



## 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: Joint Further Submission From:

- Chorus New Zealand Limited;
- Spark New Zealand Trading Limited;
- Two Degrees Networks Limited; and
- Vodafone New Zealand Limited.

Contact person (if different from above) Tom Anderson, Incite

Postal address: Incite, PO Box 2058, Wellington 6140

Email address for service: tom@incite.co.nz

Phone number: 027 231 0246

*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:

Chorus, Spark, Two Degrees and Vodafone, are telecommunication network utility operators. Telecommunications networks are identified in the Taranaki Regional Policy Statement as Regionally Significant Infrastructure and are listed as lifeline infrastructure in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act.

### **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

Date 25 August 2020

Name of Further Submitter Spark New Zealand Trading Limited

My specific further submission(s) are as follows:

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

<b>I support/oppose the submission of:</b> <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	<b>The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are:</b> <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			<b>The reasons for my support / opposition are:</b> <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	<b>I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed:</b> <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Caroline Rachlin	522.17	Support	NU	Appropriate guidance is needed so that NU effects on heritage and cultural values is clear. We have sought what we consider to be appropriate changes to the Historic Heritage provisions, but the Heritage New Zealand Submission point would provide for clarity in the NU chapter as well as the Historic Heritage Chapter.	Allow whole submission point
Ngāti Maru - Anaru Marshall	533.17	Oppose	NU / Objectives / NU-O1	The submission point sets up an 'avoid' framework for works within sensitive areas. While a consent framework for works within such areas is entirely appropriate, there must be a pathway to allow infrastructure to locate in such areas where there is an operational or functional need. An avoid objective does not provide for this consideration.	Disallow submission point. Our primary submission requested that the NU-O1 be deleted in its entirety, and replace it with IE-O1 from the dPNS-NU attached in Appendix A of the primary submission.
Te Kāhui o Taranaki Trust - Wharehoka Wano	534.10	Oppose	NU / Objectives / NU-O1	The submission point sets up an 'avoid' framework for works within sensitive areas. While a consent framework for works within such areas is entirely appropriate, there must be a pathway to allow infrastructure to locate in such areas where there is an operational or functional need. An avoid objective does not provide for this consideration.	Disallow submission point Our primary submission requested that the NU-O1 be deleted in its entirety, and replace it with IE-O1 from the dPNS-NU attached in Appendix A of the primary submission
Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust - Hemi Sundgren	459.107	Oppose	NU / Objectives / NU-O1	The submission point sets up an 'avoid' framework for works within sensitive areas. While a consent framework for works within such areas is entirely appropriate, there must be a pathway to allow infrastructure to locate in such areas where there is an operational or functional need. An avoid objective does not provide for this consideration.	Disallow submission point Our primary submission requested that the NU-O1 be deleted in its entirety, and replace it with IE-O1 from the dPNS-NU attached in Appendix A of the primary submission
Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson	520.41	Oppose	NU / Objectives / NU-O1	The submission point sets up an 'avoid' framework for works within sensitive areas. While a consent framework for works within such areas is entirely	Disallow submission point Our primary submission requested that the NU-O1 be deleted in its entirety, and replace it with IE-

<b>I support/oppose the submission of:</b> <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	<b>The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are:</b> <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			<b>The reasons for my support / opposition are:</b> <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	<b>I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed:</b> <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
				<p>appropriate, there must be a pathway to allow infrastructure to locate in such areas where there is an operational or functional need. An avoid objective does not provide for this consideration.</p>	<p>O1 from the dPNS-NU attached in Appendix A of the primary submission</p>
<p>Ngāti Maru - Anaru Marshall</p>	<p>533.14</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>NU / Policies / NU-P4</p>	<p>The submission point sets up an 'avoid' framework for works within sensitive areas. While a consent framework for works within such areas is entirely appropriate, there must be a pathway to allow infrastructure to locate in such areas where there is an operational or functional need. An avoid policy does not provide for this consideration.</p>	<p>Disallow submission point where it seeks to avoid effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic heritage</li> <li>- Waterbodies</li> <li>- Indigenous biodiversity</li> <li>- Outstanding natural landscapes or features</li> <li>- Maori land</li> </ul> <p>We consider our original submission point will reasonably address the submitters concerns. The primary submission requested the deletion of NU-P4 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P4 from the dPNS-NU attached in the Primary submission Appendix A.</p>
<p>Te Kāhui o Taranaki Trust - Wharehoka Wano</p>	<p>534.12</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>NU / Policies / NU-P4</p>	<p>The submission point sets up an 'avoid' framework for works within sensitive areas. While a consent framework for works within such areas is entirely appropriate, there must be a pathway to allow infrastructure to locate in such areas where there is an operational or functional need. An avoid policy does not provide for this consideration.</p>	<p>Disallow submission point where it seeks to avoid effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic heritage</li> <li>- Waterbodies</li> <li>- Indigenous biodiversity</li> <li>- Outstanding natural landscapes or features</li> <li>- Maori land</li> </ul> <p>We consider our original submission point will reasonably address the submitters concerns. The primary submission requested the deletion of NU-P4 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P4 from the dPNS-NU attached in the Primary submission Appendix A.</p>
<p>Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust - Hemi Sundgren</p>	<p>459.108</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>NU / Policies / NU-P4</p>	<p>The submission point sets up an 'avoid' framework for works within sensitive areas. While a consent framework for works within such areas is entirely appropriate, there must be a pathway to allow</p>	<p>Disallow submission point where it seeks to avoid effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic heritage</li> <li>- Waterbodies</li> </ul>

<b>I support/oppose the submission of:</b> <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	<b>The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are:</b> <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			<b>The reasons for my support / opposition are:</b> <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	<b>I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed:</b> <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
				infrastructure to locate in such areas where there is an operational or functional need. An avoid policy does not provide for this consideration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Indigenous biodiversity</li> <li>- Outstanding natural landscapes or features</li> <li>- Maori land</li> </ul>
Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson	520.45	Oppose	NU / Policies / NU-P4	The submission point sets up an 'avoid' framework for works within sensitive areas. While a consent framework for works within such areas is entirely appropriate, there must be a pathway to allow infrastructure to locate in such areas where there is an operational or functional need. An avoid policy does not provide for this consideration.	Disallow submission point where it seeks to avoid effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic heritage</li> <li>- Waterbodies</li> <li>- Indigenous biodiversity</li> <li>- Outstanding natural landscapes or features</li> <li>- Maori land</li> </ul> We consider our original submission point will reasonably address the submitters concerns. The primary submission requested the deletion of NU-P4 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P4 from the dPNS-NU attached in the Primary submission Appendix A.
Ngāti Maru - Anaru Marshall	533.13	Oppose	NU / Policies / NU-P5	The submission point seeks deletion of NU-P5 in its entirety. This is opposed as NU-P5 allows for the consideration of operational and functional need, which is needed for decision makers.	Disallow submission point We consider our original submission point will reasonably address the submitters concerns. The primary submission requested the deletion of NU-P5 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P7 from the dPNS-NU attached in the Primary submission Appendix A.
Te Kāhui o Taranaki Trust - Wharehoka Wano	534.13	Oppose	NU / Policies / NU-P5	The submission point seeks deletion of NU-P5 in its entirety. This is opposed as NU-P5 allows for the consideration of operational and functional need, which is needed for decision makers.	Disallow submission point We consider our original submission point will reasonably address the submitters concerns. The primary submission requested the deletion of NU-P5 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P7 from the dPNS-NU attached in the Primary submission Appendix A.
Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust - Hemi Sundgren	459.109	Oppose	NU / Policies / NU-P5	The submission point seeks deletion of NU-P5 in its entirety. This is opposed as NU-P5 allows for the consideration of operational and functional need, which is needed for decision makers.	Disallow submission point We consider our original submission point will reasonably address the submitters concerns. The primary submission requested the deletion of

<b>I support/oppose the submission of:</b> <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i>	<b>The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are:</b> <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i>			<b>The reasons for my support / opposition are:</b> <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i>	<b>I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed:</b> <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i>
					NU-P5 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P7 from the dPNS-NU attached in the Primary submission Appendix A.
Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga - Marlene Benson	520.44	Oppose	NU / Policies / NU-P5	The submission point seeks deletion of NU-P5 in its entirety. This is opposed as NU-P5 allows for the consideration of operational and functional need, which is needed for decision makers.	Disallow submission point We consider our original submission point will reasonably address the submitters concerns. The primary submission requested the deletion of NU-P5 in its entirety, and replace it with IE-P7 from the dPNS-NU attached in the Primary submission Appendix A.

### 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.

Attention: District Planning Team

Deliver to: Civic Centre, Liardet Street, New Plymouth  
 or to library and service centres at Bell Block, Inglewood or Waitara

Email to: [districtplan@npdc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@npdc.govt.nz)

Visit our website: [newplymouthnz.com/eplan](http://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](http://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.