

**PROPOSED FAR NORTH DISTRICT PLAN:  
HEARING TOPIC 11 INFRASTRUCTURE & DESIGNATIONS  
Chris Horne Summary Statement for Telcos (s282)**

1. My evidence generally supports the s42A recommendations of Jerome Wyeth (Infrastructure) and Lynette Morgan (Designations). A summary of the points covered in my evidence is:

**Infrastructure**

2. ***Policy I-P3 (282.14)***. I support My Wyeth's recommendation to delete policy I-P3 due to overlap with policies in Part 2 District Wide-Chapter provisions and refocusing Policy I-P2 on recognising operational and functional need when considering and managing adverse effects.
3. ***Rule I-R5 New Above Ground Customer Connections (282.005, 282.029)***. As notified above ground customer connections were only permitted in a limited number of zones, even where the existing distribution network is above ground. I support Mt Wyeth's recommendation to enable above ground connections in all zones, with restrictions on additional poles included for residential and settlement zones. This will apply to telecommunications and electricity networks.
4. ***Rule I-R7 Telecommunications Poles and Attached Antennas (282-006, 282-029)***. This rule covers overhead lines and telecommunications support structures and antennas. I support Mt Wyeth's recommendation to enable telecommunications support structures and attached antennas in all zones. The proposed permitted heights reflect an agreed position between Mr Wyeth and the telecommunications submitters from the pre-hearing meetings. I consider that the enabled permitted heights are appropriate and reflective of many other district plans.
5. I have recommended some minor changes to the s42A recommended version of the rule to address cross referencing, clause numbering and further standards where adjacent to site boundaries in residential zones – see para 29 of my evidence in chief.

6. I have suggested the scope of the rule is limited to **Telecommunications Poles, Towers and Attached Antennas** so that overhead lines and support structures can be included in separate rule, particularly given changes being sought by Mr Badham on behalf of Top Energy in regard to towers for lines networks<sup>1</sup>. In my experience it is not typical to combine rules for linear infrastructure with place-based support structures and antennas in the same rule

### **Designations**

7. **Chorus and Spark Designations.** Spark and Chorus sought a rollover of their existing designations without modification, with the exception of one Spark designation (legacy reference T29) which is no longer required so can be left to lapse. In some cases, both requiring authorities have designations on the same sites following the demerger of Chorus and Spark into separate companies/requiring authorities (formally Telecom NZ Ltd), with primary and secondary designation status allocated. I note a minor change to the purpose was sought for national consistency that in my opinion does not change the scope of the designations so in my view is not a modification. A submission by Spark to correct the name of the requiring authority to Spark New Zealand Trading Limited was also lodged which is noted as accepted in the s42A report, but the designation schedule attached to the report does not reflect this change (still shows as Spark NZ Ltd).
8. Subject to the correction to the requiring authority name to Spark New Zealand Trading Limited in the schedule, I agree with the recommendation of Lynette Morgan for the designations to be confirmed as shown in Appendix 1 to the Designations s42A report.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Para 6.28-6.29, David Badham EIC