

DPR-081

**BEFORE THE HEARING COMMISSIONERS  
IN CENTRAL HAWKES BAY DISTRICT**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“**the Act**”)

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan – Hearing 7 - Network Utilities

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY LYNETTE PEARL WHARFE  
FOR HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND  
30 NOVEMBER 2022**

---

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This evidence addresses submission and further submission points made by Horticulture NZ on Network Utilities and Transport.
- 1.2 I concur with many of the recommendations made in the s42A Report so only address specific points where I seek a different outcome from the report recommendations.
- 1.3 In particular, I am concerned about the application of the set of 'best practice district plan provisions for network utilities' that are sought by a number of network utility submitters.
- 1.4 I am also concerned at the application of the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission (NPSET) for all network utilities, not just the National Grid. I consider that this is an inappropriate application of the policy framework for a matter of national significance.

### NU-O3

- 1.5 I seek a change to NU-O3 that includes provisions for 'the extent reasonably possible'
- 1.6 *The safety, maintenance, upgrade or development of network utilities is not compromised by incompatible subdivision, land use or development, including the potential for reverse sensitivity effects, **to the extent reasonably possible.***

### NU-P5

- 1.7 I do not support the s42A Report recommended changes to NU-P5 and seek an alternative framework:
- 1.8 *To the extent reasonably possible, manage the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development, to ensure that the safe, effective, secure and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of network utilities is not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities, including by:*
1. *managing new activities through setbacks and design controls, where necessary, to achieve appropriate protection of a network utility;*
  2. *managing new activities that are sensitive to noise adjoining the railway corridor, the national and regional road network, and within any defined noise contour to avoid reverse sensitivity effects;*
  3. *managing access to the railway corridor and to the national and regional road network;*
  4. *managing light spill and glare from activities on road users;*

5. *managing land disturbance and activities **within the legal easements in the vicinity** of gas transmission pipelines;*
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 and ensure the electricity transmission network is not compromised;*
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*
8. *ensuring subdivision of sites containing a network utility activity retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the network utility **via legal easement agreements**.*

#### *NU-R2*

- 1.9 HortNZ sought that a limitation for increase in voltage be added to NU-R2 and that an additional matter of discretion be added as 'effects on affected landowners'.
- 1.10 The s42A Report is recommending changes which I support but note it the recommendation of a discretionary activity status is not accepted by the Hearing Panel then an additional matter of discretion is required.

#### *NU-R3*

- 1.11 I support the s42A Report recommendation to delete 'other than for the reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes' from NU-R3 d) ii) and the heading of NU-R3.

#### *NU-AER3*

- 1.12 I do not support the s42A Report to not amend NU-AER3 and seek that changes are made to reflect changes sought to the objectives and policies in the NU chapter:
- 1.13 *Network utilities are not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity effects are avoided to the extent reasonably possible on the National Grid.*

#### *Definitions*

- 1.14 I support a setback distance of 10m from a National Grid pole support structure in the definition of National Grid Yard

## **2. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE**

- 2.1 My name is Lynette Pearl Wharfe. I am a planning consultant with The AgriBusiness Group. I have a BA in Social Sciences and post graduate papers in Environmental Studies, including Environmental Law, Resource Economics and Resource Management.
- 2.2 I am an accredited commissioner under the Making Good Decisions programme with Ministry for the Environment.
- 2.3 I have been a consultant with The AgriBusiness Group since 2002. The Agribusiness Group was established in 2001 to help build business capability in the primary sector.
- 2.4 I have spent over 20 years as a consultant, primarily to the agricultural industry and rural sector, specialising in resource management, environmental issues, and environmental education and facilitation, including 18 years of providing advice to Horticulture New Zealand (“**HortNZ**”) and its precursor organisations, NZ Vegetable and Potato Growers Federation, NZ Fruitgrowers Federation.
- 2.5 As part of providing advice to HortNZ for submissions and plans across the country I have been involved in development of Regional Policy Statements, Regional Plans and District Plans, including omnibus plans such as the Auckland Unitary Plan and the Marlborough RM Plan and district plans in Dunedin, Christchurch City, Waikato, Whakatane, Opotiki and Hastings, so am familiar with the range of matters to be addressed in the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan (“**PCHBDP**”).
- 2.6 I have been involved as a consultant to HortNZ contributing to submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan.
- 2.7 I have read the Environment Court’s Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, and I agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out in Appendix 1. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on what I have been told by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

## **3. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 3.1 This evidence provides a planning assessment of those provisions on which HortNZ submitted which are addressed in Hearing 7, Network Utilities and Transport.

- 3.2 Attached to this evidence as Appendix 2 is a table that sets out all the HortNZ submission and further submission points addressed in Hearing 7.
- 3.3 Where I concur with the s42A Report recommendation on a submission point I do not specifically address that point in this evidence, but identify in the table that I agree with the s42A Report recommendation.
- 3.4 In undertaking this assessment, I have considered:
- (a) The Section 42A Hearings Report for Hearing 7
  - (b) The Section 42A Report - Hearing Overview
  - (c) The s32 Reports for PCHBDP

#### **4. MY UNDERSTANDING OF HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND'S SUBMISSIONS**

- 4.1 HortNZ made submissions and further submission on the PCHBDP because horticulture is a key activity within the Central Hawkes Bay District.
- 4.2 Submissions were made on the Network Utility chapter as the framework for providing for network utilities can affect grower operations.

#### **5. GENERAL COMMENTS**

- 5.1 There are two matters I wish to address at a broad level which underpin my comments on specific submission points in this evidence:
- (a) Best Practice District Plan Provisions for Network Utilities
  - (b) National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission (NPSET)

##### *Best Practice District Plan Provisions for Network Utilities*

- 5.2 A number of network utility companies have submitted seeking alignment with a set of 'Best Practice District Plan Provisions for Network Utilities' which have been developed by a number of companies.
- 5.3 HortNZ has been aware of a working group on this topic and has previously had discussions with the group.

- 5.4 There were significant differences in approach, particularly relating to how third party activities may be regulated in regard to network utilities.
- 5.5 While it is appreciated that the network utility companies seek consistent provisions across the country, it should also be noted that the impacts on other parties should also be reflected in any set of 'best practice provisions' that are sought to be included in district plans, particularly electricity infrastructure.
- 5.6 HortNZ opposed a number of submissions by Chorus which sought to incorporate the 'best practice district plan provisions for network utilities.'
- 5.7 The s42A Report is recommending that these submissions are generally rejected and I concur with those recommendations.
- 5.8 In my opinion the provisions in the district plan also need to take into account other activities and users who may be affected by the network utilities and so support provisions that provide for such a balance.

*National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission (NPSET)*

- 5.9 It is important that the district plan give effect to the NPSET through provisions specific for the National Grid.
- 5.10 HortNZ has worked with Transpower over a number of years to seek provisions that will provide for grower activities in proximity to the National Grid, while also recognising the requirements for operating the National Grid.
- 5.11 HortNZ supported a number of submissions where Transpower sought provisions specific for the National Grid, rather than inclusion in a general policy.
- 5.12 I support this approach because the NPSET clearly identifies the National Grid as a matter of national significance with a specific policy framework to recognise and provide for the National Grid.
- 5.13 However where provisions in the plan are generic there is a tendency to apply the NPSET framework to all network utilities, even if they are not matters of national significance.
- 5.14 For instance, NU-P5 bases the provisions on the NPSET but applies to all network utilities.
- 5.15 The Board of Inquiry for the NPSET made clear when considering submissions on the NPSET that the provisions were specific to the National Grid:

*“Some supply companies considered that the policy statement should be extended to apply to all high- tension lines, whether or not they were part of the national grid. We were not persuaded that this would be appropriate. It is the New Zealand –wide nature of the grid that is one of the principal reasons for it being of national significance. The same cannot be said of supply lines which in most cases are contained within one region. Problems of cut-off points also arise.” (Board of Inquiry Report 2008)*

- 5.16 While the comment was made regarding electricity distribution lines the same principle would apply to other network utilities that are not provided for under a National Policy Statement.
- 5.17 Therefore I do not support provisions for all network utilities based on the NPSET, as they are not matters of national significance. Nor has there been justification through a s32 analysis that such provisions should apply to all network utilities.

## 6. OBJECTIVES

### NU-O3

- 6.1 NU-O3 as notified is:
- The safety, maintenance, upgrade or development of network utilities is not compromised by incompatible subdivision, land use or development, including the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.*
- 6.2 Hort NZ sought that the objective be amended to include ‘to the extent reasonably possible’ as the objective is very absolute.
- 6.3 Transpower opposed the submission on the grounds that it is a subjective assessment and would not give effect to Policy 10 of the NPSET.
- 6.4 The s42A Report concurs with Transpower that the words ‘to the extent reasonably possible’ is subjective and inappropriate.
- 6.5 Policy 10 of the NPSET is:
- In achieving the purpose of the Act, **decision makers must, to the extent reasonably possible, manage activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the electricity transmission network and to ensure that the operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of the electricity transmission network is not compromised.***
- 6.6 Policy 10 clearly indicates that there is to be consideration as to how the policy is applied by including the words ‘to the extent reasonably possible’. The direction in the NPSET is not absolute, and that decision makers must exercise judgement in applying the policy.

- 6.7 Given that the NPSET has a limitation on the extent to which reverse sensitivity effects must be avoided, I consider that the district plan should reflect that intent.
- 6.8 In addition, NU-O3 applies to all network utilities, not just the National Grid, so would not anticipate a more stringent objective for network utilities that are not of national significance.
- 6.9 Therefore, I do not support the s42A Report recommendation to not amend NU-O3 as sought by HortNZ and support the inclusion of a clause which recognises that it may not always be possible to achieve the objective as proposed.
- 6.10 I do, however, seek that the additional wording is placed at the end of the objective rather than in the middle:
- 6.11 *The safety, maintenance, upgrade or development of network utilities is not compromised by incompatible subdivision, land use or development, including the potential for reverse sensitivity effects, **to the extent reasonably possible.***

## 7. POLICIES

### NU-P5

- 7.1 The first part of NU-P5 as notified is:
- 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:*
- 7.2 HortNZ sought that it be amended 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*
- 7.3 The changes were sought to better align with the direction of 'recognise and provide for' network utilities in NU-O1 and also with changes sought to NU-O3.
- 7.4 The s42A Report recommends that the policy should be amended to reflect the wording of Policy 10 of the NPSET, and so agrees in part with the changes sought by HortNZ.



- 7.5 The s42A Report recommends that the word 'avoid' be used as it would 'recognise and provide for' safe, effective, efficient and resilient network utilities.
- 7.6 The recommended wording is:
- 7.7 *To the extent reasonably possible, manage ~~protect network utilities from the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on network utilities~~ that where it 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:*
- 7.8 I do not fully support the recommended wording. I do support the addition of a limitation of 'to the extent reasonably possible' as it provides the ability to manage according to limitations of specific situations.
- 7.9 However, the intent of the changes are to make the policy reflect the wording of the NPSET.
- 7.10 NU-P5 applies to all network utilities – not just the National Grid.
- 7.11 As stated above, I do not support applying the framework of the NPSET to all network utilities as they are not of national significance.
- 7.12 It would be more appropriate that there is a separate policy for the National Grid where Policy 10 of the NPSET is given effect to, noting that the NPSET does not include any policies of 'protect'.
- 7.13 In addition, NU-O3 refers to 'incompatible subdivision use and development' but the recommended amendments remove 'adverse effects' and so the clause applies to 'subdivision, use and development' per se, with no refinement as to what subdivision use and development it would apply to.
- 7.14 The recommended policy will place considerable constraints on activities that occur around network utilities which was not anticipated in the proposed plan.
- 7.15 In my opinion the policy should implement NU-O1 to recognise and provide for network utilities. This does not imply 'protection' or 'avoiding' reverse sensitivity effects.
- 7.16 No submission appears to have specifically sought the inclusion of reverse sensitivity effects in NU-P5 other than Transpower in respect to the National Grid.

- 7.17 'Avoiding reverse sensitivity effects' is specific to the National Grid arising from Policy 10 of the NPSET so would be better located in clause 6 of NU-P5, as sought by Transpower.
- 7.18 HortNZ sought the deletion of clause 5 regarding gas transmission lines. If the clause is to be retained, it should be limited to within the legal easements that exist for the gas pipeline.
- 7.19 Therefore, I would support an alternative policy as follows:
- To the extent reasonably possible, manage the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development, to ensure that the safe, effective, secure and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of network utilities is not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities, including by:*
1. *managing new activities through setbacks and design controls, where necessary, to achieve appropriate protection of a network utility;*
  2. *managing new activities that are sensitive to noise adjoining the railway corridor, the national and regional road network, and within any defined noise contour to avoid reverse sensitivity effects;*
  3. *managing access to the railway corridor and to the national and regional road network;*
  4. *managing light spill and glare from activities on road users;*
  5. *managing land disturbance and activities **within the legal easements in the vicinity** of gas transmission pipelines;*
  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 and ensure the electricity transmission network is not compromised**;*
  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*
  8. *ensuring subdivision of sites containing a network **utility activity** retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair and upgrade the network utility **via legal easement agreements**.*
- 7.20 If a stronger policy is sought for the National Grid, then there should be a specific policy for the National Grid.
- 7.21 HortNZ also sought that NU-P5 (6) be amended to better reflect the location of activities to be either within the National Grid Subdivision corridor or the National Grid Yard.

- 7.22 The s42A Report is recommending similar changes which provide the necessary clarification.

## **8. RULES**

### *NU-R2*

- 8.1 HortNZ sought that a limitation for increase in voltage be added to NU-R2 and that an additional matter of discretion be added as 'effects on affected landowners'.
- 8.2 The s42A Report is recommending that NU-R2 be amended by adding 'the voltage of an existing line must not increase beyond the voltage at which the existing line has been constructed to operate'.
- 8.3 If the provision cannot be met, it is recommended that the activity status be discretionary.
- 8.4 If a line is intended to be upgraded to operate at a voltage greater than for which it was constructed to operate then it would be a discretionary activity and consideration could be given to the effects on affected parties who may no longer meet separation distances in NZECP34:2001.
- 8.5 I support that approach.
- 8.6 However, I note that if the activity status is determined as restricted discretionary then it would be necessary to add the additional matter of discretion 'effects on affected landowners' to ensure that they are identified as affected parties to the upgrade of the line.

## **9. AER**

- 9.1 NU-AER3
- 9.2 HortNZ sought that NU-AER3 be amended to better align with the amended objectives and policies.
- 9.3 The s42A Report is recommending an amendment:  
*Avoidance of adverse effects on network utilities from other land use activities.*
- 9.4 Given other changes sought in this evidence I consider that the AER will need to be revisited when decisions on submissions are made.
- 9.5 In particular, HortNZ has sought that reverse sensitivity apply only to the National Grid and that other network utilities are not compromised or constrained by subdivision use and development.

- 9.6 Such an approach should be reflected in AER3:

*Network utilities are not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity effects are avoided to the extent reasonably possible on the National Grid.*

## **10. DEFINITIONS**

### *National Grid Yard*

- 10.1 The issue of setback distances for the National Grid Yard was addressed in the context of submissions at the Rural Hearing.
- 10.2 The s42A Report refers to the s42A Reporting Officers Right of Reply Report for the Rural Hearing which summarises further information provided by Transpower and Federated Farmers.
- 10.3 The main issue with the setback from the pole is not sensitive activities (NPSET Policy 10 and 11) but rather it is access for maintenance and being able to have sufficient room for machinery.
- 10.4 Transpower seek the same distance for a tower and a pole, regardless of the fact that the type of structure is different.
- 10.5 Transpower contend that NZECP34:2001 is not appropriate for the National Grid.
- 10.6 I note that NZECP34:2001 Para 2.1 states:
- The minimum distances also ensure that the support structures can be accessed for inspection and maintenance.*
- 10.7 I have been involved in a number of site visits with growers and Transpower where there has been less than 12 metres setback from horticultural structures and pole replacements have been able to be undertaken. Requiring a 12 metre setback in such instances would have been excessive and a waste of highly productive land.
- 10.8 Given that the majority of the National Grid structures in Central Hawkes Bay are single poles this is an important issue in terms of balancing the needs of the National Grid with the ability of growers to utilise their land.
- 10.9 Therefore I support the use of 10m as the setback from a National Grid pole support structure.

## **11. CONCLUSION**

- 11.1 This evidence addresses submission and further submission points that were not addressed in Hearing 7. The approach taken in

addressing these submissions in Hearing is consistent with the policy framework that I set out in my EIC for

- 11.2 This approach is consistent with the strategic direction in the plan to provide for primary production activities which enable the economic social and cultural wellbeing of the community.

**Lynette Wharfe**

**30 November 2022**

## Appendix 1: Experience of Lynette Wharfe

Some of the projects I have been involved in that I consider are particularly relevant in this context are:

- a) Project Manager and facilitator for a Sustainable Management Fund (“**SMF**”) Project ‘Reducing nitrate leaching to groundwater from winter vegetable crops’, to develop management tools for vegetable growers to implement best practice for fertiliser applications, to assist in changing fertiliser usage.
- (b) Managed an SMF project for NZ Agrichemical Education Trust communicating the revised NZS 8409:2004 Management of Agrichemicals to local authorities throughout NZ, including development and leading workshops with councils.
- (c) Revised the Manual for the Introductory GROWSAFE® Course for the NZ Agrichemical Education Trust, to make the Manual more user friendly and accessible and to align it with the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms legislation. (
- (d) Managing the research component for SFF project – SAMSN – developing a framework for the development of Sustainable Management Systems for agriculture and horticulture.
- (e) Project Manager MAF Operational Research Project Effectiveness of Codes of Practice investigating the use of codes of practice in the agriculture and horticulture sectors.
- (f) Undertook a review of Current Industry and Regional Programmes aimed at reducing pesticide risk, including assessing a number of Codes of Practice.
- (g) Contributed as a project team member for a Sustainable Farming Fund project ‘Environmental best practice in agricultural and rural aviation’ that included developing a Guidance Note on agricultural aviation, which is now on the Quality Planning website.
- (h) Undertook a review of agrichemical provisions in the Auckland Regional Air Land and Water Plan and developed a risk-based response for inclusion in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.
- (i) Member of the Rural Advisory Group for the development of the National Planning Standards.

## Appendix 2

### Central Hawkes Bay District Plan – Hearing provisions

#### Hearing 7– Network Utilities and Transport

Sub no.	Provision	Decision sought	S42 A Ref	S42A Report rec.	Reference to evidence if specifically addressed	HNZ planning response
FS17.13	Strategic Direction	Oppose Chorus 117.025	4.2.	A		Agree with s42a Report recommendation to not include a specific strategic direction for network utilities.
FS17.12	Strategic Direction	Oppose Centralines 90.005	4.2	A		Agree with s42a Report recommendation to not include a specific strategic direction for network utilities
FS17.22	Introduction	Oppose in part Transpower 79.018	6.2	A		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
FS17.23	Issues	Support Kainga Ora 129.016 Issue 3	7.3.8	R		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
S81.051	Objectives NU-O1	Retain NU-O1		A/P		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
FS17.24	Objectives NU-O3	Oppose Chorus 117.033	8.3	A		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
S81.024	Objectives NU-O3	Amend NU-O3 The safety, maintenance, upgrade or development of network utilities is, <u>to the extent reasonably possible</u> , not compromised by incompatible subdivision, land use or development, including the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.	8.3	R	6.1	Amend NU-O3 <i>The safety, maintenance, upgrade or development of network utilities is not compromised by incompatible subdivision, land use or development, including the potential for reverse sensitivity effects, <u>to the extent reasonably possible</u></i>

Sub no.	Provision	Decision sought	S42 A Ref	S42A Report rec.	Reference to evidence if specifically addressed	HNZ planning response
FS17.25	NU-Pxx new policy	Support in part Transpower 79.026	9.3.11	R		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
FS17.26	NU-P1	Oppose Chorus 117.034 amended policy	9.3.13	A		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
FS17.27	NU-P5	Oppose in part Transpower79.030 re changes to policy	9.3.55	A/P		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
FS17.28	NU-P5	Oppose Chorus 117.038 amended policy	9.3.51	A		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
S81.053	NU-P5	Amend NU-P5 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:	9.3.56	A/P	7.1-7.17	Amend NU-P5: <i>To the extent reasonably possible, manage subdivision, use and development, to ensure that the safe, effective, secure and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of network utilities is not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity effects, including by:</i>
S81.055	NU-P5 (6)	Amend NU-P5 (6) as follows: Managing land use and development (including sensitive activities) buildings, structures and subdivision <del>near</del> <u>within</u> the National Grid <del>subdivision corridor</del> , within the National Grid Yard, or around a designated National Grid substation	9.3	A/P		Agree with s42a Report recommendation but also seek that 'avoid reverse sensitivity effects' is added to NU-P5 (6). <i>managing land use development (including sensitive activities), buildings, earthworks, vertical holes and structures and <del>subdivision near the National Grid</del>, within the National Grid Yard, and subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision</i>



Sub no.	Provision	Decision sought	S42 A Ref	S42A Report rec.	Reference to evidence if specifically addressed	HNZ planning response
						<i>Corridor, or around a designated National Grid substation to <b>avoid reverse sensitivity and ensure the electricity transmission network is not compromised</b></i>
S81.054	NU-P5 (5)	Delete NU-P5 (5) re gas lines	9.3.56	R		Amend to limit to 'within legal easements'
FS17.29	NU-Rules	Oppose in part Transpower 79.031	10.3.1	A		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
S81.056	NU-R2	Add to NU-R2 1) a) ii) <u>d) or increase the voltage of the line</u>  Add as an additional matter of discretion to NU-R2 (2): <u>h. Effects on affected landowners</u>	10.3.16	A/P	8.1	Agree with s42a Report recommendation as long as discretionary activity is provided for an increase in voltage
S81.057	NU-R3	Clarify that 'reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes carried out by a network utility operator' is provided as a permitted activity within the National Grid Yard by either NU-R3 or R4.  For example, Delete from NU-R3 the specific exclusion for this activity and delete from NU-R3 1) d) ii) <i>other than for the reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes</i>	10.3.35	A		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
S81.058	NU-AER3	Amend NU-AER3 as follows: <del>Protection of network utilities from other land use activities which may adversely affect them.</del>	12.3.9	A/P	9.1	Amend NU-AER3: <i>Network utilities are not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities and</i>

Sub no.	Provision	Decision sought	S42 A Ref	S42A Report rec.	Reference to evidence if specifically addressed	HNZ planning response
		<u>Land use activities are managed to ensure that network utilities are not compromised.</u>				<i>reverse sensitivity effects are avoided to the extent reasonably possible on the National Grid.</i>
FS17.3	Definition Minor upgrading	Support in part Transpower 79.006	14.3.25	A/P		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
S81.019	Definition Maintenance	Include voltage in definition Amend the definition of Maintenance specifically in relation to network utilities as follows: 'Specifically in relation to network utilities, 'maintenance' means: ... Includes the replacement of an existing line, building or structure or other facility with another of the same or similar height, <u>voltage</u> , size and scale within the same or similar position and for the same or similar purpose.'	14.3.18	A/P		Agree with s42a Report recommendation
S81.021	Definition National Grid Yard	Define National Grid Yard as follows: <u>The area located within:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>12m in any direction from the visible outer edge of a National Grid tower; or</u></li> <li>• <u>10m in any direction from a National Grid single pole or pi-pole; or</u></li> <li>• <u>the area located within 10m either side of the centreline of any overhead 110kV National</u></li> </ul>	14.3.36	R	10.1	Amend definition National Grid Yard to provide a 10m setback from poles in the National Grid Yard

Sub no.	Provision	Decision sought	S42 A Ref	S42A Report rec.	Reference to evidence if specifically addressed	HNZ planning response
		<p><u>Grid line on single or pi-pole;</u> <u>or</u> <u>the area located within 12m either side of the centre line of any overhead National Grid line on towers.</u></p>				
S81.59	TRANS-S1	<p>Amend TRANS-S1 post harvest facilities as follows: 1 space per 2 FTE staff employed on site <u>at any one point in time</u> OR amend to: 1 space per 50m2 of gross floor area. Except for coolstores 1 space per 500m2 of gross floor area.</p> <p>AND clarify that no parking standards apply to seasonal worker accommodation (i.e that they are not captured by a more general activity class).</p>	6.3.17	A/P		Agree with s42a Report recommendation