



FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, A SUBMISSION ON NPDC'S NOTIFIED PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 8 of Schedule 1 Resource Management Act 1991

To: New Plymouth District Council
Address: Private Bag 2025, New Plymouth 4342
Email: districtplan@npdc.govt.nz

Further Submitter Details

Name of further submitter: First Gas Limited.....

Contact person (if different from above) Zane Wood

Postal address: First Gas Limited
Private Bag 2020
New Plymouth 4340

Email address for service: zane.wood@firstgas.co.nz.....

Phone number: +64 6 769 8247

The Council will serve all formal documents by email. Where there is no email address provided, the documents will be posted to the postal address stated above.

I am: (please tick relevant box)

- a) A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.
(In this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category); or
- b) A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest of the general public.
(In this case, also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category); or
- c) The local authority for the relevant area.

Please state the grounds as to why you come within the category selected above:

As the owner and operator of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure, our interest is considered greater than that of general public.

Council Hearing (please tick relevant box)

Do you wish to be heard in support of your further submission? Yes No

If others make a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing? Yes No

Submission

The submission points, support or opposition, reasons and decisions sought are set out in the attached document.

Note: Any attachments to your submission should only be supporting information, not the submission.



Signature of the person making further submission
or the person authorised to sign on behalf of the
person making further submission

25 August 2020

Date

Name of Further Submitter: First Gas Limited (Zane Wood)

My specific further submission(s) are as follows:

(Please only insert one further submission point per line. Add further sheets as required)

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Caroline Rachlin | 522.17 | Oppose | "Whole NU Chapter" | I consider that a specific NU Chapter as proposed is appropriate and will lead to clear consenting pathways for regionally and nationally significant infrastructure. | I propose that this submission be disallowed as these matters are appropriately addressed in 'Historic and Cultural Values' section of "District Wide Matters". |
| Ngāti Maru - Anaru Marshall | 533.36 | Oppose | "Whole NU Chapter" | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Maintain the NU Chapter as proposed. |
| Ngāti Rāhiri Hapū o Te Atiawa (Taranaki) Society Inc - Keith Holswich | 503.41 | Oppose | "Whole NU Chapter" | I consider that a specific NU Chapter as proposed is appropriate and will lead to clear consenting pathways for regionally and nationally significant infrastructure. | I propose that this submission be disallowed as these matters are appropriately addressed in 'Historic and Cultural Values' section of "District Wide Matters". |
| Te Kāhui o Taranaki Trust - Wharehoka Wano | 534.9 | Oppose | "Whole NU Chapter" | I consider that a specific NU Chapter as proposed is appropriate and will lead to clear consenting pathways for regionally and nationally significant infrastructure. | I propose that this submission be disallowed as these matters are appropriately addressed in other specific section of the Proposed Plan. |
| Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust - Hemi Sundgren | 459.105 | Oppose | "Whole NU Chapter" | I consider that a specific NU Chapter as proposed is appropriate and will lead to clear consenting pathways for regionally and nationally significant infrastructure. | I propose that this submission be disallowed as these matters are appropriately addressed in other specific section of the Proposed Plan. |
| Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson | 520.31 | Oppose | "Whole NU Chapter" | I oppose in part as I think that a clear consenting pathway for NU activities can appropriately consider adverse effects in relation to the receiving environment. | Maintain the NU Chapter as proposed. |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Climate Justice Taranaki Incorporated - Catherine Cheung | 311.8 | Oppose | NU-O1 | I oppose in part as I believe addressing Climate Change in this policy undermines the clear intent of the policy. | Remove "including in emergencies such as extreme weather events". |
| Ngāti Maru - Anaru Marshall | 533.17 | Oppose | NU-O1 | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Remove: "5. Are located to avoid impacts on sensitive natural and physical resources such as significant natural features and landforms, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Māori" ... |
| Te Kāhui o Taranaki Trust - Wharehoka Wano | 534.10 | Oppose | NU-01 | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Remove: "5. Are located to avoid impacts on sensitive natural and physical resources such as significant natural features and landforms, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Māori" ... |
| Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust - Hemi Sundgren | 459.107 | Oppose | NU-01 | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Remove: "are located to avoid impacts on sensitive natural and physical resources" |
| Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson | 520.41 | Oppose | NU-01 | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Remove: "5. Are located to avoid impacts on sensitive natural and physical resources such as significant natural features and forms, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Māori" ... |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson | 520.40 | Oppose | NU-02 | I oppose in part as I do not believe this objective lacks clarity. I believe the intent is to consider any adverse effects of Network Utilities. | Remove: ...on: sensitive areas such as significant natural features and landforms, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Māori... |
| Federated Farmers Taranaki - Mark Hooper, Provincial President | 564.72 | Oppose | NU-03 | Upgrading of Network Utilities is an appropriate consideration in this objective as upgrades are often to gain efficiencies and can reduce adverse effects through the adoption of new technologies. | Retain NU-03 as notified. |
| Horticulture New Zealand - Jordyn Landers | 457.27 | Oppose | NU-03 | I oppose in part as I do not believe this is an inappropriate test in relation to the enablement of regionally and nationally significant infrastructure. | Remove: to the extent reasonably possible. |
| Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities - Dr Claire Kirman | 563.179 | Oppose | NU-03 | I oppose in part as I do not believe this is an inappropriate test in relation to the enablement of regionally and nationally significant infrastructure. | Remove: unreasonably. |
| Spark New Zealand Trading Limited - Graeme McCarrison and Tom Anderson | 567.32 | Support | NU-03 | I support exploring the proposed additions to this objective as it may assist to clarify reverse sensitivity issues. | Propose the consideration of adding: IE-03 Adverse effects on network utilities Network utilities are protected from adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, of subdivision, use and development by, where necessary: set-backs or buffer corridors within which incompatible activities will be managed; controls on the activities of others' where they can compromise the operation, safety, maintenance, upgrade and development of network utilities. |
| Spark New Zealand Trading Limited - Graeme McCarrison and Tom | 567.33 | Support | NU-P1 | I support exploring the proposed additions to this policy as it may assist to clarify considerations. | Propose the consideration of adding: Infrastructure and Energy Policies (Network Utilities) |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Anderson | | | | | IE-P1 Recognising the benefits of, and providing for, network utilities 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; |
| Two Degrees Networks Limited - Ben Blakemore and Tom Anderson | 569.35 | Support | NU-P3 | I support exploring the proposed additions to this policy as it may assist to clarify considerations. | Propose the consideration of adding: Amend Policy NU-P3 as follows: Support Provide flexibility for network utilities in to adopting new technologies that: 1. improve access to, and efficient use of, networks and services; |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | 2. allow for the re-use of redundant services and structures; 3. increase resilience, safety or reliability of networks and services; 4. result in environmental benefits and enhancements; or 5. promote environmentally sustainable outcomes including green infrastructure and the increased utilisation of renewable resources. |
| Chorus New Zealand Limited - Andrew Kantor and Tom Anderson | 547.36 | Support | NU-P4 | I support exploring the proposed additions to this policy as it may assist to clarify considerations. | Propose the consideration of adding: Delete Policy NU-P4 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P4 from the dNPS-NU: IE-P4 Adverse effects of network utilities Manage the adverse effects of network utilities on the environment by: 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 |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | 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. |
| Department of Conservation - Nardia Yozin | 550.52 | Oppose | NU-P4 | I oppose as I believe these additional matters are not needed to be specifically addressed in this policy and are addressed in other areas of the Proposed Plan. | Remove: ... (including indigenous biodiversity, natural features, natural landscape and natural character) |
| Ngāti Maru - Anaru Marshall | 533.14 | Oppose | NU-P4 | I oppose as these matters are more appropriately address in other areas of the Proposed Plan. | Remove: ... 6. avoiding historic heritage; 7. avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, outstanding natural landscapes or features and Māori Land; and 8. engaging the expertise of tangata whenua to inform the design, development, construction, maintenance, repair or upgrading of network utilities. |
| Spark New Zealand Trading Limited - Graeme McCarrison and Tom Anderson | 567.36 | Support | NU-P4 | I support exploring the proposed replacement for this policy as it may better clarify the considerations. | Propose the consideration of adding: Delete Policy NU-P4 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P4 from the dNPS-NU: IE-P4 Adverse effects of network utilities Manage the adverse effects of network utilities on the environment by: <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; |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | 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. |
| Te Kāhui o Taranaki Trust - Wharehoka Wano | 534.12 | Oppose | NU-P4 | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Remove: ... 6. avoiding historic heritage; 7. avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, outstanding natural landscapes or features and Māori Land; and 8. engaging the expertise of tangata whenua to inform the design, development, construction, maintenance, repair or upgrading of network utilities. |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust - Hemi Sundgren | 459.108 | Oppose | NU-P4 | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Remove: ... 6. avoiding historic heritage; 7. avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity, outstanding natural landscapes or features and Māori Land; and 8. engaging the expertise of tangata whenua to inform the design, development, construction, maintenance, repair or upgrading of network utilities. |
| Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson | 520.45 | Oppose | NU-P4 | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Remove: ... 6. Ensure that network utilities avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on sensitive areas such as natural features and landforms, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Māori, amenity values, and the health and safety and wellbeing of people and communities by: |
| Chorus New Zealand Limited - Andrew Kantor and Tom Anderson | 547.37 | Support | NU-P5 | I support exploring the proposed replacement for this policy as it may better clarify the considerations. | Propose the consideration of: Delete Policy NU-P5 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P7 from the dNPS-NU: IE-P7 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; |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | 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. |
| Department of Conservation - Nardia Yozin | 550.59 | Oppose | NU-P5 | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Remove: ... 2. the extent to which adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, natural landscapes, natural features and natural character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; 3. the necessity of the network utility, including:... |
| Ngāti Maru - Anaru Marshall | 533.13 | Oppose | NU-P5 | I oppose as there is a need to recognise the functional and operational needs of regionally and nationally significant infrastructure. | Retain Policy NU-P5 |
| Spark New Zealand Trading Limited - Graeme McCarrison and Tom | 567.37 | Support | NU-P5 | I support exploring the proposed replacement for this policy as it may better clarify the considerations. | Propose the consideration of: Delete Policy NU-P5 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P7 from the dNPS-NU: |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Anderson | | | | | <p>IE-P7 Consideration of the adverse effects of network utilities</p> <p>When considering the adverse effects of network utilities on the environment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | g. the extent to which the network utility is integrated with, and necessary to support, planned urban development. |
| Te Kāhui o Taranaki Trust - Wharehoka Wano | 534.13 | Oppose | NU-P5 | I oppose as there is a need to recognise the functional and operational needs of regionally and nationally significant infrastructure. | Retain Policy NU-P5 |
| Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust - Hemi Sundgren | 459.109 | Oppose | NU-P5 | I oppose as there is a need to recognise the functional and operational needs of regionally and nationally significant infrastructure. | Retain Policy NU-P5 |
| Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson | 520.44 | Oppose | NU-P5 | I oppose in part as I believe these additional matters are best addressed in other District-wide Matters in the Propose Plan. | Remove: ... 7. Ensure that network utilities avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on sensitive areas such as natural features and landforms, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation, historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Māori while recognising the functional need... 8. The expert advice provided by Tangata Whenua, in particular with respect to mitigation measures and or the incorporation of Mātauranga Māori to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects 9. Recognise that only Tangata Whenua of the New Plymouth District can identify their relationship, associations and values with sites or areas of significance to Māori. |
| Chorus New Zealand Limited - Andrew Kantor and Tom Anderson | 547.38 | Support in part | NU-P8 | I support exploring the proposed replacement for this policy as it may better clarify the considerations. | Propose the consideration of: Delete Policy NU-P8 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P8 from the dNPS-NU: IE-P8 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, |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | repair, upgrading, removal and development of network utilities, including by: <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 |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | necessary to achieve appropriate protection of a network utility. |
| Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities - Dr Claire Kirman | 563.209 | Oppose | NU-P8 | Oppose to the extent that I do not consider NU-P8 solely relates to the National Grid, and is entirely appropriate as a consideration in relation to Network Utilities. | Retain NU-P8. |
| Department of Conservation - Nardia Yozin | 550.62 | Oppose | NU Rules | I oppose to the extent that adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, natural landscape etc are appropriately managed in other District-wide Matters of the Proposed Plan. | Retain Network Utility rules which focus on Network Utility considerations, whilst managing Natural Environment Values in the relevant section of the Proposed Plan. |
| Ngāti Maru - Anaru Marshall | 533.10 | Oppose | NU Rules | I oppose to the extent that adverse effects on Historic and Cultural Values are appropriately managed in other District-wide Matters of the Proposed Plan. | Retain Network Utility rules which focus on Network Utility considerations, whilst managing Historic and Cultural Values in the relevant section of the Proposed Plan. |
| Te Kāhui o Taranaki Trust - Wharehoka Wano | 534.18 | Oppose | NU Rules | I oppose to the extent that adverse effects on Historic and Cultural Values are appropriately managed in other District-wide Matters of the Proposed Plan. | Retain Network Utility rules which focus on Network Utility considerations, whilst managing Historic and Cultural Values in the relevant section of the Proposed Plan. |
| Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust - Hemi Sundgren | 459.110 | Oppose | NU Rules | I oppose to the extent that adverse effects on Historic and Cultural Values are appropriately managed in other District-wide Matters of the Proposed Plan. | Retain Network Utility rules which focus on Network Utility considerations, whilst managing Historic and Cultural Values in the relevant section of the Proposed Plan. |
| Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson | 520.43 | Oppose | NU Rules | I oppose to the extent that adverse effects on Historic and Cultural Values are appropriately managed in other District-wide Matters of the Proposed Plan. | Retain Network Utility rules which focus on Network Utility considerations, whilst managing Historic and Cultural Values in the relevant section of the Proposed Plan. |
| Chorus New Zealand Limited - Andrew Kantor and Tom Anderson | 547.42 | Support | NU-R1 | This is an appropriate and enabling rule. | Retain as drafted. |
| OMV New Zealand Limited Cam Twigley (BTW Company Limited) | 573.28 | Support | NU-R2 | I support this submission as the time period proposed is not realistic considering the processes involved with the removal of Network Utilities such as Gas Transmission Networks. | Amend Rule NU-R2 as follows: All zones Activity status: PER Where: |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | 1. all structures that are no longer required for network utility purposes are removed within 2 years of being replaced or becoming redundant; and... |
| Powerco Limited - Cheryl Cleary | 568.40 | Support | NU-R2 | I support this submission as the inflexibility of the rule as proposed is not realistic considering the locations of, and the processes involved with the removal of Network Utilities such as Gas Transmission Networks. | Amend Rule NU-R2 as follows: ... 1. all structures that are no longer required for network utility purposes are removed within six months of being replaced or becoming redundant where practicable; and... |
| Spark New Zealand Trading Limited - Graeme McCarrison and Tom Anderson | 567.44 | Support | NU-R3 | This proposal contains more restrictive provisions as to where and how upgrading of existing above ground network utilities can be a permitted activity. | Delete Rule NU-R3 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-R3 from the dNPS-NU as follows: IE-R3 Upgrading of existing above ground network utilities (excluding access track extensions) all zones Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The realignment, relocation or replacement of a telecommunication line, pipe (excluding a gas transmission pipeline), pole, tower, conductor, cross arm, switch, transformer or ancillary structure is within 5m of the existing alignment or location. 2. The realignment, relocation or replacement of a gas transmission pipeline is within: a. an existing easement in favour of the pipeline; and b. is within 12 metres of the existing alignment or location. 3. A pole is not replaced with a tower. 4. A replacement pole, tower or telecommunication pole does not exceed a height (network utility) whichever is the lesser of the following: a. 25 metres; or |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. the height (network utility) of the replaced pole or tower or telecommunication pole by more than 30 percent. 5. The diameter or width of a replacement pole or telecommunication pole: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. does not exceed twice that of the replaced pole at its widest point; or b. where a single pole is replaced with a pi pole, the width of the pi pole structure must not exceed three times the width of the replaced pole at its widest point. 6. A replacement tower's footprint does not exceed the width of the tower by more than 25 percent. 7. A replacement pole or tower or telecommunication pole complies with height restrictions for any view shaft that is identified by, and managed by, a rule in a District Plan or does not increase the existing degree of non-compliance. 8. The diameter of a replacement conductor or line does not exceed the diameter of the replaced conductor or line or 50mm, whichever is the greater. 9. Additional conductors or lines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. do not increase the number of conductors or lines by more than 100 percent; and b. have a diameter not exceeding 50mm. 10. There are no additional towers. 11. An additional pole, up to a maximum of two additional poles, is necessary to achieve the conductor clearances required by NZECP 34:2001. 12. Additional cross arms do not exceed the length of the existing cross arm by more than 100%, up to a maximum of 4 metres. |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>13. The diameter of replacement pipes does not exceed the diameter of the replaced pipe by more than 300mm.</p> <p>14. The realignment, relocation or replacement of any other network utility structure or building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. must be within 5m of the alignment or location of the original structure or building; b. must not increase the footprint of structure or building by greater than 30 percent. <p>15. In all zones including a protected area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a replacement panel antenna does not increase the face area by more than 20 percent; b. a replacement dish antenna does not increase in diameter by more than 20 percent. <p>16. In a historic heritage site that is identified by, and managed by, a rule in a District Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a replacement antenna colour is the same or similar colour to a scheduled historic heritage building or structure. b. a replacement panel antenna does not increase the face area by more than 20 percent; c. a replacement dish antenna does not increase in diameter by more than 20 percent. <p>Where this activity complies with the following rule requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IE-REQ1 Land disturbance. 2. IE-REQ4 National Grid. 3. IE-REQ5 Radio frequency fields. 4. IE-REQ6 Electric and magnetic fields. 5. IE-REQ7 Aircraft protection |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Spark New Zealand Trading Limited - Graeme McCarrison and Tom Anderson | 567.45 | Support | NU-R4 | I support the additional clarity the proposed rule replacement would offer to the Plan user. | Delete Rule NU-R4 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-R5 from the dNPS-NU as follows: IE-R5 New and extended vehicle access tracks all zones Activity status: Permitted Where 1. The new or extended vehicle access track is located outside of the following areas: a. a protected area; b. a historic heritage site that is identified by, and managed by, a rule in a District Plan; c. a site of cultural value to tangata whenua that is identified by, and managed by, a rule in a District Plan. 2. The new or extended vehicle access track is in a visual amenity landscape (that is not for the protection of a viewshaft) has a maximum width of 3 metres excluding passing bays. Where this activity complies with the following rule requirements: Nil Activity status when compliance not achieved: Discretionary |
| Methanex New Zealand Limited - Juliet Larkin | 509.7 | Support | NU-R19 | I support this submission as the time period proposed is not realistic considering the processes involved with the removal of Network Utilities such as Gas Transmission Networks. | Amend Rule NU-R19 as follows: ... 4. all structures that are no longer required for network utility purposes are removed and an abandonment plan under Australian Standard AS2885.3 (or equivalent replacement standard) is provided; and... |
| OMV New Zealand Limited Cam Twigley (BTW Company Limited) | 573.27 | Support | NU-19 | I support this submission as the time period proposed is not realistic considering the processes involved with the removal of Network Utilities such as Gas Transmission Networks. | Amend Rule NU-R19 as follows: Where: 1. for the installation or upgrading of pipelines, a gauge pressure of 2000 kilopascals is not exceeded; ... 4. all structures that are no longer required for network utility purposes are removed within six months 2 years of being replaced or becoming redundant; and... |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Federated Farmers Taranaki - Mark Hooper, Provincial President | 654.88 | Support in part | NU-R39 | I support the intention of the explanatory note with the addition of a maximum depth for clarity. | Amend rule NU-39 as underlined below: ... 5. the earthworks or land disturbance is undertaken as part of normal agricultural, horticultural, or domestic cultivation activities, or the maintenance and repair, including sealing, of a road, footpath, driveway or farm tracks, <u>where excavation depth is less than 400mm.</u> |
| Ngāti Rāhiri Hapū o Te Atiawa (Taranaki) Society Inc - Keith Holswich | 503.42 | Oppose | NU-R41 | I am unclear of the connection which would require the identification of Tangata Whenua as affected parties in relation to the Gas Transmission Network. | Retain the matters over which discretion is restricted as proposed in the Proposed Plan. |
| Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson | 520.190 | Oppose in part | NU Zoning | I oppose in part as the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor is proposed to ensure, among other functions, the safety of those living and working near the Gas Transmission Network. | Retain the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor across the entire Gas Transmission Network. |
| Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust - Hemi Sundgren | 459.53 | Oppose | ENGY-P10 | Oppose to the extent that this approach to remediation should be reserved for remediation works in proximity to identified Waahi Taonga/ sites of significance to Maori sites. | Retain P10 as drafted. |
| Taranaki Energy Watch Incorporated - Sarah Roberts | 543.16 | Oppose | ENGY-P10 | Oppose to the extent that the sites in question are lawfully established and retrospective bonding is not the correct mechanism to ensure remediation occurs. | Retain P10 as drafted. |
| Greymouth Petroleum Limited - Tanya Hansen | 548.34 | Support in part | ENGY-P10 | I support exploring the proposed amendment for this policy as it may lead to better remediation outcomes. | Consider the proposed alternative: Amend Policy ENGY-P10 as follows: Require oil and gas activities <u>operators</u> to remediate sites (or parts of sites) containing redundant or decommissioned above ground structures <u>in consultation with the land owner, New Plymouth District Council and Taranaki Regional Council, recognising that some structures and/or other features may be able to be re-used for other purposes. including the removal of all surface production facilities, all concrete surfacing, steel and cables and flare pits.</u> |

| I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i> | The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i> | | | The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i> | I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| OMV New Zealand Limited Cam Twigley (BTW Company Limited) | 573.16 | Support in part | ENGY-P10 | I support exploring the proposed amendment for this policy as it may lead to better remediation outcomes. | Consider the proposed alternative: Amend ENGY-P10 as follows: Require oil and gas activities operators to remediate sites (or parts of sites) containing redundant or decommissioned above ground <u>structures in consultation with the land owner, New Plymouth District Council and Taranaki Regional Council.</u> including the removal of all surface production facilities, all concrete surfacing, steel and cables and flare pits. |
| The Oil Companies (Z Energy, Mobil Oil New Zealand, BP Oil New Zealand) - Matthew Thode (4Sight Consulting) | 551.98 | Support | EW-P1 | I support exploring the proposed amendment for this policy as it may help to better encompass the range of storage systems effected by this Policy. | Amend Policy EW-P1 (5) as follows: ... 5. replacement or removal and/or installation of underground petroleum storage systems. associated with service stations; |
| The Oil Companies (Z Energy, Mobil Oil New Zealand, BP Oil New Zealand) - Matthew Thode (4Sight Consulting) | 551.102 | Support | EW-P4 | I support exploring the proposed amendment for this policy as it may help to clarify practical considerations. | Amend Policy EW-P4 as follows: Ensure earthworks are undertaken in a way that avoids adverse effects on archaeological sites and sites and areas of significance to Māori, or where avoidance is not possible, appropriately remedies or mitigates adverse effects <u>to the extent practicable,</u> having regard to: |
| Te Kāhui o Taranaki Trust - Wharehoka Wano | 534.15 | Oppose | NFL-R3 | Oppose the removal of Network Utilities (NU) from this rule as it is intended to permit the maintenance and repair of existing lawfully established NU to ensure the integrity and ultimately the safety considerations of these structures are upheld. | Retain Network Utilities in the Rule as notified. |

Note to Further Submitter

This further submission on the Proposed District Plan must be received by the New Plymouth District Council by **5pm on Tuesday 25 August 2020.**

To get your further submission to us, either:

Post to: New Plymouth District Council, Reply Paid DX, DX Box NX10026, New Plymouth.

Deliver to: Attention: District Planning Team
Civic Centre, Liardet Street, New Plymouth
or to library and service centres at Bell Block, Inglewood or Waitara
Email to: districtplan@npdc.govt.nz
Visit our website: newplymouthnz.com/eplan

A copy of your further submission MUST be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority. Contact details for all submitters can be found on our Proposed Plan page at newplymouthnz.com/eplan.

Please note all information provided in your submission, including your personal information, will be made publicly available.

Your submission (or part of it) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of it):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.