

Hearing 4 – Energy and Infrastructure

Questions from the Hearing Panel

As foreshadowed by paragraph 12 of Minute 1, having read the Section 42A Report for the Energy and Infrastructure hearing, the Hearing Panel members have a number of questions that they would appreciate being answered by the Section 42A Report author(s) in writing prior to the hearing commencing.

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
7.49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed 'social infrastructure' definition is recommended to be rejected. However, would the Rolleston Prison, which is recommended to be added to the definition of 'important infrastructure', be more accurately defined as social infrastructure?
11.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation is to reject the submissions as the term 'important infrastructure' concisely covers all of the types of infrastructure identified. Please elaborate on what Federated Farmers is seeking here as it is not clear that the analysis and recommendation responds to the issue raised by the submitter.
12.26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the word "mitigating" in E1-04 in Appendix 2 be in strikeout. Does the word "managing" provide useful guidance to decision-makers as it does not infer any particular outcome as "managing" is simply a process (as you appear to agree with in your paragraph 14.4)?
13.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you considered defining "minor upgrading" of existing infrastructure and would that better respond to the submitters requested relief?
18.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re noise, at para 8.5 you stated that the EI Chapter has been created to be self-contained whereby earthworks in relation to infrastructure is regulated by the EI Chapter and not the Earthworks Chapter. Is this not the case for noise?
18.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some submitters on the Strategic Directions topic argued that 'incompatible activities' and 'reverse sensitivity' were not exactly the same thing. Is your approach consistent or inconsistent with the approach taken by the reporting officer on that topic? Would it be better to title P6 as 'incompatible activities' as that is the wording in the policy?
27.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would a landowner be expected to be aware of the NZCEP and be familiar with its requirements? If not, is there value in having a district plan rule as well?
31.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the issue with allowing underground infrastructure in areas subject to flooding if there is no permanent change in ground level (acknowledging that this question may be better directed to the natural hazards topic reporting officer)?

40.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there a rule regulating the establishment of artificial waterways and associated structures for 'non network utility operators' either in this chapter or the other chapters? ▪ If not, would the change to remove reference to network utility operators actually widen the scope of the rule significantly, thereby requiring farmers to now meet the standard and the listed rule requirements?
40.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why does this evaluation only refer to the National Grid Yard? ▪ How does EI-R26 relate to EI-R1 which specifically covers activities in the National Grid Yard including the reticulation and storage of water in open channels, dams and reservoirs, which are non-complying activities under EI-R1?
43.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elsewhere you have referred to provisions in other district plans as a comparison and for guidance. Are there any examples from other District Plans you can review that would provide guidance on appropriate provisions for wind turbines?