

BEFORE WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991 (Act)

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Proposed Waikato District Plan:
Designations by Chorus

Summary of Planning Evidence by Chris Horne on behalf of Chorus New Zealand Limited

1. I have prepared planning evidence on behalf of Chorus New Zealand Limited dated 27 March 2020. The evidence relates to the roll over of existing designations, and to a number of new designations Chorus is seeking to be included in the Waikato District Plan.
2. Andrew Kantor, the Environmental Planning and Engagement Manager for Chorus, has not prepared any evidence but is available at the hearing to answer any questions in regard to their designations if required.

Designation roll overs

3. Chorus has 8 existing designations that are all included in the Franklin Section of the Waikato District Plan. Chorus has requested that these designations be rolled over without modification. There were no submissions received on these designations, and accordingly pursuant to Clause 9(3) of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) the territorial authority cannot make any recommendation on these existing designations and they must be included in the Proposed Plan when it becomes operative. These designations have been included in the designation schedule as U1-U8 in the s42A report.
4. I note that the s42A report referred to these designations as roll overs with modifications due to some corrections sought by Chorus to errors in the designation schedule. As set

out in paragraphs 16 – 17 of my evidence, I do not consider these requested changes to be modifications. No changes are being sought to the extent or purpose of these designations from those that currently exist in the Waikato District Plan.

Proposed New Designations

5. Chorus has a policy of designating its strategic sites such as exchanges and backbone radio and microwave sites throughout New Zealand. These are typically designated in district plans, but sometimes there are anomalies in district plans where some of all sites are not designated. This has often been due to a missed roll over process in a historic district plan review.
6. Chorus has 25 existing sites in the District Plan that are not designated. These are generically the same types of facilities that are designated in the Franklin Section of the Waikato District Plan and in throughout New Zealand. Chorus is proposing to designate these sites with a suite of conditions that reflect those being sought in other district plans for similar designation exercises for existing sites.
7. Chorus seeks the same designation purpose nationally which is *“telecommunication and radiocommunication and ancillary purposes”*. That purpose accurately reflects the core network activities of Chorus, which is a telecommunications infrastructure provider with a network that uses both ‘hard’ cable links, and ‘wireless’ radio links reliant on antennas to transfer information. Equipment associated with these activities may include the obvious hardware such as the cables or antennas, as well as support structures and equipment buildings/cabinets etc. Ancillary equipment may also include infrastructure such as air-cooling units and backup generators.
8. The proposed conditions cover:
 - Restrictions on masts and antennas;
 - Circumstances where outline plans are not required for minor works
 - Noise controls (i.e. air conditioning plant and backup generators where installed)
 - Radiofrequency fields
9. The designations are grouped into zone sensitivity (e.g. rural, business, living), with some differences in conditions such as the allowable height of masts and antennas,

and relevant noise controls between these zone groupings. Height in relation to boundary controls apply from sensitive adjoining sites.

10. The reporting planner has recommended that the majority of these conditions be confirmed as sought in the s42A report. Some minor changes were recommended in the s42A report in regard to navigation sight lines at Raglan (U20) and airport obstacle limitation surfaces at Matangi (U15) in regard to survey obligations to confirm compliance with these restrictions.
11. On further investigation and discussions with the reporting planner, I have recommended that the requirement to undertake a survey at Raglan should only apply to planned works exceeding 8m in height above ground level, and that no survey should be required for Matangi due to the large headroom from the proposed height limit enabled by the designation to the obstacle limitation surfaces. I understand that these amendments are agreed by the reporting planner (see paragraphs 27-32 of my evidence)
12. Only two submissions were received on the proposed new designations. One of these is only seeking clarity as to whether one of the sites is a Transpower or Chorus designation, whilst another applying to U23 at Tauwhare seeks that the designation not allow for future cell phone transmitters. As set out in paragraphs 39- 42 of my evidence, Chorus does not operate a cell phone network, and in my opinion the suite of conditions proposed adequately protects the submitter from the adverse effects of any activities undertaken under the proposed designation.

Corrections

13. I have outlined a number of minor corrections that need to be made to mapping and the designation schedule to match the information submitted with the notice of requirement. I have also recommended that the designation descriptor be changed from “U” to “CNZ” to align with the 2019 National Planning Standards.

Chris Horne

14 April 2020