

PROPOSED FAR NORTH DISTRICT PLAN:
HEARING TOPIC 16 SUBDIVISION
Chris Horne Summary Statement for Telcos (s278 & 517)

1. My evidence only addresses subdivision standard SUB-S6 and supports the position of Chorus, One NZ and Spark that the rule should require telecommunication connections to the boundaries of new lots (other than stated exceptions) at the time of subdivision, with the resource consent process used to address situations where it is not reasonable or practical to provide a connection.
2. The Proposed Plan as notified included a requirement for connections to telecommunications and electricity services at the time of subdivision. I do not agree with the recommendations in the s42A reports for Hearing 14 Urban Zones (Ms Sarah Trinder) and Hearing 16 Subdivision (Mr Kenton Baxter) that the rule requiring a connection to telecommunications services at the boundary of new allotments be deleted.
3. As set out in my evidence, I consider the relief sought by telecommunications companies to be consistent with the provisions for “*additional infrastructure*” in the NPS-UD to the extent it is relevant to urban areas in the Far North, the Northland Regional Policy Statement, and the relevant policy framework of the Proposed Plan as recommended in relevant s42A reports (SD-UFD-O3, SUB-O3, SUB-OY, SUB-P5, SUB-P5).
4. Regardless of the way the telecommunications industry is now regulated and structured with these services delivered by private companies, which is also a model used for some electricity distributors, it delivers a critical public good service important for modern living, health and safety, and community wellbeing. Paragraph 254 of the Urban Zones s42a report sets out a number of concerns regarding the risks around having rules relating to private infrastructure. A response to this is addressed in the Corporate evidence¹.
5. I included recommended edits to SUB-S6 at paragraph 39 to my evidence which gives effect to the separate submissions by Chorus and Spark/One NZ on this issue, and in my opinion is more effective and efficient in achieving the policy direction of the relevant planning documents and achieving the purpose of the Act than the recommended s42A report version of SUB-S6.

¹ Paragraphs 10.1 – 10.11 Corporate Evidence