

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
CHRISTCHURCH REGISTRY**

ENV- 2025-CHC-

**I MUA I TE KOOTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA
ŌTAUTAHU ROHE**

IN THE MATTER

of an appeal under Clause 14 of the
First Schedule of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND IN THE MATTER

of the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan

BETWEEN

**GEORGE ELDON COATES AND CARYL
JEAN COATES ON BEHALF OF NIKAU
DEER FARM LTD**

Appellant

AND

**TE TAI O POUTINI PLAN COMMITTEE
Respondent**

**SECTION 274 NOTICE BY THE ROYAL FOREST AND BIRD PROTECTION
SOCIETY OF NEW ZEALAND INCORPORATED**

29 January 2026

Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated

Solicitor acting: E. Toleman

Email: e.toleman@forestandbird.org.nz

Phone: 021 988 315

Counsel: P Anderson

Email: peter@peteranderson.co.nz

Phone: 0212866992

SECTION 274 NOTICE

1. The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated (Forest & Bird or the Society) wishes to be a party to the appeal by George Eldon Coates and Caryl Jean Coates on behalf of Nikau Deer Farm Ltd (Appellant) on the Te Tai Poutini Plan Committee (Respondent) decisions on the Proposed Te Tai Poutini Plan (TTPP).
2. Forest & Bird made a submission and a further submission on the TTPP.
3. Forest & Bird is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308D of the Resource Management Act 1991.
4. Forest & Bird has an interest greater than the public generally, as an incorporated society with a well-known role in the protection of indigenous biodiversity.¹
5. Forest & Bird is interested in all of the proceedings. This is subject to the proviso that the appeal does not clearly set out the relief sought in terms of specific amendments to the TTPP. Once the changes sought are particularised, Forest & Bird will review its position on the matters of interest to it.
6. Forest & Bird opposes the relief sought as it does not promote sustainable management.

Dated: 29 January 2026



Peter Anderson
Counsel for Royal Forest And Bird Protection Society of New
Zealand Incorporated

¹ See Marlborough District Council v Burkhardt Fisheries Ltd [2018] NZEnvC 26 and [31]