

## Background and Interpretation.

1/ Good morning Commissioners,

This has been a Journey for myself and everyone in our group. It has been extremely taxing and a learning curve which is ongoing.

What is stated in our submission in ~~the~~ front of you is how we "view" legislation and its interpretation.

What is highlighted on the screen in our opinion points out that 33kv lines ~~and possibly 110kv~~ in the Far North area should ~~have~~ not be identified as "Regionally Significant Infrastructure" and subsequently ~~not~~ mapped as "CEL's". As they do not qualify to be treated as such.

It is very clear from the screenshots that "National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission" was intended exclusively for the National Grid/Transpower. And to be recognised in the District Plans via the Regional Councils.

The WPSET ~~in our opinion~~ has no relevance to justify the inclusion of TE in the District plan especially with their ad-hoc suggestions as they want to use this as a benchmark.

The NRC in their RPS also has ~~no clear~~ <sup>no</sup> justification or clear ~~direction~~ reasoning to directly instruct the local councils to identify "Local Distribution Network Lines" in particular 33kv lines as "Regionally Significant Infrastructure".  
Reference 5.3.5 (b) THERE MAY BE VALUE  
~~This is a suggestion with no grounding or clear rationale. They not provided any clear evidence or justification.~~

## Utility Easement

In our opinion if the FNDL go ahead and map ~~33~~ Local Distribution Company lines whereas they were never mapped or identified before and impose restrictions upon them that go beyond what was legally required of them under the Electricity Act of 1992 and other relevant legislation in regards to their current status. They are in fact creating ~~a~~ a ~~new~~ new Utility Easement.

We believe this could lead to disputes and possible legal action as ~~it~~ it appears any ~~new~~ lines post 1993 are compensated for and in effect this is a major upgrade in their "STATUS" with ~~and~~ restrictions and requirements in favor of the "Local Distribution Network" Who would be liable for this would have to be contested. Perhaps the entity granting the easement?

# Personal lay Submission: My Personal View

1/ Background around families and poles

Previous owner allowed them to go thru for the benefit of the area/community

And that is how we viewed them when we purchased the property in 1981

2/ Legislation was put in 1992 when things started to get privatised

3/ Now we are being taken advantage of the original trust and understandings. It is an abuse of the goodwill of the landowners. In my "VIEW" it is theft as it is going beyond what was originally intended.

4/ SLIDES: Pictures of existing poles and what they could become without control or proper consultation. Refer to what Top Energy is proposing in Submission point 483-51 as permitted. This is obviously the intent of the whole process by them. To over-ride rules, ~~at~~ constraints and personal property rights for their gain in my "view".

This is why in our opinion the FNDC  
in their ~~or~~ PDP never included any of Top  
Energy's lines in their map overlays  
This is stated in Top Energy's submission  
point 483-39

In fact they canvassed the FNDC to do so.  
as we believe the Far North District could see  
no clear directive or ~~reasoning to~~ justification  
to do so from the NRC as in reality  
it was a suggestion not a requirement.  
But before I hand you over examine  
the next two screenshots

In conclusion the need for CEL's has  
been created which has been prompted  
by the WZEP statement and there is no  
justification for 33kv lines to be included  
And they will be used if created to enact  
a free/clear pathways for higher capacities  
thru our properties.