289
Workshops & Events	-	7,698	7,698		15,396	15,396
Media Costs	10,087	10,002	(85)		20,004	9,917
Legal Advice	57,287	150,000	92,713		300,000	242,713
Hearings – commissioner fees	573,470	62,502	(510,968)		125,004	(448,466)
Interest Payments	-	70,415	70,415		140,829	140,829
Overhead costs	81,804	81,804	-		163,608	81,804
Appeals						
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>1,011,739</b>	<b>816,413</b>	<b>(195,327)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,632,825</b>	<b>621,086</b>
<b>NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>(690,347)</b>	<b>(495,022)</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>(990,042)</b>	

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

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

Table 2

## Te Tai o Poutini Plan

Life of Project 1 July 2019-30 June 2025											
	Prior Year -2025			2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	Current YTD	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	-	321,392	3,522,802
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>321,392</b>	<b>3,952,802</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>											
Employee costs	163,574	303,358	139,784	205,577	183,472	279,060	268,762	199,591	67,022	66,962	1,434,021
Consultant Planners and Contractors	901,333	674,400	(226,933)	695,112	172,899	420,035	231,931	108,885	-	165,691	2,695,887
Chair and iwi representatives	61,669	66,000	4,331	60,000	60,000	60,000	54,500	55,000	-	33,000	384,169
Governance	1,007	1,400	393	-	747	1,949	-	-	-	1,100	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	-	3,633	51,920
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	18,703	249,519
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	-	10,087	145,562
Legal Advice	101,049	120,000	18,951	100,854	27,289	27,343	4,689	907	-	57,287	319,418
Hearings – commissioner fees	1,226,042	214,000	(1,012,042)	419,581	6,647	-	-	-	-	573,470	2,225,740
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	81,804	998,100
Appeals											
<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>1,011,739</b>	<b>8,951,132</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>(690,347)</b>	<b>(4,998,330)</b>

\* Please note that the total cost to date column also includes the current YTD figures (1 July - 31 December 2025)