

Matthew McCallum-Clark for Vodafone New Zealand Limited (“Vodafone”), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (“Spark”) and Chorus New Zealand Limited (“Chorus”)

Opening Statement and Summary of Evidence, 23 July 2018

Chapter 24 – Wakatipu Basin – Hearing Stream 14

1. This is a summary statement of my primary evidence dated 13 June 2018.
2. I am appearing today with Mr McCarrison Spark, who is available to answer questions you may have of the telecommunications industry.
3. Spark, Vodafone and Chorus lodged identical submissions, and are presenting here as a “single voice” of the industry. I collectively refer to them as “the Telcos”, as Council reports have done. I am a resource management consultant, and I prepared the submissions for this group of submitters. I have also lodged a short brief of planning evidence in relation to their submissions and the section 42A report.
4. I have read the statement of rebuttal evidence and listened to the audio and questions asked of Mr Barr on Day 1 of this Hearing. After consideration, I agree with some of the conclusions of Mr Barr, as indicated below. For other issues, I maintain my position that further adjustment is worthwhile. Overall, I am still concerned as to the lack of clarity as to which policies might be relevant in any particular circumstance for a utility to be located in the Wakatipu Basin.

Concise Objectives and Policies

5. In submissions and evidence, the Telcos sought simplification of the objective and policy mix, in order to reduce duplication, and provide clarity and certainty. Mr Barr has suggested this is might be worthwhile, but he appears to prefer the detail and subtleties in the existing policy mix.
6. I have stated my opinion on this in my evidence, and while there is no ‘harm’ in a complex policy mix, it just creates a range of difficulties, interpretation issues and inefficiencies, particularly at the time of consenting. For example, in the need to assess the objectives and policies in a resource consent application, a wide range of detailed and overlapping policies makes this task laborious, and I suggest, with diminishing returns.

Policy 24.2.2.1

7. Mr Barr has explained in his rebuttal evidence how this policy does not apply to utilities, and I accept that position and his interpretation of the definitions.

Recognition of locational constraints

8. Mr Barr has recommended, in his rebuttal evidence, some minor changes to Policy 24.2.4.6, at page 59 of his rebuttal. He does not accept the key part of the Telco request, which is to accept the practical limits on “maintaining landscape character and visual amenity values”. In my view, the obligation in the first part of the policy – to “maintain” – is not really able to be reduced by simply having regard to other matters. That is why the Telcos requested the words “to the extent practicable”, having regard to those other matters.