

Proposed District Plan Change 14

Summary of Submissions

<i>Submission Number</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Address for Service</i>	<i>Wishes to be heard</i>
1	Federation of Wellington Progressive and Residents Associations	Peter Graham 19 Beazley Avenue Paparangi Wellington 6004	Yes
<p>Support deletion of 'where appropriate' from Policy 22.2.1.3. Believes all applications for new utility networks should be publicly notified and requests specific changes to the wording. Requests that Policy 22.2.1.4 is clarified and supports the explanatory paragraph to this Policy. Supports the change to Rule 23.1.2. Provides background information and the Association's position on the overhead cable issue. Request that Council considers taking a deposit, in the event of a utility company failing, to cover the cost of removing any equipment that has an environmental impact on the environment.</p>			
2	Meidian Energy	Meridian Energy Limited	Yes

P O Box 2454
Christchurch
Attn: Fiona Hill

Opposes removal of 'where appropriate' from Policy 22.2.1.3. Requests the Policy to remain as it is in the Operative District Plan or be amended to take into account Meridan's concerns, and any consequential relief required to give effect to Meridan's submission.

Opposes the changes to the explanatory statement to Policy 22.2.1.3. Requests that the explanatory statement remain as it is in the Operative District Plan, and any consequential relief required to give effect to Meridan's submission.

Opposes the new Standard and Term to Rule 23.3.4 that states 'No new support structure is erected'. Requests that the proposed Standard and Term deleted, and any consequential relief required to give effect to Meridan's submission.

3

Transpower

Burton Consultants Limited
P O Box 33 817
Takapuna
Auckland
Attn: Rachel Dimery

Yes

Supports the amendments to the definition of 'line'. Seeks an additional sentence to define 'reticulation line' and proposes specific wording.

Requests Policy 22.2.1.3 is amended to read 'Encourage utility network reticulation lines to be sited underground'.

Requests Policy 22.3.1.4 is amended to read 'Encourage existing utility network reticulation lines to be relocated underground'.

Seeks any other relief needed to give effect to Transpower's submission.

4	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Tonkin & Taylor Limited P O Box 2083 Wellington Attn: Chris Hansen	Yes
---	---------------------------------	---	-----

Supports the intent of the Proposed Plan Change.
Requests that the Council adopt Plan Change 14 in full.

5	UnitedNetworks Limited	Minter Ellison Rudd Watts P O Box 3798 Auckland Attn: Luke Barfoot	Yes
---	------------------------	---	-----

General submission:

The proposed amendments are not based on an adequate section 32 analysis.
The consultation process was inadequate and the results of the consultation were inadequately recorded.
UnitedNetworks requests that the Plan Change be rejected in its entirety.
Requests that Council undertakes a comprehensive review of all the network utility provisions in the District Plan.
If Council does not do the above, the Plan Change should be amended to take account of the issues raised in UnitedNetworks' submission.

Objectives and Policies:

Opposes removal of 'where appropriate' from Policy 22.2.1.3.
Opposes the changes to the explanatory statement to Policy 22.2.1.3.
Opposes the deletion of Policy 22.2.1.4.

Submits on new Policy 22.2.1.4.

Requests that the four above amendments to the policies be deleted.

Requests that the Plan Change be amended so that the objectives and policies recognise the regulatory, economic, technical and practical constraints on network utilities; recognise the essential nature of network utilities; and take accord of the purpose and principles of the RMA.

Rules:

Submits on the explanatory statement for Rule 23.1.4 for above ground utility structures.

Opposes amendment to the Standard and Terms for Rule 23.3.4.

Requests that the two above amendments to the rules be deleted.

Requests that Rule 23.1.2 be amended (or a new rule inserted) to allow the use of electricity lines for telecommunications purposes as a permitted activity.

Requests that if the above relief is not granted that amendments be made to recognise that not all utility structures which exceed the size standards permitted in Rule 2.1.4 will have adverse environmental effects which warrant a requirement to obtain resource consent.

6

TelstraClear

Tim Pegler
Network Property Manager
TelstraClear Limited
Private Bag 92143
Auckland

Yes

Opposes removal of 'where appropriate' from Policy 22.2.1.3. New wording is suggested.

Opposes the changes to the explanatory statement to Policy 22.2.1.3. New wording is suggested.

Opposes deletion of Policy 22.2.1.4 from the Operative District Plan. Requests Policy 22.2.1.4 and the associated explanation are retained.

Opposes the proposed new Policy 22.2.1.4. Suggests amended wording.

Opposes deletion of Rule 23.1.2. Suggests amended wording to limit the size of individual communication cables.

Seeks any other relief that will give effect to the intent of TelstraClear's submission.

7

Telcom New Zealand Limited

Telecom New Zealand Limited
C/- MWH New Zealand Limited
P O Box 9624
Wellington
Attn: Emma Milne

Yes

Opposes removal of 'where appropriate' from Policy 22.2.1.3.

Opposes the changes to the explanatory statement to Policy 22.2.1.3.

Requests no amendment to Policy 22.2.1.3 or alternative relief that gives the same or similar effect and any consequential relief required to give effect to Telecom's submission.

Requests amendments to proposed Policy 22.2.1.4 and the explanatory statement. Suggests new wording or seeks alternative relief that gives the same or similar effect and any consequential relief required to give effect to Telecom's submission.

Telecom is not sure what sorts of activities are proposed through the new proposed rule for an 'attached line'. Support the change if the rule is intended to cover a customer service lead.

Requests changes to the definition of 'line' and new Rule 23.1.2, concerning any 'attached line', to include the erection of one additional support structure.

Suggests new wording or seeks alternative relief that gives the same or similar effect and any consequential relief required to give effect to Telecom's submission.

Opposes the new standard and term under Rule 23.3.4 that states: 'No new support structure is erected'.
Requests no amendment to the standards and terms in Rule 23.3.4 or seeks alternative relief that gives the same or similar effect and any consequential relief required to give effect to Telecom's submission.

Opposes the proposed new assessment criteria for Rule 23.3.4.
Requests no amendment to the assessment criteria in Rule 23.3.4 or seeks alternative relief that gives the same or similar effect and any consequential relief required to give effect to Telecom's submission.

Opposes the changes to explanatory statements for Policy 22.2.1.2 and Rule 23.1.4.
Requests no amendment to the explanatory statements for Policy 22.2.1.2 and Rule 23.1.4. or seeks alternative relief that gives the same or similar effect and any consequential relief required to give effect to Telecom's submission.