

PROPOSED TE TAI POUTINI PLAN: EIT TOPIC

Chris Horne Speaking Notes

1. The Telecommunications Companies have only limited outstanding matters they wish to address on the EIT Topic that are addressed in my evidence.

Relationship between NESTF and the Proposed Plan

2. The Proposed Plan as notified does not properly explain the relationship between the NESTF and the Proposed Plan in Note 2 to the infrastructure rules introduction. The reporting planners recommend the amendments sought by the Companies in their submission be accepted, but the s42A recommended provisions do not reflect the change sought. In my opinion the note still does not properly reflect how the two instruments are integrated. I recommend that Note 2 be amended as set out in Paragraph 19 of my Evidence in Chief (EIC).
3. I also support an amendment to the scope of Rule INF-R12 to ensure it covers both new telecommunications facilities not regulated by the NESTF, and new facilities that are regulated but don't meet the permitted standards of the NESTF. Otherwise, there appears to be a rule gap for regulated equipment not meeting the NESTF permitted standards.

INF-R12 Height Limits for Poles and Antennas in Industrial Zones

4. I support an amendment in the permitted height limit for poles and attached antennas in the General Industrial Zone (GIZ) from 20m to 25m, reflecting that these are appropriate urban zone types to locate larger telecommunications facilities where practical, and in recognition that the general height limit for buildings is 20m so a margin above this is necessary to retain line of sight for effective coverage. In my opinion this is consistent with Policy INF-P2 in regard to recognising operational and functional need, and positive effects for the community, whilst appropriately managing adverse effects (in this case in the context of the amenity values and enabled building envelope of the GIZ).

INF-R14 New telecommunications poles and Antennas not in Road Reserve

5. I have recommended changes to Rule INF-R14 only from the perspective of it making sense rather than to seek any change to its intent. This rule provides a controlled activity additional margin over the permitted activity envelope. The Companies' submission supported rather than sought any changes to this rule. Accordingly, any amendments along the lines I have suggested in paragraph 38 of my EIC would need to be a Clause

16 change on the basis it currently doesn't make sense as drafted. The actual allowances provided for in the rule would not change.

INF-R4 Temporary Network Utilities

6. I support an amendment to Rule INF-R4 to allow for temporary network utilities as part of construction and reconstruction activity for up to 12 months. I do not agree with the reporting planners that Rule INF-R7 (minor upgrading of infrastructure) or Rule TEMP-R2 (as the temporary equipment may not necessarily be located on the same site) addresses this particular issue. The Companies have provided evidence on the type of scenarios where temporary equipment may be required. District-wide noise rules will continue to apply.

New INF Rule Underground Lines

7. I requested that the reporting planners confirmed at this hearing in paragraphs 45 to 47 of my EIC that Rule INF-R9 provides for underground lines as a permitted activity. If this is the correct interpretation then the Companies' requested relief of a new permitted activity rule for underground lines will not be required.

New INF Rule Back-up Standby Generators

8. The Companies sought a new permitted activity rule for back-up generators. The reporting planners considered that the requested rule was not necessary due to the temporary infrastructure rule. The intent of the submission was for fixed standby generators rather than temporary generators that may for example be moved to a site during a natural disaster. In my view a permanent stand-by generator would not necessarily be covered by the temporary activity provisions in INF-R4 (e.g. an area power outage where a state of emergency is not declared, or a remote facility relying on solar and/or wind as the primary electricity source). In my opinion permanent standby back-up generators should be specifically provided for in the INF rules as a permitted activity. The district -wide noise rules will continue to apply.

Overlay Chapters Approach Overview

9. The Companies will participate separately in relevant overlay chapter hearing topics. However, I have provided an overview in my evidence as to why infrastructure may need to be sited in areas such as natural landscapes or heritage areas due to functional and operational reasons, and accordingly why it is important that provisions in those sections retain sufficient flexibility to consider infrastructure in sensitive areas in appropriate circumstances.