

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
CHRISTCHURCH REGISTRY**

**I MUA I TE KŌTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA
KI ŌTAUTAHI**

ENV-2025-CHC-000111

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of an appeal under clause 14(1) of Schedule 1 to the Act

AND

IN THE MATTER of s 274 of the Act

BETWEEN **DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF CONSERVATION**

Appellant

AND

TE TAI O POUTINI PLAN COMMITTEE

Respondent

BULLER DISTRICT COUNCIL'S WISH TO BE A PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS
2 February 2026

FLETCHER VAUTIER MOORE
LAWYERS
PO BOX 90
NELSON 7040

Telephone: (03) 548 1469
Email: cthomsen@fvm.co.nz
ayardley@fvm.co.nz
Solicitor: Chris Thomsen

TO: The Registrar
Environment Court
Christchurch

1. Buller District Council (**BDC**) wishes to be a party to the following proceedings:

Director-General of Conservation v Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee

2. BDC made a submission about the subject matter of the proceedings.
3. BDC has an interest in the proceedings that is greater than the interest that the general public has because BDC:
 - 3.1. Is the territorial authority responsible for administering and implementing the Te Tai o Poutini Plan (**TTPP**) within the Buller District; and
 - 3.2. Has a direct interest in ensuring that the ecosystems and natural hazards provisions operate coherently, are practicable to implement, and provide clear and consistent direction for plan users and decision-makers.
4. BDC is not a trade competitor for the purposes of ss 308C or 308A Resource Management Act 1991.
5. BDC is interested in all the proceedings.
6. BDC is interested in the following particular issues:
 - 6.1. Objective ECO-O3;
 - 6.2. Policies NH-P7 and NH-P12;
 - 6.3. Rules ECO-R1 and ECO-R6;
 - 6.4. The administration of the TTPP; and

- 6.5. The clarity, consistency and internal coherence of provisions, including the relationship between objectives, policies and rules.
7. BDC conditionally supports the relief sought because:
 - 7.1. Policy NH-P7 should provide a pathway for all appropriate protection measures and the decisions-version is unduly prescriptive and, therefore, restrictive; and
 - 7.2. Any uncertainty created by the drafting of NH-P12 should be corrected.
8. BDC opposes the relief sought because:
 - 8.1. The relief seeking the deletion of Objective ECO-O3 is inappropriate as the objective appropriately recognises a pathway in TTPP to manage adverse effects, which is not inconsistent with the other direction given in ECO-01 and 02;
 - 8.2. The proposed amendments to rules ECO-R1 and ECO-R6, unduly constrain permitted activity pathways for indigenous vegetation clearance outside Significant Natural Areas, and risk altering the intended balance between enabling low-impact activities and managing ecological effects.
9. BDC agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated: 2 February 2026



CP Thomsen / AA Yardley
Counsel for Buller District Council

This notice was filed by **CHRISTOPHER PAUL THOMSEN**, solicitor for the party of the firm Fletcher Vautier Moore. The address for service of the above-named party is at the offices of Fletcher Vautier Moore, Solicitors, Level 1, 201 Queen Street, Richmond, Nelson.

Documents for service on the party may be:

- a) Posted to the solicitor at Fletcher Vautier Moore, Solicitors, PO Box 90, Nelson 7040; or
- b) Sent by email to both cthomsen@fvm.co.nz and ayardley@fvm.co.nz.

Advice

If you have any questions about this notice, contact the Environment Court in Auckland, Wellington, or Christchurch.