

Further Submission on the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan by Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities

Clause 8 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991

TO: Central Hawkes Bay District Council

PO Box 127,

Waipawa 4240

1. **Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (“Kāinga Ora”)** makes this further submission on the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan 2021 (“**PDP**”) in support of/in opposition to original submissions to the PDP.
2. Kāinga Ora is a person who has an interest in the PDP that is greater than the interest the general public has, being an original submitter on the PDP with respect to its interests as a Crown agency responsible for the provision of state housing, and its housing portfolio in the Central Hawkes Bay District. Kāinga Ora also represents a relevant aspect of the public interest and has an interest in the PDP greater than the general public for a number of reasons, including (without limitation):
 - (a) In the Central Hawkes Bay District, the housing portfolio managed by Kāinga Ora comprises just under 40 dwellings. Kāinga Ora’s role includes the efficient and effective management of state housing and the tenancies of those living in them.
 - (b) it is essential that Kāinga Ora is able to meet its responsibility of providing efficient and effective state housing for the most vulnerable members of our society, so as to deliver to the social and economic wellbeing of these people and the wider community.
3. Kāinga Ora makes this further submission in respect of submissions by third parties to the PDP provisions to the extent that they directly affect the relief sought in its own submission, which seeks specific amendments to the PDP to better enable Kāinga Ora

to provide for high quality cost effective, state housing to the people in the greatest need for the duration of their need.

4. The reasons for this further submission are:
- (a) The reasons set out in Kāinga Ora's primary submission on the PDP.
 - (b) In the case of the Primary Submissions that are opposed:
 - (i) The Primary Submissions do not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are otherwise inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**");
 - (ii) The relief sought in the Primary Submissions is not the most appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA;
 - (iii) Rejecting the relief sought in the Primary Submissions opposed would more fully serve the statutory purpose than would implementing that relief; and
 - (iv) The Primary Submissions are inconsistent with the policy intent of Kāinga Ora 's submission.
 - (c) In the case of Primary Submissions that are supported:
 - (i) The Primary Submissions promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA and with section 32 of the RMA;
 - (ii) The reasons set out in the Primary Submissions to the extent that they are consistent with Kāinga Ora 's submission; and
 - (iii) Allowing the relief sought in the Primary Submissions supported would more fully serve the statutory purpose than would disallowing that relief.
 - (d) Such additional reasons (if any) in respect of each of the Primary Submissions supported or opposed as are set out in the **attached** Schedule.

5. The specific relief in respect of each Primary Submission that is supported or opposed is set out in the **attached** Schedule.
6. Kāinga Ora wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.
7. If others make a similar submission, Kāinga Ora will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

DATED 8 November 2021

Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities



Brendon Liggett

Manager, Development Planning

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE:

Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities

PO Box 74598

Greenlane, Auckland

Email: developmentplanning@kaingaora.govt.nz

Copies to:

Campbell Brown Planning Limited

PO Box 147001

Ponsonby, Auckland 1144

Attention: Michael Campbell

Email: Michael@campbellbrown.co.nz

| Plan Provision | Submission Point | Submitter | Position | Summary of Reasons | Summary of Decision Requested | Kāinga Ora Support/Opposes | Kāinga Ora reasons |
|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|--|----------------------------|---|
| [General] | S89.009 | Central Hawkes Bay District Council | Amend | The Proposed Plan inadvertently refers to an earlier version of the New Zealand Standard on the Code of Practice for Urban Land Subdivision. The current version is NZS4404:2010. It is also proposed that reference to the Hastings District Council Engineering Code should be kept as guidance notes or methods, rather than as a mandatory matter for consideration. The reason for that is that while the HDC Code is considered to be a useful document and relevant to the Central Hawke's Bay, the document could be amended without the opportunity for input from Central Hawke's Bay District Council or District residents. That would potentially require a plan change, which would have cost and efficiency implications for the Central Hawke's Bay District. There are not considered to be any effects arising from either change, nor any change to the extent to which the Proposed Plan meets relevant statutory obligations. | Replace all references in the Proposed Plan to 'NZS4404' and 'NZS4404:2004' with 'NZS4404:2010'. And make any amendments necessary in the Proposed Plan to refer to the Hastings District Council Engineering Code as guidance or methods, rather than as a mandatory matter. | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| NU-M10 | S89.008 | Central Hawkes Bay District Council | Amend | It is proposed that reference to the Hastings District Council Engineering Code should be kept as guidance notes or methods, rather than as a mandatory matter for consideration. The reason for that is that while the HDC Code is considered to be a useful document and relevant to the Central Hawke's Bay, the document could be amended without the opportunity for input from Central Hawke's Bay District Council or District residents. That would potentially require a plan change, which would have cost and efficiency implications for the Central Hawke's Bay District. The change is not considered to have any adverse effect nor materially change the extent to which the Proposed Plan meets relevant statutory obligations. | Amend NU-M10 as follows: 'Engineering Code of Practice The Engineering Code of Practice (Central Hawke's Bay District Council utilises the current Hastings District Council's Code of Practice 2014) - establishes guidelines for the design and construction of transport and service infrastructure which can be used as a means of compliance with the objectives, policies, and rules of the District Plan.' | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| SUB-R1 | S114.001 | Central Hawkes Bay District Council | Amend | New minimum lot sizes are needed to recognise infrastructure servicing constraints, especially stormwater. Activity status and cross-references intended to both unlock land but also ensure potential opportunity for all land parcels to develop. This amendment allows some flexibility for alternative development proposals in impacts and effects able to be adequately managed. A new activity status of Discretionary is required to allow adequate consideration of proposals that do not comply with relevant provisions of the Proposed Plan, including the provisions sought as relief in this submission. | Amend SUB-R1 [to insert special provisions applicable to Waipukurau South Plan Area] as follows: 'Subdivision not otherwise provided for All Zones 1. Activity Status: CON Where the following conditions are met: a. ... b. ... c. Compliance with: i. iv. SUB-S7(1) and (2) ... d. Compliance with: ... da. Compliance with SUB-S7(3). 2. ... 3. Activity status where compliance with condition SUB-R1(1)(a) and/or SUB-R1(1)(b) and/or SUB- R1(1)(da) is not achieved: DIS 4. ...' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB-AM6 | S89.006 | Central Hawkes Bay District Council | Amend | It is proposed that reference to the Hastings District Council Engineering Code should be kept as guidance notes or methods, rather than as a mandatory matter for consideration. The reason for that is that while the HDC Code is considered to be a useful document and relevant to the Central Hawke's Bay, the document could be amended without the opportunity for input from Central Hawke's Bay District Council or District residents. That would potentially require a plan change, which would have cost and efficiency implications for the Central Hawke's Bay District. The change is not considered to have any adverse effect nor materially change the extent to which the Proposed Plan meets relevant statutory obligations. | Amend SUB-AM6 as follows (or to like effect): 'Property Access 1 ... 8. The provisions of the current Hastings District Council Engineering Code of Practice for the design and construction of roading. ... Note: The Hastings District Council Engineering Code of Practice provides detailed technical standards on the design and construction of roading which may provide an acceptable means of compliance.' | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|-------------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------|---|
| GRZ-R1 | S114.009 | Central Hawkes Bay District Council | Amend | Better enables the Proposed Plan to control the density of development and extent of impervious surfaces to the level able to be accommodated by stormwater infrastructure and makes provision for the relief sought in the form of Appendix A: Waipukurau South Plan (accompanying the full submission). Enables the Council to appropriately consider proposals that do not comply with maximum allowable coverage of the site within impervious surfaces. | Amend GRZ-R1 [to insert special provisions applicable to Waipukurau South Plan Area] as follows: '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. Compliance with: b. Compliance with: i. GRZ-S16. 2. Activity status where compliance not achieved with conditions GRZ-R1(a)(ii), GRZ-R1(a)(iii), GRZ-R1(a)(iv), GRZ-R1(a)(v), GRZ-R1(a)(vii), GRZ-R1(a)(viii), GRZ-R1(a)(ix), GRZ-R1(a)(x), GRZ-R1(a)(xi), GRZ-R1(a)(xii), GRZ-R1(a)(xiii) or GRZ-R1(a)(xiv): RDIS Matters over which discretion is restricted (where relevant to the infringed standard(s)): a. ... b. ... 3. Activity status where compliance not achieved with conditions GRZ-R1(a)(i) or GRZ(a)(vi) in the Waipukurau South Plan area: DIS [4.] Activity status where compliance with condition GRZ-R1(b) is not achieved: DIS' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| GRZ-R2 | S114.013 | Central Hawkes Bay District Council | Amend | Better enables the Proposed Plan to control density of development and extent of impervious surfaces to the level able to be accommodated by stormwater infrastructure in the Waipukurau Plan Area. Enables the Council to appropriately consider proposals that do not comply with maximum allowable coverage of the site with impervious surfaces. | Amend GRZ-R2 [to insert special provisions applicable to Waipukurau South Plan Area] as follows: '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. Limited to: ... b. Compliance with: ... c. Compliance with: i. GRZ-S16. 2. ... 3. Activity Status where compliance with conditions GRZ-R2(1)(a)or GRZ-R2(1)(c) is not achieved: DIS' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| [General] | S90.005 | Centralines Limited | Amend | Centralines generally supports the Strategic Direction chapter and associated Objectives and Policies. Notwithstanding the above Centralines considers that the Strategic Directions, as drafted, do not specifically: - Recognise the importance of infrastructure in servicing the needs of the community and protecting its functional/operational requirements. - Enable the development, upgrade, maintenance, and operation of the infrastructure network(s) to accommodate growth. - Promote renewable energy generation and utilisation. | Retain objectives and policies in 'Part 2 - Strategic Direction'. Add additional objectives/policies that are specific to infrastructure and renewable energy generation – for example: 'The important infrastructure needs of the community are fulfilled, and their operation is protected'. 'The development, upgrade, maintenance, and operation of strategic infrastructure is enabled in a way that minimises adverse effects, while having regard to the practical constraints and the logistical and technical practicalities associated with significant infrastructure.' 'There is reduced reliance on non-renewable sources of energy, increased use of renewable sources of energy and greater energy conservation.' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O3 | S90.009 | Centralines Limited | Support | Centralines support the intent behind NU-O3 as it will ensure that development around infrastructure manages any potential reverse sensitivity effects, as well as to direct rules and development standards that are enabling to the development and operation of the local electricity distribution network. | Retain NU-O3 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-P2 | S90.011 | Centralines Limited | Amend | Centralines acknowledge the intent of this policy, although it is considered that the term "avoid" is too strong. As the electricity distribution network represents linear infrastructure (as does most other network utility infrastructure), the functional need for the design (line route) of a new section of line often has a functional need to be located through more sensitive environments. | Amend NU-P2 as follows:'Avoid Manage adverse effects of upgrades to, and the development of new, network utilities on the values and attributes of areas identified in the District Plan as: ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------------------------|---------|---|--|--------|---|
| NU-P3 | S90.012 | Centralines Limited | Amend | Centralines acknowledge the intent of this policy, although it is considered that the term 'avoid' is too strong without provision of a qualifying statement. As the electricity distribution network represents linear infrastructure (as does most other network utility infrastructure), the functional need for the design (line route) of a new section of line often has a functional need to be located through more sensitive environments. Amendments are sought. | Amend NU-P3 as follows: 'Avoid significant adverse effects and remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of upgrades to, and the development of new, network utilities on the values and attributes of areas identified in the District Plan as: 1 High Natural Character Areas (in CE-SCHED7); and 2 Significant Amenity Features (in NFL-SCHED6) unless it can be demonstrated that: a) There is an operational need or functional need that means the infrastructure's location cannot be avoided, and there are no reasonable alternatives; b) The design and location of the infrastructure is subordinate to and does not compromise the identified characteristics and values of the High Natural Character Area described in CE- SCHED7 - or the Significant Amenity Features described in NFL-SCHED6; [c)?] The natural components of the High Natural Character Area or Special Amenity Feature will continue to dominate over the influence of human activity.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-P5 | S90.014 | Centralines Limited | Support | Centralines supports this policy, which seeks to manage reverse sensitivity effects on network utilities. Centralines infrastructure provides a critical supply of electricity across the district. Policy NU-P5 provides an appropriate level of security in regard to mitigating the actual and potential adverse effects on this strategic infrastructure. In particular, Centralines supports NU-P5(1), (7), and (8). | Retain NU-P5 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-S4 | S90.024 | Centralines Limited | Amend | Centralines requests a note within the standard that clarifies that the provision does not apply to poles, lines, and antenna. | Amend NU-S4 as follows: '1. Above ground buildings or structures (except those located within road reserve) must not exceed a height of 2m plus the shortest horizontal distance between that part of the building or structure and the nearest site boundary (but excluding a road boundary). Except that: a. ... Note: Note: The height in relation to boundary standard does not apply to lines, poles, towers, telecommunication poles, antenna, and lightning rods). ' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| LLRZ - Rules | S90.041 | Centralines Limited | Amend | It is noted that if compliance is not achieved with LLRZ-S11, the matters of discretion do not include consideration of effects that relevant to a breach to the Electricity Safety Distance standard. Centralines seeks that additional matter(s) of discretion are included to enable effects to be considered in relation to any non-compliance with this standard. Centralines also seeks a notification clause that requires written approval from the relevant electricity network utility operator. | Insert new matters for discretion for RDIS activities which relate to a breach of the Electricity Safety Distance standard (LLRZ-S11) in all relevant rules in the 'LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone' to include: a. Impacts on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the electricity network. b. The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage. c. The risk to the structural integrity of any support structures associated with the electricity network. d. Technical advice provided by the National Grid owner (Transpower) or electricity distribution network operator (Centralines Limited).' And insert a notification clause requiring written approval. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE (Definition) | S117.011 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | A definition of the term 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure' is appropriate. The matters that are listed in the definition all provide communities with the ability to connect or be serviced by a utility. Telecommunications allows people to connect at a local, regional, national and international level. The national significance of telecommunications is recognised through the presence of the NESTF. Telecommunications is also recognised in the Hawkes Bay Regional Resource Management Plan (which includes the Regional Policy Statement) as 'Strategic Infrastructure'. Including telecommunications in the 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure' is appropriate. | Amend the definition of 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure' as follows: 'means: a. State Highways; b. the National Grid electricity transmission network; c. national renewable electricity generation facilities that connect with the National Grid; d. major gas or oil pipeline services (such as the gas transmission pipeline from Taranaki); e. any railway (as defined in the Railways Act 2005). f. Telecommunication networks' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----------------------------|---------|--|--|-----------------|---|
| [General] | S117.025 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | Within the strategic objectives there is no infrastructure recognition except for urban form and development. The majority of the Central Hawkes Bay District is Rural, which requires infrastructure as well as urban areas. A balance is needed, particularly given the critical nature of infrastructure for modern living, regardless of whether people are residing in urban or rural areas. Including Infrastructure as a Strategic Direction, with subsequent Strategic Objectives, provides a clear message to plan users as to the strategic nature of infrastructure across the District as a whole. | Add a new 'Strategic Direction for Infrastructure' chapter in the 'Strategic Direction' section of the Proposed Plan, and include the following objectives under that heading: *1. The social, economic, environmental and cultural benefits of infrastructure are recognised and provided for, and its safe, efficient and effective development, upgrade, maintenance and operation is enabled; 2. Infrastructure, including its role and function, is protected from incompatible development and activities; and 3. The adverse effects of infrastructure on the surrounding environment are managed, having regard to the economic benefits and the technical, functional and operational needs of infrastructure.' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-I3 | S117.030 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Support | The three issues raised in the Issues section provide context for the Objectives proposed in the Proposed Plan. | Retain NU-I3. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O1 | S117.031 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | NU-O1 as proposed covers the same matters as best practice provision IE-O1, although IE-O1 provides greater context as to why network utilities should be safe, effective, efficient and resilient. See wording in body of submission to explain why best practice provisions should be utilised. | Delete NU-O1, and replace as follows: ' Effective, resilient, efficient and safe network utilities that: 1. provide essential and secure services, including in emergencies; 2. facilitate local, regional, national or international connectivity; 3. contribute to the economy and support a high standard of living; 4. integrate with urban development; 5. enable people and communities to provide for their health, safety and wellbeing.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O2 | S117.032 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | NU-O2 aligns with IE-O2 of the best practice provisions, although does not require consideration of the positive effects that network utilities can have. The definition of effect in the Resource Management Act includes positive effects. | Delete NU-O2, and replace as follows: ' The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated while recognising: 1. the functional need and operational need of network utilities; 2. that positive effects of network utilities may be realised locally, regionally or nationally.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O3 | S117.033 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | The intention of NU-O3, in that it provides for Reverse Sensitivity is supported, but the objectives should be made to be more explicit, as per IE-O3 in the best practice provisions. | Delete NU-O3, and replace as follows: ' Network utilities are protected from adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, of subdivision, use and development by, where necessary: 1. set-backs or buffer corridors within which incompatible activities will be managed; 2. controls on the activities of others' where they can compromise the operation, safety, maintenance, upgrade and development of network utilities.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-PXX (new policy) | S117.039 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | While the proposed policies within the Proposed Plan (with proposed amendments) provide direction in terms of effects management in most day to day situations, ensuring co-ordination with the development of land where demand for telecommunications (and network utilities more generally) is helpful. Include IE-P2 from the best practice provisions provided. | Add a new policy in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter in the Proposed Plan as follows: ' Network utilities, land use, subdivision, development and urban growth. Enable the coordination of network utilities planning and delivery with land use, subdivision, development and urban growth so that future land use and network utilities are integrated, efficient and aligned.' | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------|----------------------------|-------|---|--|----------------|---|
| NU-P2 | S117.035 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | The intention of NU-P2 is generally well aligned with IE-P5 (supported by IE-P7) of the best practice provisions. | Delete NU-P2, and replace as follows: ' Adverse effects of network utilities on areas of outstanding or significant value In the coastal environment 1. Avoid adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new network utilities on: a. the values and attributes of areas that are identified in the plan as having outstanding natural character, outstanding natural features or outstanding natural landscapes; b. taxa, ecosystems or vegetation types identified as threatened, rare or protected in the plan in accordance with Policy 11(a) of the NZCPS; 2. avoid significant adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new network utilities on the values and attributes of areas that are identified in the plan as having natural character, natural features, natural landscapes, or being significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna and remedy or mitigate other adverse effects. In all areas 3. Give priority to avoiding the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new network utilities, on the values and attributes of areas that are identified in the plan as: a. wetlands and lakes and rivers and their margins that have natural character; b. outstanding natural features and landscapes outside of the coastal environment; c. areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna outside of the coastal environment; d. ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga of mana whenua; e. historic heritage. 4. Where the avoidance of adverse effects under clause (3) is not possible, the appropriateness of the substantial upgrades to, or the development of, new network utilities will be determined by having regard to the matters listed in {Link,5146,Policy IE-P7}.' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-P3 | S117.036 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | The intention of NU-P3 is generally well aligned with IE-P7 of the best practice provisions. | Delete NU-P3, and replace as follows: ' Consideration of the adverse effects of network utilities When considering the adverse effects of network utilities on the environment: 1. recognise that there may be situations where all adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 2. recognise that the adverse effects on the values and attributes of the areas listed in Policy IE-P5(3) can be mitigated by locating some types of network utilities in land transport corridors; 3. decision-makers must have regard to: a. the extent to which adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated may be constrained by a network utility's functional need or operational need; b. the time, duration or frequency of adverse effects; c. the necessity of the network utility including: i. the need to quickly repair and restore disrupted services; ii. the impact of not operating, repairing, maintaining, upgrading, removing or developing a network utility; d. existing network utilities including: i. the complexity and connectedness of networks and services; ii. the potential for co-location and shared use of network utility corridors; e. anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment and the degree to which past modifications have compromised the achievement of those outcomes; f. the benefits derived from the network utility at a local, regional and national scale; g. the extent to which the network utility is integrated with, and necessary to support, planned urban development.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--|---|---------------|--|
| <p>NU-P4</p> | <p>S117.037</p> | <p>Chorus New Zealand Limited</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>The intention of NU-P4 is generally well aligned with IE-P4 of the best practice provisions. However for consistency IE-P4 of the best practice provisions should be used in the Proposed Plan.</p> | <p>Delete NU-P4, and replace as follows:</p> <p>'Adverse effects of network utilities</p> <p>Manage the adverse effects of network utilities on the environment by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. recognising that the adverse effects of the ongoing operation, maintenance, repair, upgrade and removal of existing network utilities are typically insignificant or minor by enabling these activities to occur without the need for planning approvals; 2. avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new network utilities, including effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. natural and physical resources; b. amenity values; c. sensitive activities; d. the safe and efficient operation of other network utilities; e. the health, well-being and safety of people and communities. 3. managing the potential adverse effects of noise, vibration, radiofrequency fields and electric and magnetic fields by requiring compliance with national environmental standards or other nationally recognised standards or guidelines. 4. preferring the undergrounding of new network utilities in urban areas where it is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. technically feasible; b. justified by the extent of adverse visual effects; and c. viable, including where costs are proportionate to the adverse effects being avoided.' | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission</p> |
| <p>NU-P5</p> | <p>S117.038</p> | <p>Chorus New Zealand Limited</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>The intention of NU-P5 is generally well aligned with IE-P8 of the best practice provisions. However for consistency IE-P8 of the best practice provisions should be used in the Proposed Plan.</p> | <p>Delete NU-P5, and replace as follows:</p> <p>'Adverse effects on network utilities</p> <p>Protect network utilities from the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development that may constrain or compromise the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, removal and development of network utilities, including by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. locating and designing new buildings and activities sensitive to noise to avoid the potential adverse effects of the railway corridor and national and regional road network; 2. managing access to the railway corridor and national and regional road network; 3. managing new activities sensitive to noise within a defined air noise contour; 4. avoiding physical obstructions in take-off, approach, landing or departure paths and runway end protection areas; 5. requiring subdivision of sites containing significant electricity distribution lines to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the significant electricity distribution line; and b. ensure that future buildings, earthworks and construction activities maintain safe electrical clearance distances under all building and electricity distribution line operating conditions; 6. managing land disturbance and activities sensitive to gas transmission to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects of, and on, gas transmission pipelines; 7. requiring subdivision of sites containing a gas transmission pipeline to retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the gas transmission pipeline; 8. managing the activities of others' through set-backs and design controls where it is necessary to achieve appropriate protection of a network utility.' | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------|---|
| NU-S4 | S117.050 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | Like for NU-S2, a setback for structures, which is what a height in relation to boundary control essentially is, is generally supported as it assists in the mitigation of bulk and dominance effects. However telecommunication pole facilities are typically slim, and do not create the bulk and dominance effect wider structures can have. As such, an exemption is sought for pole structures within the standard. | Amend NU-S4 as follows: '1. Above ground buildings or structures (except those located within road reserve) must not exceed a height of 2m plus the shortest horizontal distance between that part of the building or structure and the nearest site boundary (but excluding a road boundary). Except that: a. ... b. This standard does not apply to poles with a diameter of 600mm or less, and any permitted attachments to the poles. ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-S5 | S117.051 | Chorus New Zealand Limited | Amend | Whilst it is appropriate that any new accesses comply with the relevant transport provisions of the PDP, having a threshold based on area should be replaced by whether or not the activity on the site demands a new access or not. Minimum parking or loading requirements are not necessary for telecommunications companies, as the operator will provide on site parking or loading to meet the demands of the activity. | Amend NU-S5 as follows: '1. Any activity which requires a new vehicle access Activities on sites greater than 200m ² in area must comply with the relevant vehicle access provisions of the TRAN – Transport chapter for access, parking and loading.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| TW-O2 | S64.010 | Department of Conservation | Support | Support the recognition of the role of Māori in the protection and management of the environment as provided for under sections 6(e), 6(g) and 7(a). | Retain TW-O2. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| TW-P1 | S64.013 | Department of Conservation | Support | Support the acknowledgement of Iwi management plans as an environmental protection resource. Policies recognise the important of protecting traditional practices of mahinga kai and wāhi tapu. | Retain TW-P1. | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-P2 | S64.022 | Department of Conservation | Support | Policies appropriately reflect Policy 8 of NPS-ET. | Retain NU-P2. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-P3 | S64.023 | Department of Conservation | Support | Policies appropriately reflect Policy 8 of NPS-ET. | Retain NU-P3. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NH-O3 | S64.040 | Department of Conservation | Support | Support this objective as appropriate. Sections 6(h), s7(i) and Objective 5 of the NZCPS. | Retain NH-O3. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NFL-R1 | S64.078 | Department of Conservation | Oppose | 25 square metre building with a height of three metres may potentially have a significant impact upon an ONFL. Activity status should be restricted discretionary. | Amend NFL-R1 to 'Restricted Discretionary' activity status. | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| CLEARANCE (Definition) | S121.232 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Oppose | The definition appears similar to the definition of 'Clearance' in the 2019 proposed National Policy Statement for Biodiversity, which is: clearance refers to the removal of indigenous vegetation by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, drainage, burning, cultivation, over-planting, application of seed of exotic pasture species, mobstocking and/or changes to soils, hydrology or landforms However it has a few extra clauses snuck in. We oppose mob-stocking being included in the definition of clearance, if it consequently requires fencing of SNAs. Farmers with large SNAs in hill country or along DoC estate that are unfenced will struggle to keep all their extensively farmed sheep and cattle out of the SNA. We are unsure what mob stocking is defined as. Mob-stocking must not include stock having access to an SNA by virtue of it being unfenced and use it for shelter or shade. This is distinct from high-density stock being deliberately confined inside an SNA and grazing it down to the ground. | Amend the definition of 'Clearance' as follows: 'in relation to indigenous vegetation means the felling, burning, removal, damage or destruction of the vegetation, including the following activities within the vegetation drip line: a. application of chemicals b. application of seed of exotic pastures c. burning d. changes to soils, hydrology, or landforms e. drainage f. drilling or excavation [g.] discharge of toxic substances [h.] mob-stocking [i.] overplanting' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NH-O2 | S121.124 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Amend | Farm buildings and earthworks must be clearly differentiated from habitable buildings and earthworks, as they have different risk profiles. Farm buildings are simple structures that are uninhabited, it may be acceptable to a farmer if their dirt floor shed is flooded, compared to the major disruption and displacement if a house was flooded. The concept of vulnerable activities is a good one and winnows out farm structures. | Amend NH-O2 as follows: 'The effects of natural hazards and the long-term effects of climate change on the community and vulnerable activities the built environment are minimised.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------|---|
| SASM-M1 | S121.168 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Amend | A Schedule 1 process is required when identifying and mapping sites, to ensure landowners can participate. | Amend SASM-M1 as follows: 'Identifying sites and areas of significance to Maori in SASM-SCHED3 in the District Plan and showing them on the relevant Planning Maps. Any new sites and areas will be incorporated using a Schedule 1 process. ' | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| NFL-R1 | S121.045 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand | Amend | We support the permitted status, however the floor area of 25m2 is too small and not fit for purpose for farm buildings. Even a single kitset garage 4.4m x 6.8m exceeds the limit, plus also exceeds the height limit being 3.2m, and farm buildings need to be much bigger than a garage. Rule NFL-R1 should permit farm buildings where on existing farming landuse, on the ONFLs that already have farming present, such as ONF-5, ONF-6, ONF-8. Providing for farm buildings where farm land uses are already occurring will be consistent with NFL-P3(3). | Amend Rule NFL-R1(1) as follows: 'All ONFLs-(except ONF-5, ONF-7, ONF-9 & ONF-10) 1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. Gross floor area of the building or alteration is less than 25m2. The building is for an existing farm landuse, or b. Gross floor area of the building or alteration is less than 25m2 and Maximum height of any building is less than 3m.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NATURAL HAZARD (Definition) | S57.007 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | The definition of 'Natural Hazard' being consistent with section 2 of the RMA is supported. | Retain the definition of 'Natural hazard' as notified (subject to minor typo correction 'NAUTRALNATURAL HAZARD'). | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| Table 2 | S57.028 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Amend | Adequate access to both the source of a fire and a firefighting water supply is essential to the efficient operation of Fire and Emergency. The requirements for firefighting access are set out in SNA PAS 4509: 2008 and further detailed in Fire and Emergency's 'Emergency Vehicle Access Guidelines' (May 2015). Referencing SNA PAS 4509: 2008 is therefore supported. Fire and Emergency does however seek that height clearance along accessways is included in Table 2 to ensure that Fire and Emergency access to a fire hazard is unobstructed in an emergency. | Add new 'Height Clearance' requirement in the 'Design Environment' in Table 2 as follows (applying to 'All Zones'): Minimum height clearance: 4m' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| Table 3 | S57.029 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Amend | Table 3 is supported insofar that it provides adequate minimum legal access widths for fire appliance access in an emergency. Fire and Emergency does however seek that height clearances along accessways are included in Table 3 to ensure that Fire and Emergency access to a fire hazard is unobstructed in an emergency. | Add new 'Height Clearance' requirement in the 'Design Environment' in Table 3 as follows (applying to 'All Zones'): Minimum height clearance: 4m' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| Table 4 | S57.030 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Amend | Table 4 is supported in part insofar that it provides adequate minimum legal access widths for fire appliance access in an emergency. However it is sought that height clearances along accessways are included in Table 4 to ensure that Fire and Emergency access to a fire hazard is unobstructed in an emergency. | Add new 'Height Clearance' requirement in the 'Design Environment' in Table 4 as follows (applying to 'All Zones'): Minimum height clearance: 4m' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| TRAN-AM1 | S57.031 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Amend | TRAN-AM1 is supported in part insofar that it provides Council discretion over applications that are unable to comply with TRAN-R1. However, no discretion is given to Council where the minimum legal vehicle access width cannot be achieved. Therefore it is requested that a new matter of discretion is included to provide Council the discretion to consider Fire and Emergency's operational requirements. | Add a new matter of discretion [assessment matter?] to TRAN-AM1 as follows: 'The extent of consistency with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509: 2008 where the minimum legal access width and height clearance cannot be achieved.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-SCHED2 | S57.059 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | The Ongaonga Fire Station is listed as a Category 2 building. The rule framework for Category 2 buildings is considered appropriate for buildings of this category. | Retain HH-SCHED2 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| COMZ-AMXX (new assessment matter) | S57.244 | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Amend | Fire and Emergency seeks an additional assessment matter. Where water supply servicing requirements cannot be met under the new proposed standard (COMZ-S12), this will provide Council discretion as to the extent a development or activity is able to achieve compliance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. This amendment is consistent with the subdivision servicing assessment matters in SUB - Subdivision chapter. | Add a new assessment matter to the 'Commercial Zone' chapter as follows: ' COMZ-AM5 Servicing 1. The provisions of the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| TRAN-O1 | S11.008 | Hawke's Bay Regional Council | Amend | We are seeking amendments to the transport chapter to align it with CHB District Council's contribution and commitment to the strategic direction set in the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). | Amend TRAN-O1 as follows: 'The transport network is sustainable , safe, resilient, efficient and effective in moving people and goods within and beyond the District.' | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-------|---|--|-----------------|---|
| TRAN-P2 | S11.009 | Hawke's Bay Regional Council | Amend | The standards for cycleways and footpaths are detailed in the HDC Code of Practice that is linked to the CHB District Plan. This amendment seeks to ensure that the District Plan makes it clear that alternative modes of transport options should be provided, where possible. | Amend TRAN-P2 as follows: 'To set standards for the design of new public roads, private roads, cycleways, footpaths and accessways to ensure that they are appropriate for the function they serve.' | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| TRAN-P4 | S11.010 | Hawke's Bay Regional Council | Amend | The standards for cycleways and footpaths are detailed in the HDC Code of practice that is linked to the CHB District Plan. This amendment seeks to ensure that the District Plan makes it clear that alternative modes of transport options should be provided where possible and that provision for cars should always consider the safety of other road and carpark users. | Amend TRAN-P4 as follows: 'To establish appropriate design standards for the construction of car parking spaces, and loading areas and active modes of transport that promote the safe and efficient use of vehicles and the safety of cyclists and pedestrians within those spaces. ' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| TRAN-P6 | S11.011 | Hawke's Bay Regional Council | Amend | This amendment seeks to align the CHB District Plan with the vision of the Regional Land Transport Plan of which the Council is a key partner. To give effect to this policy, we are requesting a new standard be included that requires the provision of cycle stands and end of journey facilities. This standard (or other words to similar effect) will align the CHB Transport chapter with the Transport chapters of both HDC and NCC. | Amend TRAN-P6 as follows: 'To promote require (where practical) alternative means of safe, efficient and effective transport, including cycling and walking and public transport facilities to enable people of all ages to move within the District and reduce the effects of vehicle-based transport systems.' Add new standard (TRAN-S) as follows: '1. Bicycle Spaces Where on-site car parking is required provision shall also be made for purpose built bicycle stands on site. These shall be provided at a rate of 1 bicycle stand per 5 carpark spaces that are required except for supermarket where the ratio shall be 1 bicycle stand per 20 carpark spaces that are required. The bicycle stands shall meet the following requirements: (a) They shall be securely attached to a wall or the ground and shall support the bicycle frame. (b) Each cycle stand shall be adequately spaced to allow a cyclist to manoeuvre and attach a bicycle to the stand. (c) They shall allow the bicycle to be secured. (d) They shall be visible and signposted. 2. Bicycle End of Journey Facilities Commercial or Industrial Activities which employ more than 15 FTE staff members shall provide one male and one female shower and changing facilities for staff to encourage the use of alternative transport modes.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| [General] | S120.008 | Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust | Amend | The Proposed Plan recognises the need to consult with tangata whenua stems from the Treaty of Waitangi principle of partnership, requiring both parties to act reasonably and make informed decisions. The Plan also acknowledges that the RMA has different requirements for consulting with tangata whenua and that their contribution to assessing effects on Māori cultural values as set out under Part 2 of the RMA can be significant. Only tangata whenua can identify their relationship and that of their cultural and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga. The Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust consider it necessary that tangata whenua and their cultural expertise is engaged to inform any development and decision-making process. | Amend the wording throughout the Proposed Plan to reflect the statutory requirement to engage tangata whenua as a cultural expert to inform any development and decision making process. | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| TW-P1 | S120.012 | Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust | Amend | Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust suggest expanding on this objection to ensure that tangata whenua have the opportunity to actively engage in the resource management process. | Amend TW-P1 as follows: 'To provide for opportunities for tangata whenua to actively engage in a timely, effective and meaningful way engagement with tangata whenua in resource management decision-making and implementation where tangata whenua are interested and/or affected which recognises .' | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| TW-P5 | S120.013 | Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust | Amend | As part of the Treaty Settlement, land and facilities within the Central Hawke's Bay District have been returned to hapū. It is important that the opportunities for development are provided and enhanced to ensure that the people of the hapū of the district can thrive and prosper. | Amend TW- P5 as follows: 'To recognise- actively promote, enhance and provide for development of, and a range of activities on, Māori Land to meet the needs and aspirations of tangata whenua, while ensuring that actual or potentially adverse effects of activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.' | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| UFD-OXX (new objective) | S120.014 | Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust | Amend | Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust consider that the objectives need to include specific provision for papakāinga housing being made available throughout the district. This needs to be recognised at a strategic level to ensure the relationship of tangata whenua with the culture and traditions and opportunities to live in the district are appropriately recognised. | Add a new objective in the 'UFD - Urban Form and Development' chapter in the Proposed Plan as follows: 'Papakāinga housing that provides for the ongoing relationship of tangata whenua with their culture and traditions and with their ancestral lands and for their cultural, environmental, social and economic wellbeing.' | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|--|--|--------|---|
| HH - Introduction | S55.020 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | Generally support the wording of the chapter introduction. However it should be noted that 'wāhi taonga' is not a category under the HNZPT Act. The HNZPT Act 2014 is referred to incorrectly. Section 42 of the HNZPTA makes it an offense to modify or destroy an archaeological site - the word damage is not used in this section of the Act. Similarly, section 44 refers to modify and destroy, not damage. | Amend the second paragraph of 'HH - Introduction' as follows: '...The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 provides a framework for the recognition of places of historical, cultural and ancestral significance including historic places (archaeological sites, buildings and memorials), historic areas, wāhi tūpuna, wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga tapu areas.' And amend the fourth paragraph as follows: '... Section 42 of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 makes it an offense for anyone to destroy, damage or modify or destroy the whole, or any part of any site, if it is known or suspected to be an archaeological site. Section 44 of the Act requires applications for an authority to modify or destroy, damage or modify an archaeological site to be made to Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-P1 | S55.021 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | The intention of HH-P1 is supported, however the wording should be revised. Rarity, representativeness, authenticity, and integrity are important values which are not included in the values listed in HH-P1. | Amend HH-P1 as follows: 'To identify and classify heritage items in the District according to their relative significance and value including aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historic, social, spiritual, technological, industrial or traditional significance or value, and their rarity, representativeness, authenticity and integrity. ' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-P3 | S55.022 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | The settings of heritage items is an important aspect which needs to be recognised in the policy framework. | Amend HH-P3 as follows: 'To ensure activities avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the character and values of heritage items and their settings. ' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-RXX (new rule) | S55.030 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Oppose | It is important to protect the historic value of the settings of scheduled buildings and objects by controlling development and new buildings within the defined settings. A rule on buildings within settings would accomplish this. | Add new rule as follows: 'HH-RXX Any new building or structure within the heritage setting of a heritage item included in SCHED2. Activity status: RDIS Matters of discretion are limited to: HH-AM2.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-R1 | S55.023 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Oppose | The activity status for repairs and maintenance is supported. However there are some aspects of the definitions of maintenance and repairs that are better suited to be included as permitted activity standards as part of HH-R1. Two other clauses are recommended related to avoiding damage to heritage fabric when repairs are undertaken, and limiting the amount of fabric removed to the minimum necessary. | Amend HH-R1 as follows: 1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: N/A a. The work carried out on the building must generally match the original in terms of quality, materials and detailing; b. Repair of material or of a site should generally be with original or similar materials. However, repairs to a technically higher standard than the original workmanship or materials may be justified where the life expectancy of the site or material is increased, the new material is compatible with the old and any heritage value is not diminished; c. Any materials removed to carry out the repairs must be limited to the amount necessary to carry out the works; d. The work is for the purposes of keeping the building in good condition; e. There must be no damage to the heritage item when undertaking the repairs and maintenance, and protective material must be used where necessary to prevent damage.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-R3 | S55.024 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | Support the activity status of HH-R3 for internal safety alterations of Category 1 places. However regarding Category 2 places, many of these places also have interiors with significant heritage values. In Central Hawke's Bay, many of the Category 2 churches and rural homesteads for example have interior heritage values which are worthy of a level of protection. For this reason our submission is that internal safety alterations of Category 2 places be given controlled activity status. | Amend HH-R3 as follows: 1. Activity Status: PER CON Where the following conditions are met: N/A a. A structural engineering assessment by a chartered professional engineer must be supplied to Council with the application. 2. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: N/A Matters over which control is reserved: HH-AM1.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-R5 | S55.026 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | The activity status of HH-R5 for internal alterations of Category 1 places is supported. However regarding Category 2 places, many of these places also have interiors with significant heritage values. In Central Hawke's Bay many of the Category 2 churches and rural homesteads for example have interior heritage values which should be managed. For this reason our submission is that internal alterations of Category 2 places be given controlled activity status. It is acknowledged that not all interiors retain heritage values and warrant District Plan control or protection, however differentiating on the basis of Category 1 and Category 2 is not the most robust approach. Ideally each place is assessed as to whether there are interior heritage values which warrant control, or whether it is only the exterior which needs protection. | Amend HH-R5 as follows: 'Category 2 Heritage Items 1. Activity Status: PER CON Where the following conditions are met: N/A Matters over which control is reserved: HH-AM2.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|--|---|--------|---|
| HH-R6 | S55.027 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | Support the activity status of HH-R6 and in particular the differentiation between Category 1 and Category 2. | Retain HH-R6 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-R7 | S55.028 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | The activity status of HH-R7 is supported. | Retain HH-R7 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-R8 | S55.029 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | The activity status of HH-R8 for partial and full demolition of Category 1 and Category 2 items is supported. | Retain HH-R8 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-AM1 | S55.031 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | The assessment matters contained here are supported. | Retain HH-AM1 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-AM2 | S55.032 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | In general the matters contained within HH-AM2 are supported, but submits that the assessment matters be broadened to include new buildings and structures within a heritage setting. | Amend HH-AM2 as follows: 'Alterations, Repairs and Maintenance and Any New Building or Structure within a Heritage Setting... 12. The effects of any new building or structure within the setting of a scheduled heritage item, including its location, form, design and materials, and whether the new building or structure is compatible with the values of the heritage item.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-AM3 | S55.033 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | This assessment matter is generally supported. However, along with documenting genuine threats to the building, it should be demonstrated that other means of retaining the structure in its current location have been exhausted. | Add to HH-AM3 guidance note as follows: 'Relocation should only occur where: a. ... b. ... c. ... d. All other means of retaining the structure in its current location have been exhausted. ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-AM4 | S55.034 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | This section on assessment matters for demolition is supported. | Retain HH-AM4 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-M3 | S55.035 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | The incentive that safety alteration resource consent applications are processed for free is supported. | Retain HH-M3 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH - Principal Reasons | S55.036 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | This section includes reference to the protection of archaeological sites under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. The inclusion of this section is supported. | Retain 'HH - Principal Reasons' as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-SCHED2 | S55.037 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | CHBDC has taken the approach of adopting the HNZPT List. This approach is supported, however the NZ Heritage List is not intended to be a comprehensive survey capturing all of New Zealand's important heritage places. There will be many other places that embody the heritage values and themes that are particular to Central Hawke's Bay's history and culture that are worthy of recognition and protection in the District Plan. The following are some examples of historic places which are not included in the schedule but for which there is evidence to support their inclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waipukurau Railway Station • Waipawa Railway Station • Pōrangahau War Memorial Hall. A conservation plan was prepared for this building in 2015, which provides evidence of its heritage values. • Waipawa Town Hall and Theatre - included in the Operative District Plan item H21. A conservation plan was prepared for this building in 2010, which provides evidence of its heritage values | That the Council proactively work on including additional, locally significant places in HH-SCHED2. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH-SCHED2 | S55.045 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Oppose | The Bibby Family Memorial Church has been nominated for inclusion on the New Zealand Heritage List/ Rārangī Kōrero. This church was constructed in 1911, and is a well-preserved example of a rural place of worship for a pioneer farming family. It is a very good candidate for inclusion in the District Plan schedule. HNZPT can provide information supplied with the nomination to support inclusion in HH-SCHED2. | Include the 'Bibby Memorial Church' in HH- SCHED2. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|--|---------|---|--|---------|---|
| SASM-SCHED3 | S55.048 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Oppose | Many of the entries in SASM Schedule 3 are light on information, including in some instances the name, address, and site description. It may be beneficial to include more detail on some of these places. HNZPT has relevant information on many of these places. We expect that tangata whenua would also have relevant details which may be appropriate to add, although we also understand there are cases where the preference is to refrain from publishing sensitive information about a site. | Consider adding more information to SASM- SCHED3, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location information, including address and legal description. • Name of the place, where this is known. • More detail on site type (summary description) where this is available. • Site values. | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| SUB-PXX (new policy) | S55.058 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Oppose | Policy 2 deals with lifestyle block developments, and Policy 15 addresses the effects of earthworks which are associated with subdivisions. However there is no policy which explicitly manages the effects of subdivision on Historic Heritage values and values of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. A policy along these lines would help to support rules which recognise the presence of such sites. | Add new policy as follows: 'Only allow subdivision of sites containing scheduled heritage items or Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori where it can be demonstrated that the values of the scheduled item can be maintained and there is sufficient land provided around the scheduled place to protect associated cultural and heritage values.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB-R7 | S55.063 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | This rule is supported providing for subdivision to create lifestyle sites in association with conservation lots for protection of special features including historic heritage items and sites and areas of significance to Māori. Clauses SUB-R7(1)(a)(iv) and SUB-R7(1)(b)(ii) state that: 'the whole of the feature will be physically and legally protected'. For the purposes of this rule, the use of historic heritage settings would be appropriate. | Amend SUB-R7(1)(a)(iv) as follows: 'iv. the whole of the feature within the conservation lot, including the setting of any historic heritage feature , will be physically and legally protected in perpetuity.' And amend SUB-R7(1)(b)(ii) as follows: 'ii. the whole of the feature within the conservation lot, including the setting of any historic heritage feature , will be physically and legally protected in perpetuity.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| EW-SXX (new standard) | S55.071 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Oppose | A new standard is needed to address earthworks on sites of historic heritage, and sites and areas of significance to Māori. | Insert a new Standard as follows: 'EW-S10 Earthworks with sites identified as Historic Heritage in SCHED2 or Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori in SCHED3 All Zones: 1. The earthworks are not within a site identified as Historic Heritage in SCHED2 or identified as a Site or Area of Significance to Māori in SCHED3, unless the earthworks are limited to trenching necessary for the installation of service connections or effluent disposal systems, or interments in existing cemeteries or urupā.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| COMZ - Introduction | S55.076 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | The introduction to the Commercial Zone includes the comments that 'Waipawa and Waipukurau have a number of historic buildings. In Waipawa they are wooden, built around the turn of last century; while, in Waipukurau they are typically in 'art deco' style, built after the 1931 Napier earthquake'. HNZPT appreciates this commentary, noting however that this acknowledgement of the historic character of the District's town centres has not been translated into practical recognition and protection in the Proposed Plan, as there are no scheduled buildings in the Waipukurau Commercial Zone, and only two in the Waipawa Commercial Zone. | As requested elsewhere in this submission, consider adding more locally significant places to HH-SCHED2. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| COMZ-P3 | S55.078 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Support | The intention of this policy is supported. However very few buildings within the Commercial Zone have any protection of their historic values by being included in the schedules. | Include more commercial buildings in HH- SCHED2. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O3 | S81.052 | Horticulture New Zealand | Amend | The objective is rather absolute. The NPSET seeks that activities are managed 'to the extent reasonably possible (e.g Policy 10). This should be reflected in the objective. | Amend NU-O3 as follows: 'The safety, maintenance, upgrade or development of network utilities is, to the extent reasonably possible , not compromised by incompatible subdivision, land use or development, including the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-P5 | S81.053 | Horticulture New Zealand | Amend | A change is sought to NU-P5 consistent with the change sought to NU-O3 above, to ensure that the policy reflects the objective to 'recognise and provide for' network utilities. Including 'amenity values' does not link to the objectives. | Amend NU-P5 as follows: ' To ensure that the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development, do not, to the extent reasonably possible, protect network utilities from the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development that may constrain or compromise the safe, effective, secure and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of network utilities, and the safety and amenity values of people and the community, including by: ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|-----------------------|--------|--|--|-----------------|---|
| Table 3 | S105.007 | James Bridge | Oppose | Requiring a 20m legal access width of 20m is excessive. Providing 3m pedestrian access on both sides of the road in rural areas is unnecessary. Providing parking and loading bays on the roadside is inconsistent with the character of rural areas, and inconsistent with Policy TRAN- P1 requiring off-street parking, access and loading facilities to be provided within sites. The large lot sizes required in rural environments will be sufficient to allow parking and loading to be accommodated within sites without the need for dedicated on-road parking. | Amend 'Table 3 - Minimum Legal Widths of Private Access - Rural Environments - Commercial, Industrial & Other Activities' as follows: 1. For access serving '21-200 sites', to require a maximum legal access width of 15m, and pedestrian access of either 3m on one side or 1.5m on each side; and 2. In all instances within Table 3, remove the requirement for parking and loading bays. And include a note stating that pedestrian access in rural areas can be provided on the grass verge and that the formation of footpaths is not necessary or appropriate in rural areas. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| HH - Introduction | S84.001 | Kairakau Lands Trust | Amend | The Introduction to this section of the Proposed Plan encourages landowners to search the New Zealand Archaeological Association database (ArchSite) for 'the latest site record information'. We would recommend that the wording be changed slightly to emphasise that not all sites are recorded. Caution should be advised for any sites located within 100m of a specific location, as the usual GPS errors and biases occur within ArchSite. | Amend the second to last paragraph of 'HH - Introduction' as follows: 'There are also legal responsibilities that relate to all archaeological sites... Landowners are encouraged to search the New Zealand Archaeological Association's database for the latest recorded site record information prior to commencing any land disturbance activities.' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SASM - Introduction | S84.003 | Kairakau Lands Trust | Amend | This section identifies the specific obligations of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to Tangata Whenua but fails to note the purpose to 'promote the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand' and one of the principles of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act (HNZPT Act) 'the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tūpuna, wāhi tapu, and other taonga'. We feel it is essential to reference the HNZPT Act here to make it abundantly clear that all sites of significance to Māori are protected in New Zealand and to ensure that this Section of the Plan accurately portrays legislative protection of sites of significance to Māori if it is read in isolation of other sections of the Plan. Additionally, the NZAA database should also be mentioned here in this Section for the same reasons as above. | Amend 'SASM - Introduction' to include reference to both the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) Act and the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) database. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB - Subdivision | S84.015 | Kairakau Lands Trust | Oppose | Change of land use, through subdivision, especially of farmland, puts many of our cultural sites at serious risk. The current processes are not adequate at protecting our cultural sites and landscapes. Any areas where cultural activity is suspected should be checked by an archaeologist or suitably experienced person. | Require a cultural assessment during the subdivision consent process to ensure that sites of significance to Māori are identified before any parcel of land changes ownership. Require the NZAA ArchSite database to be checked. Require subdivisions within 100m of a recorded site to be checked by an archaeologist or suitably experienced person. Require subdivisions within an area of known Māori occupation or where cultural activity is suspected to be checked by an archaeologist or suitably experienced person in every instance. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| EW - Earthworks | S84.014 | Kairakau Lands Trust | Oppose | The Plan states that 'whilst integral to development, earthworks can have adverse effects on the environment if not appropriately managed'. Earthworks are the greatest threat to cultural sites. However, there are no specific objectives or policies that relate to ensuring that cultural sites are protected in this Section of the Plan. We would like to see Council employ earthworks contractors who have had sufficient training or a certain level of competency in regards to recognising sites of significance to Māori. | Add specific objectives or policies in the 'EW - Earthworks' chapter that relate to ensuring that cultural sites are protected. Council should employ earthworks contractors who have had sufficient training or a certain level of competency in regards to recognising sites of significance to Maori. | Support in Part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| LLRZ-R5 | S73.014 | Ministry of Education | Amend | The Ministry supports the provisions of Educational Facilities in the zone however opposes the gross floor area limit of 100m ² . Educational facilities, particularly schools, are considered essential social infrastructure required to support coastal communities. The typical size for early childhood education centres in residential areas is a 100-200m ² gross floor area in-keeping with the size of a typical dwelling in this zone where many early childhood centres are established in existing dwellings. The proposed amendments would create flexibility and enable Educational Facilities in this zone to serve the education needs of the community. | Amend LLRZ-R5(1)(a) as follows: '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a) Limited to 200-400m ² gross floor area. b) ...' And amend LLRZ-R5(2) as follows: '2. Activity status where gross floor area is 200- 400m ² and/or compliance with condition LLRZ- R5(1)(b) is not achieved: RDIS ...' And amend LLRZ-R5(3) as follows: '3. Activity status where gross floor area is over 400m ² where compliance with condition LLRZ-R5(1)(a) is not achieved: DIS' | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|--------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| GRZ-R5 | S73.017 | Ministry of Education | Amend | The Ministry supports the provisions of Educational Facilities in the zone however opposes the gross floor area limit of 100m2. Educational facilities, particularly schools, are considered essential social infrastructure required to support communities. The typical size for early childhood education centres in residential areas is a 100-200m2 gross floor area in-keeping with the size of a typical dwelling in this zone where many early childhood centres are established in existing dwellings. The proposed amendments would create flexibility and enable Educational Facilities in this zone to serve the education needs of the community. | Amend GRZ-R5(1)(a) as follows: '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a) Limited to 200 400m2 gross floor area. b) ...' And amend GRZ-R5(2) as follows: '2. Activity status where gross floor area is 200- 400m2 and/or compliance with condition GRZ-R5(1)(b) is not achieved: RDIS ...' And amend GRZ-R5(3) as follows: '3. Activity status where gross floor area is over 400m2 where compliance with condition GRZ-R5(1)(a) is not achieved: DIS' | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| TW - Issues | S125.017 | Ngā hapū me ngā marae o Tamatea | Amend | Ngā Take/issues include the lack of mana whenua involvement in resource management decision- making, the loss of mauri and the ongoing degradation of sites of significance. | Amend 'Ngā Take: Issues' to include the following text (or alternative wording to similar effect): 'The lack of mana whenua involvement in resource management decision-making. The loss of mauri particularly in relation to fresh and coastal waters. The continuing loss of quality, quantity, and access to mahinga kai and natural resources for customary use.' | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| TW-O3 | S125.020 | Ngā hapū me ngā marae o Tamatea | Oppose | Tangata whenua/mana whenua are best placed to decide how wāhi taonga and sites of significance are managed and protected, including determining who has knowledge of and can access the sites. Not all wāhi taonga and sites of significance are mapped in the District Plan and it is important that District Council engage with tangata whenua/mana whenua to confirm their relationship with these sites. | Amend TW-O3 as follows (or words to similar effect): 'Wāhi taonga and sites of significance to tangata whenua are managed and actively protected and managed in partnership with mana whenua.' | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission, noting that Kāinga Ora would want to see these areas mapped. |
| TW-P8 | S125.026 | Ngā hapū me ngā marae o Tamatea | Amend | It is often not appropriate to have public access to mahinga kai sites and this should be reflected in the policy. | Retain TW-P8, but with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): 'To work with tangata whenua/mana whenua to identify , maintain and enhance appropriate public access to the District's public forests and significant waterways, wetlands and coastal areas, having regard to their traditional the importance as-of protecting mahinga kai, wahi tāonga and tangata whenua sites of significance.' | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| TW-MXX (new method) | S125.032 | Ngā hapū me ngā marae o Tamatea | Amend | We recommend that the District Plan includes a clear directive on how council and mana whenua agree to deal with burial sites or when Māori artefacts are unearthed or disturbed. | Retain the methods in 'TW - Methods' as notified, but add the following: 'Include an Accidental Discovery Protocol to address Māori artefacts or koiwi (human remains) disturbed by earthworks.' | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| SUB - Subdivision | S125.068 | Ngā hapū me ngā marae o Tamatea | Amend | When Council is making decisions about subdivisions it must have regard to the region's iwi and hapū and their relationship with the environment ensuring that mana whenua are actively involved to participate in decision-making. Mana whenua want all housing and infrastructure development to respect the natural environment and tikanga Māori. There is an opportunity to incorporate Māori values into urban design through the Whānau Ora Outcomes Framework, which provides for a range of housing choices and affordability, supports healthy, environmentally sustainable, functionally efficient outcomes, while also retaining and restoring values important to mana whenua. | Amend the 'SUB - Subdivision' chapter in the Proposed Plan to incorporate the Whānau Ora Outcomes Framework as part of future spatial and urban design. The amended wording should be drafted collaboratively with mana whenua of the District and would include the following outcomes: a) Whānau are self-managing and empowered leaders. b) Whānau are leading healthy lifestyles. c) Whānau are confidently participating in Te Ao Māori (the Māori world). d) Whānau are participating fully in society e) Whānau are economically secure and successfully involved in wealth creation. Whānau are cohesive, resilient and nurturing. f) Whānau are responsible stewards of their living g) and natural environment. | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission. |
| TW - Ngā Tangata Whenua o Tamatea | S134.004 | Ngāti Kere Hapū Authority | Amend | We are concerned with the ability of Māori bodies to be able to vet Resource Consents in an appropriate fashion. We have neither the capability or capacity to do so and we suspect that this has previously been done on an ad hoc basis by good- hearted but inexperienced people or cultural resource consultants whom Māori have had to pay for. Although we understand that CHBDC consults (in a cursory fashion) routinely with mana whenua over resource consents, we are unsure of the CHBDC requirements for cultural impact assessments upon those applying for resource consents. | We recommend that the planning regulations should require that resource consents automatically include a formal cultural impact assessment. We recommend that the CHBDC should actively develop training for tangata whenua around capability in assessment of resource consents and to develop capacity for the same. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|---------------------------|---------|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| TW - Ngā Tangata Whenua o Tamatea | S134.005 | Ngāti Kere Hapū Authority | Amend | As urban Māori populations retreat back from COVID-19, from urban pressure and at retirement to settle back onto whenua tipu lands, we see the need to be able to house hapū members in increasing numbers in Pōrangahau on lands that we own either individually, as a whānau or as a hapū. We see this as a fundamental right of Māori to be able to return to their whenua tipu and contribute more fully to hapū and community life. We expect CHCDC (and other regulatory bodies) to recognise this and actively promote these moves. | We recommend that the Proposed Plan recognises in the 'Tangata Whenua' chapter, the likely population increase of mana whenua returning to their homes areas and states a commitment to planning for the promotion of land development and housing opportunities for this eventually. | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori | S134.003 | Ngāti Kere Hapū Authority | Amend | We understand that in general the Plan develops the ability to register and take note of wāhi tapu sites important to Māori whānau and hapū and that it increases levels of protection around such sites from development. We are very supportive of this and would be keen to develop with CHB a more comprehensive wāhi tapu listing mechanism. We are aware for instance of many sites that demand such protection eg the Matanui site on Pōrangahau 1B4N2 and the Whangaehu Reserve are two that have been raised recently. But more so, we are concerned with the ability of Māori bodies to be able to vet Resource Consents in an appropriate fashion. We have neither the capability or capacity to do so and we suspect that this has previously been done on an ad hoc basis by good-hearted but inexperienced people or cultural resource consultants whom Māori have had to pay for. Although we understand that CHBDC consults (in a cursory fashion) routinely with mana whenua over resource consents, we are unsure of the CHBDC requirements for cultural impact assessments upon those applying for resource consents. | We recommend that the Council works with tangata whenua to develop a more effective method for identifying wāhi tapu and updates the list of wāhi tapu sites in the Plan using that method. We recommend that the planning regulations should require that resource consents automatically include a formal cultural impact assessment. We recommend that the CHBDC should actively develop training for tangata whenua around capability in assessment of resource consents and to develop capacity for the same. | Support in part Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora supports and opposes in part the proposed relief, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| PKH - Papakāinga And Kaumātua Housing, and Associated Marae-Based Development | S134.006 | Ngāti Kere Hapū Authority | Amend | We recognise the enabling provision of the papakainga-kaumatua housing section in the Plan and that there appears to be a clear commitment to make it easier for mana whenua Māori to build on and develop their own lands. We are very supportive of this direction. But we own portions of land of various sizes held in both Māori and European tenure and we need to know that Māori land as such, is not the operative criteria for building, rather that the desire of Māori to build safe and secure housing where we own or can purchase land is not impeded by the various regulations around the new classes of rural land. | We recommend that the Proposed Plan states a commitment to promoting housing opportunities for hapū members across all classes of land. | Support | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |
| NU-O2 | S56.010 | Powerco Limited | Support | Powerco seeks that the policy be amended to recognise that adverse effects of network utilities (especially new network utilities) may not be capable of being avoided, remedied or mitigated at times. | Amend NU-O2 as follows: 'The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated as far as reasonably practicable , while recognising the functional and operational needs of network utilities (including those associated with their scale, design and locational requirements).' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-P3 | S56.014 | Powerco Limited | Support | At times network utilities are required to be upgraded and new infrastructure is required to be installed service the requirements of its customers wherever they are located including in High Character Areas and Significant Amenity Features. It is appropriate in these areas that significant adverse effects are avoided. | Retain NU-P3 as notified. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---------|--|--|----------------|---|
| NU-P4 | S56.015 | Powerco Limited | Oppose | Powerco opposes this policy as it too broad e.g. natural and physical resources and amenity values are extremely wide terms. Requiring 'compliance' with standards and guidelines in a policy is also not supported. The term 'appropriate network utilities' is very subjective, when it appears the intent is for it to apply to overhead electricity and communication lines. | Amend NU-P4 as follows: Manage the effects of network utilities on the environment by: 1. avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on: a. natural and physical resources; b. amenity values, including from shading, visual dominance, noise, vibration, light spill, traffic and access, dust nuisance; c. the safe and efficient operation of other network utilities, including effects on electricity transmission and the National Grid, gas transmission pipelines, road and rail networks, and infrastructural service networks; 2. requiring assessing requiring assessing compliance with recognised standards and guidelines for the potential adverse effects of noise, vibration, radiofrequency fields and electric and magnetic fields; 3. encouraging the progressive undergrounding of appropriate network utilities overhead electricity and telecommunication lines in new areas of development within the General Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Large Lot Residential and Settlement Zones and the systematic replacement of existing overhead services with underground reticulation or the upgrading of existing overhead services within these areas, where this is technically and commercially viable; 4. encouraging the co-siting and sharing of masts, facilities, utility corridors and other innovative solutions within residential environments and roads, where technically feasible and practicable; 5. encouraging the removal of redundant and superseded network utilities utilities facilities.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| Definitions | S75.090 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest & Bird) | Amend | Environmental compensation and environmental offsetting are not synonymous. Biodiversity offsets must meet best practice principles for offsetting, whereas biodiversity compensation only needs to provide a positive, measurable outcome that achieves no net loss. Environmental compensation (as defined in the draft plan) does not need to achieve no net loss. It's possible under this definition that provision for a new town hall or swimming pool could be considered 'environmental compensation'. This approach is inappropriate and perpetuates the loss of biodiversity and other natural values. Compensation is a final option after avoidance, remediation, mitigation, and offsetting have been considered, and therefore should not be promoted as a core method for addressing adverse effects. | Add new definitions for 'Biodiversity Offset' and 'Biodiversity Compensation' as follows: 'BIODIVERSITY OFFSET means a measurable conservation outcome resulting from actions designed to compensate for residual, adverse biodiversity effects arising from activities after appropriate avoidance, remediation, and mitigation measures have been applied. The goal of a biodiversity offset is to achieve no net loss, and preferably a net gain of indigenous biodiversity values. Offsetting should be consistent with the best practice offsetting principles. "BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION a measurable conservation outcome resulting from actions designed to compensate for residual, adverse biodiversity effects arising from activities after appropriate avoidance, remediation, and mitigation measures have been applied. Biodiversity compensation should be as consistent as possible with the best practice offsetting principles.' | Oppose in Part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| ENVIRONMENTAL COMPENSATION (Definition) | S75.004 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest & Bird) | Amend | Environmental compensation and environmental offsetting are not synonymous. The definition should be amended to reflect this by removing reference to compensation (or creating separate definitions). Biodiversity offsets must meet best practice principles for offsetting, whereas biodiversity compensation only needs to provide a positive, measurable outcome that achieves no net loss. Compensation is a final option after avoidance, remediation, mitigation, and offsetting have been considered, and therefore should not be promoted as a core method for addressing adverse effects. | Amend the definition of 'Environmental Compensation' as follows: 'Environmental Compensation: any action (work, services, financial contribution or restrictive covenants) to compensate for, or offset, the environmental effects of activities that cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated or addressed by a biodiversity offset or biodiversity compensation. Positive measures to correct, balance, or otherwise compensate for the loss of the resource or value affected.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| ECO-P3 | S75.033 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest & Bird) | Support | It is consistent with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, particularly Policy 11. | Retain ECO-P3 as proposed. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| ECO-APP1 | S75.057 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest & Bird) | Oppose | Forest & Bird are largely supportive of the criteria/guidance used here. We are also support of the notion in Policy 1[ECO-P1?] that an area only needs to meet one of the criteria to qualify as an SNA. However, in APP1[ECO-APP1?], it appears that to qualify as significant an area needs to meet one of the criteria from 2-7 AND that the area currently be, or is recommended to be, set aside 'specifically for the protection of biodiversity' (i.e. meet Criteria 1). We assume this is not the intention of the plan and it needs amending for consistency with P1[ECO-P1?]. Otherwise this is not an appropriate test - i.e. significance should be able to be recognised in any area, regardless of whether that area is on private or public land, or has been recognised (or recommended) for protection before. | Amend the "Ecological Significance Determination Criteria' in ECO-APP1 to be clear that an area only needs to meet one of any of the criteria from 1-7 to be a 'Significant Natural Area (SNA)'. 1-7 to be a 'Significant Natural Area (SNA)'. 1-7 to be a 'Significant Natural Area (SNA)'. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------|---|
| NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE (Definition) | S118.011 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | A definition of the term 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure' is appropriate. The matters that are listed in the definition all provide communities with the ability to connect or be serviced by a utility. Telecommunications allows people to connect at a local, regional, national and international level. The national significance of telecommunications is recognised through the presence of the NESTF. Telecommunications is also recognised in the Hawkes Bay Regional Resource Management Plan (which includes the Regional Policy Statement) as 'Strategic Infrastructure'. Including telecommunications in the 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure' is appropriate. | Amend the definition of 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure' as follows: 'means: a. State Highways; b. the National Grid electricity transmission network; c. national renewable electricity generation facilities that connect with the National Grid; d. major gas or oil pipeline services (such as the gas transmission pipeline from Taranaki); e. any railway (as defined in the Railways Act 2005). f. Telecommunication networks' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| [General] | S118.025 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | Within the strategic objectives there is no infrastructure recognition except for urban form and development. The majority of the Central Hawkes Bay District is Rural, which requires infrastructure as well as urban areas. A balance is needed, particularly given the critical nature of infrastructure for modern living, regardless of whether people are residing in urban or rural areas. Including Infrastructure as a Strategic Direction, with subsequent Strategic Objectives, provides a clear message to plan users as to the strategic nature of infrastructure across the District as a whole. | Add a new 'Strategic Direction for Infrastructure' chapter in the 'Strategic Direction' section of the Proposed Plan, and include the following objectives under that heading: '1. The social, economic, environmental and cultural benefits of infrastructure are recognised and provided for, and its safe, efficient and effective development, upgrade, maintenance and operation is enabled; 2. Infrastructure, including its role and function, is protected from incompatible development and activities; and 3. The adverse effects of infrastructure on the surrounding environment are managed, having regard to the economic benefits and the technical, functional and operational needs of infrastructure.' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-I3 | S118.030 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Support | The three issues raised in the Issues section provide context for the Objectives proposed in the Proposed Plan. | Retain NU-I3. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O1 | S118.031 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | NU-O1 as proposed covers the same matters as best practice provision IE-O1, although IE-O1 provides greater context as to why network utilities should be safe, effective, efficient and resilient. See wording in body of submission to explain why best practice provisions should be utilised. | Delete NU-O1, and replace as follows: 'Effective, resilient, efficient and safe network utilities that: 1. provide essential and secure services, including in emergencies; 2. facilitate local, regional, national or international connectivity; 3. contribute to the economy and support a high standard of living; 4. integrate with urban development; 5. enable people and communities to provide for their health, safety and wellbeing.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O2 | S118.032 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | NU-O2 aligns with IE-O2 of the best practice provisions, although does not require consideration of the positive effects that network utilities can have. The definition of effect in the Resource Management Act includes positive effects. | Delete NU-O2, and replace as follows: 'The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated while recognising: 1. the functional need and operational need of network utilities; 2. that positive effects of network utilities may be realised locally, regionally or nationally.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O3 | S118.033 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | The intention of NU-O3, in that it provides for Reverse Sensitivity is supported, but the objectives should be made to be more explicit, as per IE-O3 in the best practice provisions. | Delete NU-O3, and replace as follows: 'Network utilities are protected from adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, of subdivision, use and development by, where necessary: 1. set-backs or buffer corridors within which incompatible activities will be managed; 2. controls on the activities of others' where they can compromise the operation, safety, maintenance, upgrade and development of network utilities.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|--------------|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| <p>NU-P1</p> | <p>S118.034</p> | <p>Spark New Zealand Trading Limited</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>While the intention of NU-P1 is generally well aligned with IE-P1 of the best practice provisions, the second part of IE-P1 of the best practice provisions is more prescriptive than what exists in NU-P1 of the Proposed District Plan.</p> | <p>Delete NU-P1, and replace as follows: '1. Recognise the benefits of network utilities by: a. enabling the operation, maintenance, repair, minor upgrade or removal of existing network utilities throughout the district; b. enabling investigation, monitoring and navigation activities associated with network utility operations throughout the district; c. providing for significant upgrades to, and the development of new, network utilities; d. providing for the functions and responsibilities of network utilities as lifeline utilities during an emergency. The national, regional and local benefits of network utilities that are recognised are those that enable the economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being of people and communities and provide for their health and safety, including through: a. the effective safe, secure and efficient transmission or distribution of electricity, gas, fuel or energy; b. an integrated, efficient and safe transport network for the movement of people and goods by land, air or water, including public transport, walking, cycling, private vehicles; c. effective, reliable and future-proofed communications networks and services; d. effective, resilient, efficient and safe water, wastewater and stormwater treatment systems, networks and services.'</p> | <p>Oppose in part</p> | <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission</p> |
| <p>NU-P3</p> | <p>S118.036</p> | <p>Spark New Zealand Trading Limited</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>The intention of NU-P3 is generally well aligned with IE-P7 of the best practice provisions.</p> | <p>Delete NU-P3, and replace as follows: 'Consideration of the adverse effects of network utilities When considering the adverse effects of network utilities on the environment: 1. recognise that there may be situations where all adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 2. recognise that the adverse effects on the values and attributes of the areas listed in Policy IE-P5(3) can be mitigated by locating some types of network utilities in land transport corridors; 3. decision-makers must have regard to: a. the extent to which adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated may be constrained by a network utility's functional need or operational need; b. the time, duration or frequency of adverse effects; c. the necessity of the network utility including: i. the need to quickly repair and restore disrupted services; ii. the impact of not operating, repairing, maintaining, upgrading, removing or developing a network utility; d. existing network utilities including: i. the complexity and connectedness of networks and services; ii. the potential for co-location and shared use of network utility corridors; e. anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment and the degree to which past modifications have compromised the achievement of those outcomes; f. the benefits derived from the network utility at a local, regional and national scale; g. the extent to which the network utility is integrated with, and necessary to support, planned urban development.'</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|---|---|--------|---|
| NU-P4 | S118.037 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | <p>The intention of NU-P4 is generally well aligned with IE-P4 of the best practice provisions. However for consistency IE-P4 of the best practice provisions should be used in the Proposed Plan.</p> | <p>Delete NU-P4, and replace as follows:</p> <p>'Adverse effects of network utilities</p> <p>Manage the adverse effects of network utilities on the environment by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. recognising that the adverse effects of the ongoing operation, maintenance, repair, upgrade and removal of existing network utilities are typically insignificant or minor by enabling these activities to occur without the need for planning approvals; 2. avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new network utilities, including effects on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. natural and physical resources; b. amenity values; c. sensitive activities; d. the safe and efficient operation of other network utilities; e. the health, well-being and safety of people and communities. 3. managing the potential adverse effects of noise, vibration, radiofrequency fields and electric and magnetic fields by requiring compliance with national environmental standards or other nationally recognised standards or guidelines. 4. preferring the undergrounding of new network utilities in urban areas where it is: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. technically feasible; b. justified by the extent of adverse visual effects; and c. viable, including where costs are proportionate to the adverse effects being avoided.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
|-------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|---|---|--------|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|---|---|--------|---|
| NU-P5 | S118.038 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | <p>The intention of NU-P5 is generally well aligned with IE-P8 of the best practice provisions. However for consistency IE-P8 of the best practice provisions should be used in the Proposed Plan.</p> | <p>Delete NU-P5, and replace as follows: 'Adverse effects on network utilities Protect network utilities from the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development that may constrain or compromise the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, removal and development of network utilities, including by: 1. locating and designing new buildings and activities sensitive to noise to avoid the potential adverse effects of the railway corridor and national and regional road network; 2. managing access to the railway corridor and national and regional road network; 3. managing new activities sensitive to noise within a defined air noise contour; 4. avoiding physical obstructions in take-off, approach, landing or departure paths and runway end protection areas; 5. requiring subdivision of sites containing significant electricity distribution lines to: a. retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the significant electricity distribution line; and b. ensure that future buildings, earthworks and construction activities maintain safe electrical clearance distances under all building and electricity distribution line operating conditions; 6. managing land disturbance and activities sensitive to gas transmission to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects of, and on, gas transmission pipelines; 7. requiring subdivision of sites containing a gas transmission pipeline to retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the gas transmission pipeline; 8. managing the activities of others' through set-backs and design controls where it is necessary to achieve appropriate protection of a network utility.'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
|-------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|---|---|--------|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|---|---|-----------------|---|
| NU-S3 | S118.049 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | <p>The proposed heights for antennas attached to buildings should align with the NESTF (5m above the part of the building to which it is attached, and in Residential Zones only applies if the building is 15m or higher). The proposed height for antennas attached to poles should be increased so that they are at least 5m above the permitted building height in each zone (with the exception of the Rural zones).</p> <p>This assists in providing better coverage, as the antennas are above structures such as buildings which can interfere with their efficacy. In all Rural Zones (Rural Lifestyle, Rural Production, General Rural and Settlement), the pole height should be 25m to align with the NESTF. GPS antenna, which have a very small size, with effects akin to a lightning rod, should also be excluded from meeting the permitted height standard.</p> <p>It is unclear what the reference to Clause 4 is in standards 6, 7 and 8. The exception in ONF and ONL which has a smaller building height is not practicable for the addition of telecommunication facilities to existing structures/buildings. Removing the exception and making it easier for such facilities to be attached to existing buildings in these areas encourages consolidation of structures in areas where they are not readily expected. The height sought in industrial areas is considered appropriate as it encourages telecommunication companies who need new high facilities to be located in a zone where the amenity is lower, and power and fibre is typically available.</p> | <p>Amend NU-S3 as follows:</p> <p>General Residential Zone / Settlement Zone / Rural Lifestyle Zone / Large Lot Residential Zone (Coastal)</p> <p>3. ...</p> <p>4. Where an antenna is can only be attached to a building, the antenna and building must not exceed a combined height of 8.5m. if that building is 15m high. The top of the antenna must not be more than 5m above the point of the building to which it is attached.</p> <p>5. Above ground structures (poles, towers, and telecommunication poles, including combined height of pole and antenna) must not exceed a height of 11.5m 13m.</p> <p>Except that:</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p>b. Lightning rods and GPS antenna are exempt from the maximum structure height standard. Rural Production Zone / Settlement Zone / Rural Lifestyle Zone / General Rural Zone</p> <p>6. Except as excluded in clause 4. below, above ground buildings (where located outside road reserve and the rail corridor) must not exceed a height of 5m...</p> <p>7. Except as excluded in Clause 4 below, where an antenna is attached to a building, the top of the antenna and building must not exceed a combined height 8.5m must not be more than 5m above the point of the building to which it is attached.</p> <p>Except that: a. Where located within an Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature identified in NFL- SCHED6, the antenna and building must not exceed a combined height of 6.5m.</p> <p>8. Except as excluded in clause 4. below, above ground structures (poles, towers and telecommunication poles, including combined height of pole and antenna) must not exceed a height of 25m.</p> <p>Except that:</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p>b. Lightning rods and GPS antennas are exempt from the maximum structure height standard.</p> <p>9. ... Commercial Zone / General Industrial Zone 10. ...</p> <p>11. Where an antenna is attached to a building, the top of the antenna and building must not exceed a combined height 8.5m must not be more than 5m above the point of the building to which it is attached.</p> <p>12. Above ground structures (poles, towers, and telecommunication poles, including combined height of pole and antenna) must not exceed a height of 15m 25m.</p> <p>Except that:</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-S4 | S118.050 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | <p>Like for NU-S2, a setback for structures, which is what a height in relation to boundary control essentially is, is generally supported as it assists in the mitigation of bulk and dominance effects. However telecommunication pole facilities are typically slim, and do not create the bulk and dominance effect wider structures can have. As such, an exemption is sought for pole structures within the standard.</p> | <p>Amend NU-S4 as follows:</p> <p>1. Above ground buildings or structures (except those located within road reserve) must not exceed a height of 2m plus the shortest horizontal distance between that part of the building or structure and the nearest site boundary (but excluding a road boundary).</p> <p>Except that:</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p>b. This standard does not apply to poles with a diameter of 600mm or less, and any permitted attachments to the poles.</p> <p>...</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-S5 | S118.051 | Spark New Zealand Trading Limited | Amend | <p>Whilst it is appropriate that any new accesses comply with the relevant transport provisions of the PDP, having a threshold based on area should be replaced by whether or not the activity on the site demands a new access or not. Minimum parking or loading requirements are not necessary for telecommunications companies, as the operator will provide on site parking or loading to meet the demands of the activity.</p> | <p>Amend NU-S5 as follows:</p> <p>1. Any activity which requires a new vehicle access Activities on sites greater than 200m² in area must comply with the relevant vehicle access provisions of the TRAN - Transport chapter for access, parking and loading.'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SENSITIVE ACTIVITY (Definition) | S79.013 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>The definition of 'sensitive activities' is used within the plan, in some provisions being specific to the National Grid. However, the term used in the PDP is wider than that typically sought and applied to the National Grid in respect of reverse sensitivity effects and would inappropriately capture activities beyond those that should be managed near the National Grid. As such, Transpower would support an amendment to the definition to make it clear what activities are included. In particular, Transpower considers that tightening the definition would enable better effect to be given to the rules specific to third party activities within the National Grid Yard. As alternative, Transpower would support a definition sensitive activity specific to the National Grid.</p> | <p>Amend the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' as follows:</p> <p>'activities which are sensitive to noise, dust, the use and storage of hazardous substances, spray-residue, odour or visual effects of nearby activities. Includes residential activities, marae, urupā, visitor accommodation, rest homes, retirement villages, day care facilities, educational facilities and hospitals.'</p> <p>Alternately, Transpower would support a definition that is specific to the National Grid.</p> | Support in part | Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------|----------------------------|---------|---|--|----------------|---|
| NU - Introduction | S79.018 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower largely supports the introductory statement which outlines the role, and importance of network utilities. The reference to the NESs is supported, as it clarifies that the NESs prevail (which is the case for the NESETA).</p> <p>Transpower also supports paragraph 4 of the Introduction. This makes it clear that the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid is to be solely addressed in the NU chapter. This approach is supported. However, the statement is potentially confused by references to rules in addition to the provisions in this chapter. These clauses are confusing in light of the earlier clause saying the NU provisions are stand alone.</p> <p>Transpower's preference is for a standalone set of provisions within the Network Utilities Chapter as it avoids duplication (in terms of the zone rules) and provides a coherent set of rules which applicants can refer to. A standalone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards, Standard 7.</p> | <p>Amend paragraphs 4/5 of 'NU - Introduction' as follows: '... Because many network utilities are lineal, and traverse many parts of the District, it is considered appropriate that a single set of rules are provided which apply across the District. Provisions to manage the effects of other activities on network utilities (including state highway and rail corridors, the National Grid, and gas transmission pipelines) are contained within the Network Utilities provisions of the plan elsewhere in the District Plan, in the respective zones in Part 3 of the District Plan, and the NOISE - Noise chapter of the District Plan...' And provide clarity as to the relationship of the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter to other chapters in the Proposed Plan, and make amendments to the Proposed Plan to clarify the provisions and make the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter stand alone.</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-I3 | S79.021 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Support | <p>Transpower supports recognition of the effects of other party activities on network utilities, and in particular the potential for some activities to constrain and compromise network utilities. The issue appropriately recognises that that the issue of adverse effects on the network is wider than solely that of reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>Specific recognition of the National Grid is supported.</p> | Retain NU-I3. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-PXX (new policy) | S79.026 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower would support the provision of a policy relating to managing the effects of the National Grid electricity transmission network. Such a policy would give effect to Sections 6 and 7 (policies 1 - 8) of the NPSET. In particular: Policy 8 of the NPSET. Given the nature of existing assets within the district and very confined nature of existing settlements, the policy approach by Transpower is focused on Policy 8 of the NPSET which relates to rural areas as opposed to Policy 7 (Urban areas).</p> <p>Clause 1 would give effect to NPSET Policy 4. Clause 2 would give effect to NPSET Policy 3. Clauses 3 and 4 give effect to NPSET Policy 8. Policy 8 provides a 'seek to avoid' approach within more valued areas. Clause 4 also reconciles the NPSET and the NZCPS by providing a policy framework specific to the coastal environment.</p> <p>Clause 5 is a general avoid, remedy or mitigate clause.</p> <p>While Policies NU-P2 and NU-P3 provide a policy framework for addressing the effects of network utilities, they do not give effect to the NPSET in terms of recognising the clear policy directives in respect of the National Grid.</p> | <p>Add a new policy to the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter as follows: 'Manage the adverse effects of the planning and development of the National Grid by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considering the extent to which any adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by the route, site and method selection process. 2. Having regard to the functional and operational needs of the network. 3. Seeking to avoid adverse effects on identified High Natural Character Areas, Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, Significant Natural Areas, Significant Amenity Features, and areas of high recreational value or high amenity in rural areas. 4. Seeking to avoid significant adverse effects on other areas of natural character and other natural features and landscapes in the coastal environment. 5. Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects. <p>In the event of any conflict with any other objectives and policies within the Plan, Policy NU-Pa takes precedence.'</p> | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--|---|---------------|--|
| <p>NU-P5</p> | <p>S79.030</p> | <p>Transpower New Zealand Ltd</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>Transpower is generally supportive of the policy in that it recognises the adverse effects of subdivision, land use and development on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid. Such policy recognition largely gives effect to Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET.</p> <p>The policy is also supported in that it recognises that in addition to reverse sensitivity effects, subdivision, land use and development can also compromise the National Grid through activities such as access to the National Grid assets being blocked, buildings and structures being located close to assets, or the location of buildings and activities, including 'sensitive activities' beneath or in close proximity to lines and/or structures can limit Transpower's ability to maintain, upgrade and develop the National Grid. Earthworks (and vertical holes) are an activity which can also adversely affect and compromise the National Grid. It is noted the policy references 'land disturbance' but not earthworks. Given the confined definition of 'land disturbance in the PDP, Transpower seeks specific reference within the policy to earthworks. It is noted earthworks within the National Grid Yard are managed in the Earthworks chapter (as part of the General District-Wide Matters). However, while there are rules in the EW chapter, there is no specific policy support. Transpower therefore seeks specific policy recognition within NU-P5.</p> <p>Transpower supports reference to subdivision within policy NU-P5. However, for clarity amendment is sought to also include reference to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor as the corridor, not the yard, manages subdivision.</p> <p>The reference to 'near the National Grid' is deleted as the term is vague, uncertain and not required.</p> <p>Instead the policy relies on the defined National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor. The reference to "around a designated National Grid substation" is also Transpower is not seeking restrictions around its substation beyond the designation boundary itself.</p> | <p>Amend NU-P5 as follows:</p> <p>'To protect network utilities from the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development that may constrain or compromise the safe, effective, secure and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of network utilities, and the safety and amenity values of people and the community, including by:</p> <p>1. 6. managing land use development (including sensitive activities), buildings, earthworks, vertical holes and structures and subdivision near the National Grid, within the National Grid Yard, and subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor, or around a designated National Grid substation, to avoid reverse sensitivity effects and ensure the electricity transmission network is not compromised;</p> <p>7. managing land disturbance, earthworks and vertical holes, land use development and buildings to maintain safe electrical clearance distances under electricity distributions lines and support structures; and</p> <p>8. ensuring subdivision of sites containing a network activity retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the network utility.'</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission</p> |
| <p>NU - Rules</p> | <p>S79.031</p> | <p>Transpower New Zealand Ltd</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>In relation to the Rules Notes, Transpower supports the reference to the National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities (2009) within the Note as it highlights the standards to plan users.</p> <p>As proposed, the structure of the PDP provides for activities undertaken by Transpower to be managed within the Network Utilities section, whereas activities undertaken by other parties within the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor are managed in the respective activity or zone chapter (i.e. for earthworks, subdivision and in the zone chapters). Transpower's preference is for a standalone set of provisions within the Network Utilities Chapter as it avoids duplication (in terms of the zone rules) and provides a coherent set of rules which applicants can refer to.</p> <p>Specific to other matters addressed within the Note, Transpower supports the attempt at clarity regarding the relationship of various provisions in the plan. However, as noted in an earlier submission point, the cross references to other provisions are confusing.</p> | <p>Relocate the relevant National Grid provisions in other sections of the Proposed Plan to the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Insert the following into the Rules Notes section:</p> <p>'...Rules relating to the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of network utilities are addressed in the NU- Network Utilities chapter of the district plan and reference is not required to other chapters.</p> <p>Rules relating to subdivision and land development involving network utilities and other activities addressed in this chapter are contained in the SUB - Subdivision chapter of the District Plan.</p> <p>Rules relating to earthworks associated with activities addressed in this chapter are contained in the EW - Earthworks chapter of the District Plan.Rules relating to subdivision, land development and earthworks within the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor are addressed in this chapter.Rules for activities addressed in this chapter that are located within the identified ONL and ONFs are contained in this chapter.</p> <p>The construction, operation, maintenance, replacement, removal and upgrading of cycleways or walkways located within road reserve are subject to the rules of this chapter.</p> <p>Cycleways and walkways located outside road reserve fall within the definition of 'Community Facilities' and are subject to the relevant zone chapter rules.It is important to note that in addition to the provisions in this chapter, a number of other Part 2- District- Wide Matters chapters also contain provisions that may be relevant to network utilities (e.g. TRANSPORT - Transport, HH - Historic Heritage, ECO - Ecosystems & Indigenous Biodiversity, SUB - Subdivision, EW - Earthworks, LIGHT - Light, and NOISE - Noise).'</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--------|---|--|----------------|---|
| NU - Principal Reasons | S79.052 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower supports the reasoning provides as it reflects the policy and rule framework provided. However, a minor amendment is sought to include reference to ensuring the grid is not compromised. | Retain the 'NU - Principal Reasons' section, but include a reference at the end of the final paragraph as follows: '... To protect the adjoining activities and the ongoing operation of the utilities, various degrees of control will be implemented in the District Plan to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects and ensure the network utility is not compromised. ' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NH-R3 | S79.060 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Oppose | Depending on the relevance and applicability of the Natural Hazards Chapter to the National Grid, Transpower opposes any non-complying activity status that would apply to the National Grid. The National Grid is a linear network that is constrained in its location. Such constraints should be reflected in a restricted discretionary activity status. The Restricted Discretionary matters would ensure an adequate assessment of the risks and need. | Amend NH-R3 to remove non-complying activity status for the National Grid. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB-O4 | S79.073 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower supports the provision of an objective specific to reverse sensitivity. However, it is not only reverse sensitivity that can compromise the National Grid. Policy NU-P5 appropriately articulates the issues for the National Grid. | Retain SUB-O4, provided NU-P5 is amended as sought. Should NU-P5 not be amended as sought, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-O4 to give effect to the NPSET. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB-P17 | S79.074 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Given the national significance of the National Grid, inappropriate development is a potential issue. In order to manage subdivision that has the potential to compromise the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid, Transpower supports the provision of a corridor management approach which allows for the reasonable use of land inside the transmission line corridor, with several standards and rules imposed to ensure that any subdivision that might compromise the Grid is either avoided or managed. Notwithstanding its location, Transpower supports Policy SUB-P17 (noting SUB-P18 addresses the issue of ensuring network utilities are not compromised). | Retain SUB-P17, provided NU-P5 is amended as sought. Should NU-P5 not be amended as sought, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-P17 to give effect to the NPSET (in particular specific reference to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor and removal of reference 'to the extent practicable'). | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB-P18 | S79.075 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Given the national significance of the National Grid, inappropriate development is a potential issue. In order to manage subdivision that has the potential to compromise the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid, Transpower supports the provision of a corridor management approach which allows for the reasonable use of land inside the transmission line corridor, with several standards and rules imposed to ensure that any subdivision that might compromise the Grid is either avoided or managed. While Transpower supports SUB-P18, it is not explicitly directive to give effect to the NPSET. | Retain SUB-P17[SUB-P18?], provided NU-P5 is amended as sought. Should NU-P5 not be amended as sought, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-P17 [SUB-P18?] to give effect to the NPSET (in particular specific reference to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor and removal of reference 'to the extent practicable'). | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB - Rules | S79.077 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | As proposed the PDP Subdivision Chapter provides for the subdivision provisions relating to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor provided as a standard within SUB-S4, which is then referenced in each of the relevant rules. While Transpower supports a specific standard relating to subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor, Transpower seeks a stand-alone rule and a specific standard and activity status that appropriately manages subdivision within proximity of the National Grid. In relation to a stand-alone rule, Transpower seeks a stand-alone rule (to be located within the Network Utilities chapter) as it would provide clarity to plan users. In relation to activity status, Transpower seeks that subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor be a restricted discretionary activity (as opposed to being controlled as notified) where the newly created lots comply with the standards SUB- S4. A restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision that demonstrates a building platform outside the National Grid Yard, and where vehicle access to support structures is maintained, provides an appropriate incentive to design subdivision layouts that avoid building sites within the National Grid Yard. The default non-complying activity status is supported on the basis it is considered the most effective means of giving effect to the NPSET's objective of managing the adverse effects of the network and managing the adverse effects of other activities on the network. | Add a new subdivision rule (preference for it to be located in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter) as follows: 'Subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor All Zones 1. Activity Status: RDIS Where the following condition is met: a. Compliance with: SUB-S4(2) and SUB-S4(3) National Grid Subdivision Corridor. Matters of discretion are restricted to: The matters in SUB-AM172. Activity status where compliance with SUB- S4(2) and SUB-S4(3) is not achieved: NC Notification An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA. When deciding whether any person is affected in relation to this rule for the purposes of section 95E of the RMA, the Council will give specific consideration to any adverse effects on Transpower New Zealand Limited.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|----------------------------|-------|--|--|--------|---|
| SUB-R1 | S79.078 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a stand-alone rule and a specific standard and activity status that appropriately manages subdivision within proximity of the National Grid. Transpower seeks this stand- alone rule be located within the Network Utilities chapter, as it would provide clarity to plan users. | Remove all reference to the 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' from SUB-R1, on the basis of a new stand alone rule addressing this matter. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB-R4 | S79.080 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a stand-alone rule and a specific standard and activity status that appropriately manages subdivision within proximity of the National Grid. Transpower seeks this stand- alone rule be located within the Network Utilities chapter, as it would provide clarity to plan users. | Remove all reference to the 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' from SUB-R4, on the basis of a new stand alone rule addressing this matter. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB-R5 | S79.081 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a stand-alone rule and a specific standard and activity status that appropriately manages subdivision within proximity of the National Grid. Transpower seeks this stand- alone rule be located within the Network Utilities chapter, as it would provide clarity to plan users. | Remove all reference to the 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' from SUB-R5, on the basis of a new stand alone rule addressing this matter. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB-R7 | S79.083 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a stand-alone rule and a specific standard and activity status that appropriately manages subdivision within proximity of the National Grid. Transpower seeks this stand- alone rule be located within the Network Utilities chapter, as it would provide clarity to plan users. | Remove all reference to the 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' from SUB-R7, on the basis of a new stand alone rule addressing this matter. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| SUB-S4 | S79.084 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Notwithstanding Transpower is seeking the relocation of all the National Grid subdivision provisions within the Network Utilities chapter, Transpower supports the standards in that they provide a clear framework for managing the effects of subdivision on the National Grid. | Retain SUB-S4, but relocate it within the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| [General] | S79.125 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being: - Provision of one permitted and one non- complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non- complying. | Amend RPROZ-R14 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: CON Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid). ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|-------|---|--|--------|---|
| GRUZ - General Rural Zone | S79.095 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower's preference is for a standalone set of provisions within the Network Utility chapter as it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of policies and rules. A standalone set of provisions is also consistent with the National Planning Standards, mandatory direction in Planning Standard 7. Specific to the Rural Zones, NU-P5 (as sought to be amended) within the Network Utilities chapter provides the policy framework for land activities within the National Grid Yard, as well as the policy framework for the operation and development of the grid itself. However, the associated zoning rules (and more importantly the National Grid Yard Standards) for land use activities within the National Grid Yard are provided within the General Rural and Rural Production Zone Chapters. The disconnect between the rules/ standards and the policy framework is potentially confusing to plan users. The sought rule framework reflects that proposed in the PDP with the primary sought differences being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses b. - g. to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. <p>Two minor amendments are sought to the 'Setback from National Grid Yard and National Grid Substation' standard, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of the requirement for a 25m setback from a National Grid substation. Given the rural location (and Rural Production zoning) of the substation with provides a 12ha minimum lots area and that there are no existing sensitive activities in proximity, the setback is not considered efficient or effective. - Amendment to Standard 3 to reflect the required 12m setback from support structures. An 8m setback from support structures is not considered sufficient to ensure the grid is not compromised. | <p>Merge, relocate and renumber the relevant National Grid rules contained in the 'GRUZ - General Rural Zone' chapter to the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter, as follows: 'NU-xx National Grid Yard Buildings, structures and activities within the National Grid Yard – PER 1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. Compliance with GRUZ-S13 (setbacks from National Grid). 2. Activity status where compliance with GRUZ-S13 (setbacks from National Grid) is not achieved: NC NU-xy National Grid Yard Buildings, structures, and activities within the National Grid Yard – NC 1. Activity Status: NC Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with GRUZ-S13 (setbacks from National Grid); or b. The building or structure is not provided for within NU-xx. c. Any new building for a sensitive land use, or addition to an existing building that involves an increase in the building envelope or height for a sensitive land use, within the National Grid Yard d. Any change of use of an existing building to a sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard e. The establishment of any new sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard f. Any new hazardous facility that involves the storage and handling of hazardous substances with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties within 12m of the centre line of a National Grid Transmission Lineg. Dairy/milking sheds (excluding accessory structures and buildings), commercial glass houses, PSA structures or buildings for intensive primary production within the National Grid Yard.' And 'GRUZ-S13 Setback from National Grid Yard and National Grid Substation Sensitive Activities1. Minimum setback of buildings and structures from the designated boundary of a National Grid substation is 25m. All Buildings and Structures 2. Under the National Grid conductors (wires): a. on all sites within any part of the National Grid Yard, all buildings and structures must: i. if for an existing sensitive activity, not involve an increase in the building height or footprint where alterations and additions to existing buildings occur; or ii. be a fence less than 2.5m high; or</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| GRUZ - Rules | S79.097 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | An additional statement is sought within the Introduction to the rules section to refer to the Network Utilities chapter. | Add to following to the 'GRUZ - Rules' introductory statement: ' ... Rules for activities within the National Grid Yard within the General Rural Zone are contained in the Network Utilities (NU) Chapter.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| GRUZ-R1 | S79.098 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | <p>Amend GRUZ-R1 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with GRUZ-S13 (setbacks from National Grid). ...'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| GRUZ-R2 | S79.099 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | <p>Amend GRUZ-R2 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with GRUZ-S13 (setbacks from National Grid). ...'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| GRUZ-R3 | S79.100 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | <p>Amend GRUZ-R3 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. e. Compliance with GRUZ-S13 (setbacks from National Grid). ...'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|-------|---|---|--------|---|
| GRUZ-R14 | S79.109 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | <p>Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter):</p> <p>'1. Activity Status: CON Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with GRUZ-S13 (setbacks from National Grid): ...'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ - Rural Production Zone | S79.111 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower's preference is for a standalone set of provisions within the Network Utility chapter as it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of policies and rules. A standalone set of provisions is also consistent with the National Planning Standards, mandatory direction in Planning Standard 7. Specific to the Rural Zones, NU-P5 (as sought to be amended) within the Network Utilities chapter provides the policy framework for land activities within the National Grid Yard, as well as the policy framework for the operation and development of the grid itself. However, the associated zoning rules (and more importantly the National Grid Yard Standards) for land use activities within the National Grid Yard are provided within the General Rural and Rural Production Zone Chapters. The disconnect between the rules/ standards and the policy framework is potentially confusing to plan users. The sought rule framework reflects that proposed in the PDP with the primary sought differences being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses b. - g. to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. <p>Two minor amendments are sought to the 'Setback from National Grid Yard and National Grid Substation' standard, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of the requirement for a 25m setback from a National Grid substation. Given the rural location (and Rural Production zoning) of the substation with provides a 12ha minimum lots area and that there are no existing sensitive activities in proximity, the setback is not considered efficient or effective. - Amendment to Standard 3 to reflect the required 12m setback from support structures. An 8m setback from support structures is not considered sufficient to ensure the grid is not compromised. | <p>Merge, relocate and renumber the relevant National Grid rules contained in the 'RPROZ - Rural Production Zone' chapter to the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter, as follows:</p> <p>'NU-xx National Grid Yard</p> <p>Buildings, structures and activities within the National Grid Yard – PER</p> <p>1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met:</p> <p>a. Compliance with RPROZ-S13 (setbacks from National Grid). 2. Activity status where compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid) is not achieved: NC</p> <p>NU-xy National Grid Yard</p> <p>Buildings, structures, and activities within the National Grid Yard – NC</p> <p>1. Activity Status: NC Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid); or b. The building or structure is not provided for within NU-xx. c. Any new building for a sensitive land use, or addition to an existing building that involves an increase in the building envelope or height for a sensitive land use, within the National Grid Yard d. Any change of use of an existing building to a sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard e. The establishment of any new sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard f. Any new hazardous facility that involves the storage and handling of hazardous substances with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties within 12m of the centre line of a National Grid Transmission Line g. Dairy/milking sheds (excluding accessory structures and buildings), commercial glass houses, PSA structures or buildings for intensive primary production within the National Grid Yard.'</p> <p>And 'RROZ-S15 Setback from National Grid Yard and National Grid Substation Sensitive Activities 1. Minimum setback of buildings and structures from the designated boundary of a National Grid substation is 25m.</p> <p>All Buildings and Structures 2. Under the National Grid conductors (wires):</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ-P2 | S79.112 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower supports in part RPROZ -P2 but seeks specific recognition of Network Utilities on the basis of the functional and operational needs of these activities which often require and are appropriate within, a rural environment. The reference to "of a limited scale" is opposed given the ambiguity around the terms. The reference is avoid, remedy or mitigate is also opposed as it has minimal benefit to the policy.</p> | <p>Amend RPROZ-P2 as follows:</p> <p>'To allow activities of a limited scale (such as Network Utilities) which support the function and wellbeing of rural communities and/or enjoyment of the rural environment, and contribute to the vitality and resilience of the District's economy, where adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ - Rules | S79.113 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>An additional statement is sought within the Introduction to the rules section to refer to the Network Utilities chapter.</p> | <p>Add to following to the 'RPROZ - Rules' introductory statement:</p> <p>'... Rules for activities within the National Grid Yard within the Rural Production Zone are contained in the Network Utilities (NU) Chapter.'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ-R1 | S79.114 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | <p>Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | <p>Amend RPROZ-R1 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter):</p> <p>'1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid): ...'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|----------------------------|-------|--|--|--------|---|
| RPROZ-R2 | S79.115 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being: - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | Amend RPROZ-R2 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid): ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ-R3 | S79.116 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being: - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | Amend RPROZ-R3 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. e. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid): ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ-R5 | S79.117 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being: - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | Amend RPROZ-R5 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. f. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid): ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ-R6 | S79.118 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being: - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | Amend RPROZ-R6 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid): ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ-R9 | S79.121 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being: - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | Amend RPROZ-R9 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. e. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid): ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ-R10 | S79.122 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being: - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | Amend RPROZ-R10 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid): ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ-R11 | S79.123 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being: - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | Amend RPROZ-R11 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid): ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|------------------------------|---------|---|--|----------------|---|
| RPROZ-R12 | S79.124 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks a new rule framework that reflects that proposed in the Proposed Plan with the primary sought differences being: - Provision of one permitted and one non-complying rule within the Network Utilities chapters as opposed to the National Grid being referenced across multiple rules. This reduces duplication and provides an easy point of reference for plan users. - Insertion of new non-complying clauses to provide clarity that the activities listed are non-complying. | Amend RPROZ-R12 as follows (as part of relocating as a new merged rule in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter): '1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: a. d. Compliance with RPROZ-S15 (setbacks from National Grid); ...' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| RPROZ-S15 | S79.126 | Transpower New Zealand Ltd | Amend | Transpower seeks minor amendment and relocation of this standard to the Network Utilities chapter. | Delete RPROZ-S15 (as part of relocating as a new amended standard in the 'NU - Network Utilities' chapter). | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment |
| NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE (Definition) | S119.011 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | A definition of the term 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure' is appropriate. The matters that are listed in the definition all provide communities with the ability to connect or be serviced by a utility. Telecommunications allows people to connect at a local, regional, national and international level. The national significance of telecommunications is recognised through the presence of the NESTF. Telecommunications is also recognised in the Hawkes Bay Regional Resource Management Plan (which includes the Regional Policy Statement) as 'Strategic Infrastructure'. Including telecommunications in the 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure' is appropriate. | Amend the definition of 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure' as follows: 'means: a. State Highways; b. the National Grid electricity transmission network; c. national renewable electricity generation facilities that connect with the National Grid; d. major gas or oil pipeline services (such as the gas transmission pipeline from Taranaki); e. any railway (as defined in the Railways Act 2005). f. Telecommunication networks' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| [General] | S119.025 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | Within the strategic objectives there is no infrastructure recognition except for urban form and development. The majority of the Central Hawkes Bay District is Rural, which requires infrastructure as well as urban areas. A balance is needed, particularly given the critical nature of infrastructure for modern living, regardless of whether people are residing in urban or rural areas. Including Infrastructure as a Strategic Direction, with subsequent Strategic Objectives, provides a clear message to plan users as to the strategic nature of infrastructure across the District as a whole. | Add a new 'Strategic Direction for Infrastructure' chapter in the 'Strategic Direction' section of the Proposed Plan, and include the following objectives under that heading: '1. The social, economic, environmental and cultural benefits of infrastructure are recognised and provided for, and its safe, efficient and effective development, upgrade, maintenance and operation is enabled; 2. Infrastructure, including its role and function, is protected from incompatible development and activities; and 3. The adverse effects of infrastructure on the surrounding environment are managed, having regard to the economic benefits and the technical, functional and operational needs of infrastructure.' | Oppose in part | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-I3 | S119.030 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Support | The three issues raised in the Issues section provide context for the Objectives proposed in the Proposed Plan. | Retain NU-I3. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O1 | S119.031 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | NU-O1 as proposed covers the same matters as best practice provision IE-O1, although IE-O1 provides greater context as to why network utilities should be safe, effective, efficient and resilient. See wording in body of submission to explain why best practice provisions should be utilised. | Delete NU-O1, and replace as follows: 'Effective, resilient, efficient and safe network utilities that: 1. provide essential and secure services, including in emergencies; 2. facilitate local, regional, national or international connectivity; 3. contribute to the economy and support a high standard of living; 4. integrate with urban development; 5. enable people and communities to provide for their health, safety and wellbeing.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O2 | S119.032 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | NU-O2 aligns with IE-O2 of the best practice provisions, although does not require consideration of the positive effects that network utilities can have. The definition of effect in the Resource Management Act includes positive effects. | Delete NU-O2, and replace as follows: 'The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated while recognising: 1. the functional need and operational need of network utilities; 2. that positive effects of network utilities may be realised locally, regionally or nationally.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-O3 | S119.033 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | The intention of NU-O3, in that it provides for Reverse Sensitivity is supported, but the objectives should be made to be more explicit, as per IE-O3 in the best practice provisions. | Delete NU-O3, and replace as follows: 'Network utilities are protected from adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, of subdivision, use and development by, where necessary: 1. set-backs or buffer corridors within which incompatible activities will be managed; 2. controls on the activities of others' where they can compromise the operation, safety, maintenance, upgrade and development of network utilities.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| <p>NU-P1</p> | <p>S119.034</p> | <p>Vodafone New Zealand Limited</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>While the intention of NU-P1 is generally well aligned with IE-P1 of the best practice provisions, the second part of IE-P1 of the best practice provisions is more prescriptive than what exists in NU-P1 of the Proposed District Plan.</p> | <p>Delete NU-P1, and replace as follows: '1. Recognise the benefits of network utilities by: a. enabling the operation, maintenance, repair, minor upgrade or removal of existing network utilities throughout the district; b. enabling investigation, monitoring and navigation activities associated with network utility operations throughout the district; c. providing for significant upgrades to, and the development of new, network utilities; d. providing for the functions and responsibilities of network utilities as lifeline utilities during an emergency. The national, regional and local benefits of network utilities that are recognised are those that enable the economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being of people and communities and provide for their health and safety, including through: a. the effective safe, secure and efficient transmission or distribution of electricity, gas, fuel or energy; b. an integrated, efficient and safe transport network for the movement of people and goods by land, air or water, including public transport, walking, cycling, private vehicles; c. effective, reliable and future-proofed communications networks and services; d. effective, resilient, efficient and safe water, wastewater and stormwater treatment systems, networks and services.'</p> | <p>Oppose in part</p> | <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission</p> |
| <p>NU-P2</p> | <p>S119.035</p> | <p>Vodafone New Zealand Limited</p> | <p>Amend</p> | <p>The intention of NU-P2 is generally well aligned with IE-P5 (supported by IE-P7) of the best practice provisions.</p> | <p>Delete NU-P2, and replace as follows: 'Adverse effects of network utilities on areas of outstanding or significant value in the coastal environment 1. Avoid adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new network utilities on: a. the values and attributes of areas that are identified in the plan as having outstanding natural character, outstanding natural features or outstanding natural landscapes; b. taxa, ecosystems or vegetation types identified as threatened, rare or protected in the plan in accordance with Policy 11(a) of the NZCPS; 2. avoid significant adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new network utilities on the values and attributes of areas that are identified in the plan as having natural character, natural features, natural landscapes, or being significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna and remedy or mitigate other adverse effects. In all areas 3. Give priority to avoiding the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new network utilities, on the values and attributes of areas that are identified in the plan as: a. wetlands and lakes and rivers and their margins that have natural character; b. outstanding natural features and landscapes outside of the coastal environment; c. areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna outside of the coastal environment; d. ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga of mana whenua; e. historic heritage. 4. Where the avoidance of adverse effects under clause (3) is not possible, the appropriateness of the substantial upgrades to, or the development of, new network utilities will be determined by having regard to the matters listed in {Link,5146,Policy IE-P7}.'</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------|------------------------------|-------|---|---|--------|---|
| NU-P3 | S119.036 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | The intention of NU-P3 is generally well aligned with IE-P7 of the best practice provisions. | <p>Delete NU-P3, and replace as follows:</p> <p>'Consideration of the adverse effects of network utilities When considering the adverse effects of network utilities on the environment:</p> <p>1. recognise that there may be situations where all adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 2. recognise that the adverse effects on the values and attributes of the areas listed in Policy IE-P5(3) can be mitigated by locating some types of network utilities in land transport corridors; 3. decision-makers must have regard to: a. the extent to which adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated may be constrained by a network utility's functional need or operational need; b. the time, duration or frequency of adverse effects; c. the necessity of the network utility including: i. the need to quickly repair and restore disrupted services; ii. the impact of not operating, repairing, maintaining, upgrading, removing or developing a network utility;</p> <p>d. existing network utilities including: i. the complexity and connectedness of networks and services; ii. the potential for co-location and shared use of network utility corridors; e. anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment and the degree to which past modifications have compromised the achievement of those outcomes; f. the benefits derived from the network utility at a local, regional and national scale; g. the extent to which the network utility is integrated with, and necessary to support, planned urban development.'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-P4 | S119.037 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | The intention of NU-P4 is generally well aligned with IE-P4 of the best practice provisions. However for consistency IE-P4 of the best practice provisions should be used in the Proposed Plan. | <p>Delete NU-P4, and replace as follows: 'Adverse effects of network utilities Manage the adverse effects of network utilities on the environment by:</p> <p>1. recognising that the adverse effects of the ongoing operation, maintenance, repair, upgrade and removal of existing network utilities are typically insignificant or minor by enabling these activities to occur without the need for planning approvals; 2. avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of substantial upgrades to, or the development of new network utilities, including effects on: a. natural and physical resources; b. amenity values; c. sensitive activities; d. the safe and efficient operation of other network utilities; e. the health, well-being and safety of people and communities. 3. managing the potential adverse effects of noise, vibration, radiofrequency fields and electric and magnetic fields by requiring compliance with national environmental standards or other nationally recognised standards or guidelines. 4. preferring the undergrounding of new network utilities in urban areas where it is: a. technically feasible; b. justified by the extent of adverse visual effects; and c. viable, including where costs are proportionate to the adverse effects being avoided.'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------|------------------------------|-------|---|--|--------|---|
| NU-P5 | S119.038 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | <p>The intention of NU-P5 is generally well aligned with IE-P8 of the best practice provisions. However for consistency IE-P8 of the best practice provisions should be used in the Proposed Plan.</p> | <p>Delete NU-P5, and replace as follows: 'Adverse effects on network utilities Protect network utilities from the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development that may constrain or compromise the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, removal and development of network utilities, including by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. locating and designing new buildings and activities sensitive to noise to avoid the potential adverse effects of the railway corridor and national and regional road network; 2. managing access to the railway corridor and national and regional road network; 3. managing new activities sensitive to noise within a defined air noise contour; 4. avoiding physical obstructions in take-off, approach, landing or departure paths and runway end protection areas; 5. requiring subdivision of sites containing significant electricity distribution lines to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the significant electricity distribution line; and b. ensure that future buildings, earthworks and construction activities maintain safe electrical clearance distances under all building and electricity distribution line operating conditions; 6. managing land disturbance and activities sensitive to gas transmission to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects of, and on, gas transmission pipelines; 7. requiring subdivision of sites containing a gas transmission pipeline to retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the gas transmission pipeline; 8. managing the activities of others' through set-backs and design controls where it is necessary to achieve appropriate protection of a network utility.' | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
|-------|----------|------------------------------|-------|---|--|--------|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|----------|---------------------------------|---------|--|--|--------|---|
| NU-S3 | S119.049 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | <p>The proposed heights for antennas attached to buildings should align with the NESTF (5m above the part of the building to which it is attached, and in Residential Zones only applies if the building is 15m or higher). The proposed height for antennas attached to poles should be increased so that they are at least 5m above the permitted building height in each zone (with the exception of the Rural zones).</p> <p>This assists in providing better coverage, as the antennas are above structures such as buildings which can interfere with their efficacy. In all Rural Zones (Rural Lifestyle, Rural Production, General Rural and Settlement), the pole height should be 25m to align with the NESTF. GPS antenna, which have a very small size, with effects akin to a lightning rod, should also be excluded from meeting the permitted height standard. It is unclear what the reference to Clause 4 is in standards 6, 7 and 8. The exception in ONF and ONL which has a smaller building height is not practicable for the addition of telecommunication facilities to existing structures/buildings. Removing the exception and making it easier for such facilities to be attached to existing buildings in these areas encourages consolidation of structures in areas where they are not readily expected. The height sought in industrial areas is considered appropriate as it encourages telecommunication companies who need new high facilities to be located in a zone where the amenity is lower, and power and fibre is typically available.</p> | <p>Amend NU-S3 as follows:</p> <p>1. ... General Residential Zone / Settlement Zone / Rural Lifestyle Zone / Large Lot Residential Zone (Coastal)</p> <p>3. ...</p> <p>4. Where an antenna is can only be attached to a building, the antenna and building must not exceed a combined height of 8.5m. if that building is 15m high. The top of the antenna must not be more than 5m above the point of the building to which it is attached.</p> <p>5. Above ground structures (poles, towers, and telecommunication poles, including combined height of pole and antenna) must not exceed a height of 11.5m 13m.</p> <p>Except that:</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p>b. Lightning rods and GPS antenna are exempt from the maximum structure height standard. Rural Production Zone / Settlement Zone / Rural Lifestyle Zone / General Rural Zone</p> <p>6. Except as excluded in clause 4. below, above ground buildings (where located outside road reserve and the rail corridor) must not exceed a height of 5m...</p> <p>7. Except as excluded in Clause 4 below, where an antenna is attached to a building, the top of the antenna and building must not exceed a combined height 8.5m must not be more than 5m above the point of the building to which it is attached.</p> <p>Except that: a. Where located within an Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature identified in NFL-SCHED6, the antenna and building must not exceed a combined height of 6.5m.</p> <p>8. Except as excluded in clause 4. below, above ground structures (poles, towers and telecommunication poles, including combined height of pole and antenna) must not exceed a height of 25 m.</p> <p>Except that:</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p>b. Lightning rods and GPS antennas are exempt from the maximum structure height standard.</p> <p>9. ... Commercial Zone / General Industrial Zone 10. ...</p> <p>11. Where an antenna is attached to a building, the top of the antenna and building must not exceed a combined height 8.5m must not be more than 5m above the point of the building to which it is attached.</p> <p>12. Above ground structures (poles, towers, and telecommunication poles, including combined height of pole and antenna) must not exceed a height of 15m25m.</p> <p>Except that:</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-S4 | S119.050 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | <p>Like for NU-S2, a setback for structures, which is what a height in relation to boundary control essentially is, is generally supported as it assists in the mitigation of bulk and dominance effects. However telecommunication pole facilities are typically slim, and do not create the bulk and dominance effect wider structures can have. As such, an exemption is sought for pole structures within the standard.</p> | <p>Amend NU-S4 as follows:</p> <p>1. Above ground buildings or structures (except those located within road reserve) must not exceed a height of 2m plus the shortest horizontal distance between that part of the building or structure and the nearest site boundary (but excluding a road boundary).</p> <p>Except that:</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p>b. This standard does not apply to poles with a diameter of 600mm or less, and any permitted attachments to the poles.</p> <p>...</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-S5 | S119.051 | Vodafone New Zealand Limited | Amend | <p>Whilst it is appropriate that any new accesses comply with the relevant transport provisions of the PDP, having a threshold based on area should be replaced by whether or not the activity on the site demands a new access or not. Minimum parking or loading requirements are not necessary for telecommunications companies, as the operator will provide on site parking or loading to meet the demands of the activity.</p> | <p>Amend NU-S5 as follows:</p> <p>1. Any activity which requires a new vehicle accessActivities on sites greater than 200m² in area must comply with the relevant vehicle access provisions of the TRAN - Transport chapter for access, parking and loading.'</p> | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NU-I3 | S78.014 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | Support | Support as written. | Retain NU-I3 as written. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NOISE-O3 | S78.009 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | Support | Support as written. | Retain NOISE-O3 as written. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NOISE-O4 | S78.010 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | Support | Support as written. | Retain NOISE-O4 as written. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------|--|---------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------|---|
| NOISE-P2 | S78.011 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | Support | Support as written. | Retain NOISE-P2 as written. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |
| NOISE-S3 | S78.012 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | Support | Support as written. | Retain NOISE-S3 as written. | Oppose | Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission |