

In the Environment Court
At Christchurch

ENV-2025-CHC-130

I te Kōti Taiao o Aotearoa
Ki Ōtautahi

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

In the matter of an appeal under clause 14(1) of Schedule 1 and section 274 of the RMA

Between **GREY DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Appellant

And **TE TAI O POUTINI PLAN COMMITTEE**

Respondent

**NOTICE OF TE RŪNANGA O NGĀTI WAEWAE, TE RŪNANGA O MAKAAWHIO AND
TE RŪNANGA O NGĀI TAHU WHO WISH TO BECOME A PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS**

Dated: 2 February 2026

**SIMPSON
GRIERSON**

Sarah Scott / Oscar Wilson
T: +64 3 968 4018 / +64 3 924 3503
sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
oscar.wilson@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874 Christchurch

To: The Registrar
Environment Court
Christchurch

Introduction

- 1.** Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae and Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio (collectively referred to as **Poutini Ngāi Tahu**) and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (**TRoNT**) wish to be a party to an appeal made by Grey District Council (**Appellant**) against parts of the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee (**TTPP Committee**) decision on the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (**TTPP**).
- 2.** Poutini Ngāi Tahu and TRoNT made a submission about the subject matter of the proceeding. Poutini Ngāi Tahu and TRoNT either made a submission on the relevant provisions appealed, or the appeal points concern the same subject matter and issues that are prevalent throughout its submissions.
- 3.** Poutini Ngāi Tahu and TRoNT also have an interest that is greater than the interest of the general public, as mana whenua of the land that is subject to the TTPP and for the reasons set out in its Notice of Appeal, ENV-2025-CHC-134, at [6] to [12].
- 4.** Poutini Ngāi Tahu and TRoNT are not trade competitors for the purposes of 308C or 308CA of the RMA.

Interest in proceedings

- 5.** The parts of the proceedings that Poutini Ngāi Tahu and TRoNT seek to join, its position on those appeals, and the reasons for that position are set out in **Appendix A**.
- 6.** More generally, for the relief opposed:
 - (a)** It will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA, in that it:

- (i) fails to sustain the potential of natural and physical resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;
 - (ii) does not safeguard the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and
 - (iii) fails to appropriately avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects of activities on the environment;
- (b) Is contrary to Part 2 of the RMA, including sections 6(e), 7 and 8; and
 - (c) Is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, as required under section 32 of the RMA.

7. Poutini Ngāi Tahu and TRoNT agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

DATED 2 February 2026



Sarah Scott / Oscar Wilson
Counsel for Te Rūnanga o Ngāti
Waewae, Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio
and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu

Address for service of interested party:

Simpson Grierson
151 Cambridge Terrace
PO Box 874
Christchurch

Attention: Sarah Scott / Oscar Wilson

Telephone: +64-3-968 4018

Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com / oscar.wilson@simpsongrierson.com

Appendix A – Poutini Ngāi Tahu and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu appeal position

| PROVISION | APPELLANT RELIEF (SHOWN IN <u>UNDERLINED AND STRUCK THROUGH</u> BLACK FONT) | POUTINI NGĀI TAHU AND TRONT POSITION ON RELIEF AND REASONS |
|---|--|---|
| <p>District Wide-Noise</p> <p>NOISE – R3(2)</p> | <p>Amend NOISE -R3 (2) to reduce the noise control boundary from 100m to 60 m from the edge of the tracks as per the Notified Version, as set out in Attachment A.</p> <p>2. <u>60m</u> 100m of the edge of the tracks of any railway line except for the Hokitika line where any new or altered habitable room used for a sensitive activity and/or space used for sleeping:</p> | <p>Support</p> <p>Due to historical policy, a significant amount of Māori Land is impacted by this provision. Poutini Ngāi Tahu and TRoNT support the reasoning that the noise boundary from 60m to 100m from the edge of railway tracks is disproportionate to the volume of rail traffic and noise effects. The change in the decisions version to 100m also raises natural justice concerns as the expanded distance will capture many property owners who were not aware of and therefore did not submit on the change.</p> |
| <p>Natural Hazards</p> <p>NH-R4</p> | <p>Amend the activity status under NH-R4 from restricted discretionary to permitted activity status, as set out in Attachment A.</p> <p>In the alternative, amend the activity status under NH-R4 from restricted discretionary to permitted, where the Statutory Agency is a district council or a regional council, as set out in Attachment A.</p> <p>New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structure and Repairs, Maintenance and Operation of any Minor Upgrades to, or Demolition of, Existing Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures not meeting Permitted Activity Standards</p> <p>Activity Status Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Discretion is Restricted to:</p> <p>the effects on people and property;</p> <p>The effects on the natural character of the coastal environment;</p> <p>The effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu values, and archaeological sites, historic heritage or on any Site and Areas of Significance to Māori identified in Schedule Three;</p> <p>The effects on public access;</p> <p>Volume and area of earthworks;</p> <p>Effects on ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity;</p> <p>Measures to mitigate landscape effects; and</p> <p>The functional need or operational need of the activity.</p> <p>...</p> | <p>Oppose</p> <p>The effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu values, archaeology and SASM needs to remain a consideration.</p> |