

## **Energy Infrastructure and Transport (EIT) – Reconvened Hearing**

The following are a series of questions from the Panel for the planners related to the reconvened EIT hearing. This is not an exhaustive list and there are likely to be further questions.

Participants are reminded that this is a reconvened hearing based on the Planning Joint Witness Statement and response from the s42A reporting officers. This is not an opportunity to relitigate matters have already been addressed in evidence at the original hearing.

### **Questions**

#### **S42A Reporting Officer**

Are you recommending that the Waka Kotahi map lines and associated wording from the Waka Kotahi tables both be replicated to identify relevant special purpose roads in the pTTPP?

With regards to narrowing the scope of RSI to statutory agencies and requiring authorities for particular kinds of infrastructure indicated by Ngāi Tahu as being of concern (e.g. ports, landfills and waste storage and disposal, 3 waters infrastructure), is there potential to differentiate these from energy and telecommunications activities?

How do you understand the difference between ‘provide for’ and ‘enable’? (ENG-O3, ENG-P1)

If reverse sensitivity effects are managed as part of strategic directions in the plan, is ENG-P3 needed?

Is ENG-PX2 missing the word ‘of’?

ENG – R6 and ENG – RX10 - despite lack of national level protection, do you think that the fact these are identified as regionally significant electricity distribution lines increases the need for their protection? – i.e. non-complying status – do you agree that national direction is not the only consideration? – i.e. RPS RSI Objective 1 and associated policies 1, 2, 5 and 6

If non-renewable back-up generators do not meet ENG-R1 standards, what status is the activity? – i.e. the PA rule ENG-R9 and the RD rule ENG-RX4 both rely on compliance with ENG-R1, but the NC rule ENG-RX9 does not apply? Could that situation arise or is it in a non-issue?

Large scale distributed electricity generation – recommendation for ‘small and community scale electricity generation activities’ does not include scale for generating capacity but instead defines the term by description – should reference to capacity be dropped and simply leave the descriptor as the defining characteristic between the two types? Exporting to the distribution network and National Grid can happen at household and community scale presumably?

#### **Westpower**

On reflection, do you support the s42A officer amendments to the Overview as now proposed?

What is the evidence we should rely on or reference in support of the need for your recommended addition to ENG-P2 (f)?

ENG-P5 – On reflection, do you support the s42A amendments as now proposed? In your proposed version is there any need for the sub-clause list with the deletion of (b)? and if so should the policy end ahead of the word ‘and’?

ENG – R4 - Outside of the EIT chapter, use of the term ‘minor upgrade’ is limited to NC – R1, CE – R5 and CE – R10 – if those rules cross-referenced to ‘activities that are permitted in the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport chapter’ wouldn’t that resolve the issue and remove the need for differentiating between upgrade and minor upgrade?

ENG – R4 (2)(ii)(c) – three new terms are introduced that do not appear anywhere else in the plan – ‘earthwire’, ‘earthgrid’ and ‘earthpeak’ – is there alternative means of addressing the matter that contains less jargon?

ENG – R4 (2)(ii)(c) – where do the 50% and 25m figures come from?

ENG – R8 – where did the 10m2 come from?

Energy – could the final sentence instead read “This includes all types of electricity generation activities”? Isn’t it also true that it includes non-renewable electricity generation activities?

### **Ngāi Tahu**

Is it primarily ports, landfills and waste storage and disposal, and 3 waters infrastructure that should be limited to statutory agencies and requiring authorities as part of the RSI definition?

What is the concern with non-requiring authorities being considered Regionally Significant Infrastructure.

Is there a way to address the concerns of Manawa Energy and that telecommunications companies that is acceptable to Ngāi Tahu given that they are not a requiring authority?

Would an assessment of Poutini Ngāi Tahu values require Ngāi Tahu input into all applications under rules ENG-R11, ENG-R14, INF-R16, TRN-R9 and TRN-R10.

### **Manawa**

Is the matter of statutory agency and requiring authority status of most concern in relation to renewable electricity and telecommunications companies such that it may be appropriate to differentiate other infrastructure types and their regional significance that way?

### **WCRC**

Are existing emergency powers in the RMA able to be relied upon to address the circumstances of concern?

### **Waka Kotahi**

What is Waka Kotahi’s current position on their submission.

What are the appropriate trigger thresholds for equivalent vehicle movements?

### **BT Mining - Claire Hunter**

What is the reason for not simply relying on the mining zones to enable the high number of heavy vehicle movements?

Isn’t the purpose of the zoning to indicate to plan users where in each district to expect higher volumes of heavy vehicle movements?

**Generic Question**

Is it appropriate for any consent under rules ENG-R11, ENG-R14, INF-R16, TRN-R9 and TRN-R10 to be accompanying by the cultural impact assessment.