

BEFORE HUTT CITY COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Hutt City Council's Proposed District Plan:
Hearing Stream 6 –Infrastructure

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE TOM ANDERSON

ON BEHALF OF

**CHORUS NEW ZEALAND LIMITED, CONNEXA LIMITED, FORTYSOUTH GROUP
LP AND SPARK NEW ZEALAND TRADING LIMITED**

4 September 2026

SUMMARY STATEMENT

- i. My name is Tom Anderson. I am a Principal Planner and a Director of Incite, a resource management consulting firm. My qualifications and experience are set out in my evidence in chief in this statement.
- ii. I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (section 9 of the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2023). My evidence has been prepared in compliance with that code.
- iii. Chorus, Connexa, FortySouth and Spark (the telecommunication companies) lodged submissions on the Proposed Hutt City District Plan (PDP).
- iv. 66 of the submission points are addressed in Hearing Stream 6, all within the Infrastructure Section 42A (S42A) Report. I agree with the Council officer recommendations in the S42A Reports on 58 of these submission points.
- v. The matters which remain in contention for the hearing primarily relate to alignment with the imminent update to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations (NESTF). I understand that this update will be gazetted between the lodgement of this evidence and the hearing. I also note that the Minister Responsible for RMA Reform's final decisions on what is to be included in the updated NESTF have been publicly released, which provides a significant degree of surety as to what the gazetted NESTF will include. These matters include:
 - An amendment to the definitions of *aboveground mounted equipment* and ;
 - The deletion of the definition of *mount*; and
 - An amendment to the definition of; and
 - Amendments to INF-R14, INF-S2 INF-S6 and INF-S9.
- vi. The only other matter which remains in contention is how the PDP protects telecommunications as regionally significant infrastructure, which is what is required by the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region. In response to the position recommended in the S42A Report, I have suggested amendments to the matters of discretion for the height standards in targeted zones, which would give effect to the relief sought through the submission.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF

Professional Qualifications and Experience

1. My name is Tom Anderson. I am a Principal Planner and a Director of Incite, a resource management consulting firm. I hold a Bachelor of Science and a Master of Planning (with Distinction), both from the University of Otago. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and a member of the Resource Management Law Association. I am an Independent Commissioner, certified under the Ministry for the Environment's *Making Good Decisions* programme.
2. I have 19 years professional experience. Throughout my career I have provided advice to a number of telecommunication and radiocommunication companies, including submitters Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Connexa Limited (Connexa), FortySouth Group LP (FortySouth) and Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark – formerly Telecom New Zealand Limited and Telecom Mobile Limited), as well as One New Zealand Group Limited (formerly Vodafone New Zealand Limited), Two Degrees Networks Limited, Tait Systems NZ Limited, Rural Connectivity Group and Vital (formerly TeamTalk). I have provided the telecommunication companies with advice on district and unitary plan reviews and plan changes, site selection exercises, designation and outline plan of works processes, and consenting activities for network rollouts and exchange upgrades.
3. On this basis, I consider myself to have a comprehensive understanding of telecommunication and radiocommunication networks, and the practical implications of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) framework, including the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016 (NESTF), in relation to network installation, upgrade and operation.
4. I drafted and submitted the joint submissions of Chorus, Connexa, FortySouth and Spark (collectively referred to as 'the Telecommunication Companies') on the Proposed Hutt City District Plan (PDP).
5. I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (section 9 of the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2023). My evidence has been prepared in compliance with that code. In particular, unless I state otherwise, this evidence is within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider any material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

Scope and Purpose of Evidence

6. This evidence has been prepared in review of the aforementioned telecommunications companies submissions on the PDP, as they relate to Hearing Stream 6 (HS6). In preparing this evidence I have read all other submissions and further submissions relevant to the companies submissions and the Infrastructure S42A report for HS6¹.
7. For the most part, the officers recommendations on these submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or the alternate relief recommended in the Infrastructure S42A report is acceptable. Therefore changes to those provisions are no longer being pursued. For the record, attached in Appendix A to this evidence is a table of the submissions where I accept the officer's recommendation.
8. There are however a number of submission points for which I seek alternative relief to that recommended in the Infrastructure S42A Report, being:
 - Submission Point 311.1 concerning an amendment sought to the definition of *aboveground mounted equipment*;
 - Submission Point 311.8 which sought the deletion of the definition of *mount*;
 - Submission Point 311.12 concerning amendments sought to the definition of *support structure*;
 - Submission Point 311.54 concerning amendments to INF-R14;
 - Submission Point 311.59 concerning amendments to INF-S2;
 - Submission Point 311.63 concerning amendments to INF-S6;
 - Submission Point 311.66 concerning amendments to INF-S9; and
 - Submission Point 311.79 concerning amendments to PINF-P1.
9. Through this evidence, I provide the justification as to why alternative relief to what is in the S42A Report is sought on the above points.

¹ For completeness, the telecommunication companies do not have any submission points which are addressed in the S42A reports for Transport or Three Waters.

10. As part of that reasoning, and what I consider to be important context for making decisions on some of the matters which remain in contention, is the imminent update to the NESTF. I note that Mr McDonald, the reporting officer, is aware of this as he has noted it at Paragraph 175 of his Infrastructure S42A Report.
11. During the preparation of this update, and for full disclosure, I have been consulted by officials from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) and the Ministry for Cities, Environment, Regions and Transport (MCERT – formerly the Ministry for the Environment) as part of a technical working group, which has also included industry and local government planners.
12. As I understand it, in between the time that this evidence is circulated and the hearing commencing on 22 September 2026, the amended NESTF will be gazetted, and will have legal effect after the date of gazettal. I will provide an update on this when presenting at the hearing.
13. In the interim, I note that the Minister Responsible for RMA Reform’s final decisions on what is to be included in the updated NESTF have been publicly released in a document produced by the Ministry for the Environment in May of this year titled *National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities and National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities: Report on Recommendations and Decisions* and an *Addendum to recommendations and decisions for National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities* (collectively referred to as “the Minister’s decisions”). A copy of these documents can be found [here](#) and [here](#). I note below where I rely on the Minister’s decisions in my evidence.
14. I have therefore sought to provide alignment between the provisions provided in the Minister’s decisions, while remaining within scope of the submissions that the telecommunication companies lodged on the PDP.
15. My brief summary of the Minister’s decisions, which provide important context for the balance of my evidence, is that the updated NESTF will:
- Continue to permit cabinets in all zones, both within and outside of road reserve;
 - Permit larger poles with antenna and ancillary equipment than what it currently does in road reserve;
 - Permit poles with antenna and ancillary equipment outside of road reserve in the local centre, neighbourhood centre, mixed use, commercial large format retail, industrial

and rural zones but rely on district plan provisions for residential, open space, town centre, city centre and special purpose zones;

- Increase size of permitted antenna, headframes and other ancillary measures; and
- Continue to permit upgrades (within standards) of existing facilities, regardless of location or zone.

16. In my opinion, the key difference from the current NESTF is that the revised version increases the number of zones where it applies to telecommunication facilities on private sites. The existing version primarily applies to new poles in road reserve and in rural zone. The revised version increases the number of zones that the NESTF will apply for facilities outside of road reserve, as well as permitting larger equipment on regulated sites.

17. Essentially, the zones where new poles with antenna and ancillary equipment will continue to be regulated by the PDP are:

- Large Lot Residential Zone;
- Medium Density Residential Zone;
- High Density Residential Zone;
- City Centre Zone;
- Metropolitan Centre Zone;
- Natural Open Space Zone;
- Open Space Zone;
- Sport and Active Recreation Zone;
- Hospital Zone;
- Marae Zone;
- Quarry Zone;
- Seaview Marina Zone; and

- Tertiary Education Zone.

18. The PDP will continue to set the activity status for NESTF regulated activities which cannot meet the permitted standards of the NESTF.
19. As stated above, I will confirm this at the hearing, on the assumption that gazettal of the revised NESTF occurs between now and the hearing.

Definition of *aboveground mounted equipment*

20. Submission 311.1 sought that the words “*supporting equipment for antenna*” be deleted from the definition of aboveground mounted, on the basis that such equipment is provided for under the NESTF. Under the revised NESTF, ancillary equipment will be permitted on a much wider basis.
21. Ancillary equipment (or *supporting equipment*) for antenna is primarily in the form of Remote Radio Heads or Remote Radio Units, which are box shaped structures, typically in the order of 300mm to 600mm high by 120mm to 300mm wide², attached generally to the pole below antenna. As I understand it, this ancillary equipment essentially processes, filters and amplifies the ability of an antenna to provide a signal to and from a user’s devices.
22. I am also informed by radiofrequency engineers at Spark that the ancillary equipment technology is evolving and now also includes an active unit mounted on a pole that turns digital signals into focused radio waves sent to a user’s device. This is a similar function to Radio Heads or Remote Radio Units, but I am told very different technology, developed to support making 5G networks more efficient.
23. Ancillary equipment like this effectively reduces the number of facilities that are needed to service an area. Another way of putting it, if there was no ancillary equipment there would be a need for more cell phone towers.
24. I also note that ancillary equipment is not specifically regulated under the recently reviewed and now operative or operative in part Wellington, Porirua and Wairarapa Combined district plans.
25. If useful, I have identified ancillary equipment on the following image.

² The sizes vary depending on the amplification needed for the antenna and the coverage that antenna needs to provide.



Figure 1: Mobile Phone Facility identifying ancillary equipment

26. As it currently stands, ancillary equipment is permitted (without regard as to size) under the NESTF on all poles in road reserve as well as on poles in rural areas, upgrades of existing poles regardless of location and for all antenna attached to buildings. Based on the Minister's decisions, ancillary equipment will become permitted on new poles outside of road reserve in the local centre, neighbourhood centre, mixed use, commercial large format retail, and industrial zones. However there would be a need to assess the size of ancillary equipment on new poles outside of road reserve in those zones identified in Paragraph 17 above.

27. Removal of the words “*supporting equipment for antenna*” from the definition will mean that the ancillary equipment in question will be permitted without need for assessment for all antenna in Hutt City, not just those regulated by the NESTF.
28. In my view, given the relatively small size of the ancillary equipment compared with the other aspects that comprise a mobile phone facility, there does not need to be a difference between how the NESTF and the PDP regulate such matters. It also improves the efficiency of the mobile phone and wireless broadband network.
29. As such, I continue to seek the relief as per Submission Point 311.1. It should be noted that for all relief sought in my evidence, recommended amendments as per the S42A Report are shown in red, with my recommended amendments shown in blue (and in both instances, underline is used for additional text and strikethrough for ~~deleted~~ text):

Amend the definition of *aboveground mounted equipment* as follows:

Aboveground mounted equipment:

means equipment which are located above ground level on a support structure, and includes transformers, switches, capacitors, battery banks, small cell units and similar devices, ~~and supporting equipment for antennas.~~

Does not include:

- a. antennas and ancillary equipment for antenna,*
- b. aerials, or*
- c. lighting devices.*

Definition of *mount*

30. Submission Point 311.8 sought that the definition of *mount* be deleted. As discussed by the reporting officer (Paragraph 663 of the s42A Report), the term *mount* is only used in Clause 5 of INF-S9, which Submission Point 311.66 seeks to delete (and which I continue to seek deletion of through this evidence). It is not used elsewhere in the PDP. As such, should the panel agree that the relief I seek regarding Submission Point 311.66 is appropriate, then there would be no need for the definition of *mount*. I address this in more detail on my assessment of INF-S9 below.

31. I note that, as per the definition of *aboveground mounted equipment* above, the NESTF regulates *mounts* as *ancillary equipment* and as such they are permitted activities.
32. I also note that the definition of *mount* as notified in the PDP includes equipment used to attach antenna attached to buildings. This is an activity that is solely regulated under the current NESTF, with no changes to that under the Minister's decisions for the updated NESTF. As such, it is an activity which should not be regulated under the PDP.
33. The definition also includes equipment used to attach a headframe to a pole. A headframe is integrated onto a pole. Referring back to Figure 1, I am unsure under this definition as to what would constitute a headframe mount as opposed to the headframe or pole.
34. Consequently, I continue to seek the definition of *mount* be deleted in its entirety.

Delete the definition of *mount* in its entirety:

~~*Mount:*~~

~~*means equipment used to attached—*~~

~~*a. an antenna to a building; or*~~

~~*b. an antenna to a pole without a headframe; or*~~

~~*c. an antenna to a headframe; or*~~

~~*d. a headframe to a pole.*~~

Definition of *support structure*

35. Submission 311.12 sought an amendment to the definition of *support structure* that removed the terms *lightning rods*, *antennas*, *sensing devices* and *lines*, and added a new definition of pole, which replicates the NESTF definition of pole.
36. The reasoning for the submission was to remove potential confusion between what the NESTF defines and what the PDP defines.
37. The reporting officer recommends that the submission point be accepted in part (paragraph 684), recommending that the definition of *support structure* be retained as notified, but adding the definition of *pole* as per the submission.

38. The reasoning for this was the broader application of *support structure* in the PDP. I understand this reasoning, however I consider that some finessing of the definition of *support structure* is needed to avoid overlap between that definition and the recommended inclusion of the *pole* definition.
39. I consider the word *antenna* should be removed from the definition of *support structure*, otherwise a pole with antenna attached will be both a *pole* as defined by the PDP and a *support structure*. I also consider that *lightning rods* should be removed from the definition of *support structure*. *Lightning rods* are ancillary to other activities on poles. A support structure would not be erected solely for a lightning rod, rather a lightning rod would be attached to the top of a facility used for another purpose.
40. On this basis, I consider the following amendments are necessary to the definition of *support structure*, and support the reporting officer's recommendation that the definition of *pole* as per Submission Point 311.12 be included in the PDP.

Amend the definition of *support structure* as follows:

means any mast, pole or similar structure used or intended to be used for the support of lighting devices, ~~lighting rods~~, signs, aerials, ~~antennas~~, sensing devices, beacons, lines or aboveground mounted equipment.

INF-R14

41. Submission Point 311.54 sought to include controlled activity status for panel antenna and dish antenna activities that are regulated by the NETSF but do not meet the permitted activity standards of the NESTF. The reporting officer has recommended this point be rejected.
42. Based on the Minister's decisions, the activity status is no longer being sought.
43. However, it is noted that the title to INF-R14 specifies standards that are breached in the NESTF. Given the breadth of amendments in the Minister's decisions, in my view it is more than likely that the NESTF regulation order will change. This would make the rule effectively out of date before the PDP takes effect.
44. To avoid this, I suggest that the title of the rule be amended so that it does not specify which regulations are breached, but instead has a more generic 'relevance' added to it. This is

effectively how the NESTF is set up in any instance, as when it was first introduced it had to be able to work with district plans without them referencing the NESTF.

45. Therefore, I suggest that the title to INF-R14 be amended as follows:

Amend the title of INF-R14 as follows:

INF-R14 Cabinets, antennas and poles regulated by the NESTF that do not meet the [relevant](#) permitted activity standards ~~in Regulations 20, 21, 22, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35 or 37~~ of the NESTF

INF-S2

46. Submission Point 311.59 sought two amendments to INF-S2.
47. One amendment was to delete the word “steel” in reference to lattice towers from Clause 2 of INF-S2. Lattice towers do not have to be made of steel. This point was recommended to be accepted by the reporting officer, which I agree clearly agree with.
48. The other amendment was to Clause 1 of INF-S2 allow for upgraded infrastructure to be within 10m of the infrastructure it is replacing (rather than 5m as provided for in notified PDP). This was recommended to be rejected by the reporting officer.
49. It is noted that the Minister’s decisions allow for replacement of any utility pole with a new pole containing telecommunication facilities increases the replacement distance from 5m to 10m.
50. A 10m distance allows greater flexibility given constraints which I have seen on site visits primarily from the location of underground infrastructure (which typically have various setback distances regulated by the utility administering that infrastructure, to prevent surcharging or for health and safety reasons), as well as driveways, vehicle sight distances, tree roots, street furniture and so forth.
51. As such, it is my preference that INF-S2.1 align with the Minister’s decisions and provide for a 10m setback. This is provided for as follows:

Amend INF-S2.1 as follows:

INF-S2 Upgrading of Infrastructure

1. *The replacement, realignment or relocation of a line, any pipe (excluding a gas transmission pipeline), support structure, conductor, cross arm, switch, transformer or ancillary structure must be within 510m of the existing alignment or location.*

52. However, it is noted that INF-S2 applies to *support structures* and not *poles* as per Submission Point 311.8. If this is accepted by the panel there would not be a requirement to amend INF-S2 as detailed above.

INF-S6

53. Submission Point 311.63 sought amendments to INF-S6. INF-S6 provides for support structure (and pole) heights. The submission sought to increase the permitted pole height under this standard to be 5m higher than the permitted height. This has been accepted by the reporting officer.

54. However, complicating matters somewhat are the Minister's decisions for the forthcoming NESTF update. These decisions introduce, as a permitted height outside of road reserve, the following:

- 20m in the local centre, neighbourhood centre zones;
- 25m in the mixed use, commercial, large format retail, and all industrial zones; and
- 35m in the rural zones (general rural and rural lifestyle).

55. Therefore, it is my view that these zones do not need a permitted height in INF-S6. If the above height standards are not met, resource consent would be required as a Restricted Discretionary Activity under Rule INF-R14. In my opinion, this is how the NESTF is intended to work.

56. The PDP will continue to regulate the height of telecommunication poles outside of road reserve in the:

- All residential zones;
- City centre and metropolitan centre zones;
- All open space and recreation zones; and
- All special purpose zones.

57. The reporting officer's recommended wording for INF-S6 at Paragraph 513 is generally acceptable. However I have suggested some amendments to provide recognise the recommendation that telecommunication poles are separately defined from support structures. I do not consider that the heights need amending, given that it provides for support structures, which has wider application than just telecommunication poles.

Amend INF-S6 as follows:

INF-S6 Support structures and poles not regulated by the NESTF

Residential zones, Rural zones, Industrial zones, Open Space and Recreation zones, Special Purpose zones, Local Centre Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone

1. The support structure or pole must not exceed a maximum height of the permitted height for the relevant zone or the Specific Height Control Overlay, plus 5 metres.
2. A further 5 metres in height is afforded where two or more infrastructure providers are co-located on the same structure or pole.

City Centre Zone

3. The support structure or pole must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of 27m (single provider).
4. The support structure or pole must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of 32m (two or more providers).

Metropolitan Centre Zone

5. Where located in the Specific Height Control Overlay; the support structure or pole must not exceed a maximum height of the Specific Height Control Overlay, plus 5 metres.
6. Where not located in the Specific Height Control Overlay;
 - a. The support structure or pole must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of 27m (single provider).
 - b. The support structure or pole must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of 32m (two or more providers).

INF-S9

58. Submission Point 311.66 sought amendments to INF-S9. INF-S9 provides for antenna (and aboveground mounted equipment) size. Noting the aforementioned amendment to the definition of aboveground mounted equipment, amendments were (and continue to be sought) to the parts of the standard that apply to aboveground mounted equipment. These were rejected by the reporting officer.
59. The parts of the submission focussed on wording regarding the measurement of an antenna was accepted by the reporting officer.
60. The panel antenna sizes within INF-S9 as notified directly replicate what is in the current NESTF. The Minister's decision provide for larger sizes as a permitted activity. As such, I consider that this opportunity should be undertaken to align the antenna sizes between the PDP and forthcoming NESTF so that the PDP is not more stringent than the NESTF.
61. The following recommended amendment to INF-S9 details the antenna dimensions that are permitted in the Minister's decisions, as well as alignment with the relief I seek above regarding the definitions of *above-ground mounted equipment* and *mount*.

Amend INF-S9 as follows:

INF-S9 Size – Antennas and aboveground mounted equipment

1. A panel antenna:

- a. Must not exceed a front face width of 0.71.0m, and
- b. When in a road reserve, must fit within an envelope of 3.55.0m in length and 0.71.2m in width if not on a headframe, or not exceed a front face width of 0.7m if on a headframe.

2. A dish antenna: ~~must not exceed a diameter of 1.2m.~~

- a. When in a road reserve, must not exceed 0.6m in diameter or a protrusion distance of 0.8m from the structure to which it is attached;
- b. When outside of road reserve in a residential zone, must not exceed 0.6m in diameter or a protrusion distance of 0.8m from the structure to which it is attached;

- c. When outside of road reserve in a Local Centre Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Open Space Zones, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone must not exceed 1.2m in diameter; and
 - d. When outside of road reserve in a Mixed Use Zone, Commercial Zone, Large Format Retail Zone, Special Purpose Zones, Industrial Zones and Rural Zones must not exceed 2.0m in diameter;
3. Omni directional 'whip' or dipole antenna must not exceed:
- a. 1.6m in vertical length,
 - b. 60mm in diameter, and
 - c. 1.5m in horizontal length.
4. A headframe ~~must not exceed:~~
- a. 2.5m in diameter in Residential Zones (except when located in a road) When in road reserve in the Residential Zones and Open Space Zones must not exceed 1.6m wide (not including attached antenna);~~or~~
 - b. When in road reserve in the Local Centre Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Metropolitan Zone, Mixed-Use Zone, City Centre Zone and Special Purpose Zones must not exceed 2.5m wide (not including attached antenna);
 - c. When outside of road reserve in the Local Centre Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone and Mixed-Use Zone must not exceed 2.5m wide (not including attached antenna);
 - d. When in road reserve in the Commercial Zone, Large Format Retail Zone, Industrial Zones and Rural Zones must not exceed 4.5m wide (not including attached antenna);
 - e. When outside of road reserve in the Commercial Zone, Large Format Retail Zone and Industrial Zones must not exceed 4.5m wide (not including attached antenna); and
 - f. 6m in diameter in all other zones.
- ~~5. In residential zones, aboveground mounted equipment associated with antennas must be located within the antenna mounts.~~

6. Aboveground mounted equipment must not exceed 1m in length.
7. The area when measured in plan view of aboveground mounted equipment ~~not~~ *associated with antennas* must not exceed:
 - a. 0.5m² if unenclosed, and
 - b. 1.0m² if enclosed in a three-dimensional casing.

PINF-P1

62. PINF-P1 is a policy which seeks to protect regionally significant infrastructure. By definition in the PDP, which follows the definition in the Wellington Regional Policy Statement, telecommunication networks as prescribed by the Telecommunications Act 2001 incorporate all elements of a system comprising telecommunication links to permit telecommunication, as regionally significant infrastructure.
63. Submission Point 311.79 sought a new clause be added to PINF-P9 to control buildings in close proximity to existing telecommunications antenna.
64. The reporting officer recommends that this relief be rejected on the basis that *“it would be a hanging policy clause, as it is not implemented by any notified PDP provisions. The submitter has not suggested any supporting rules and standards which would implement their requested policy clause”* (Paragraph 781 of the S42A Report).
65. The reporting officer also notes that the *by enabling suitable heights for telecommunication poles or providing for the location of facilities atop building is a better approach to ensuring telecommunication facilities are effective.*
66. In my opinion, the heights prescribed in the PDP and NESTF are effective only where buildings, particularly in urban zones, are constructed to their permitted height limit. If a building is allowed by resource consent to breach the permitted height limit, the efficacy of any nearby telecommunication antenna, as well as the health and safety of the building occupant, can be adversely affected. Buildings effectively disrupt antenna signal, and higher buildings can also be within the radiofrequency plume, which can result in the facility no longer complying with the requisite New Zealand Standard.

67. I note that the corporate evidence provided by the telecommunications companies highlights and provides examples of the reverse sensitivity issues that the telecommunications networks face.
68. In respect of the reporting officers point regarding supporting rules, I suggest that the simplest way to ensure that the PDP appropriately provides protects telecommunication antennas as regionally significant infrastructure is to include in PINF-P1 the clause as per Submission Point 311.79 and add, as a matter of discretion to all building height related standards in the following zones, *any effects on any telecommunication antenna, and subsequent consultation with the network operator of that antenna*. The zones that this should apply to are:
- Residential Zones;
 - Commercial and Mixed Use Zones;
 - Special Purpose Zones.
69. These are the zones where the permitted building height limit is within 5m of the permitted pole height limit. In other zones, there is a much larger discrepancy between the two height limits, and therefore much more unlikely that a landowner will construct a building that adversely affects an antenna.
70. As such, my requested relief is as follows:

Amend PINF-P1 as follows:

PINF-P1 Protecting regionally significant infrastructure

Regionally significant infrastructure is protected from incompatible new subdivision, use and development by:

- 1. Avoiding the location of activities sensitive to hazardous substance risk within a defined risk management overlay.*
- 2. Avoiding activities sensitive to the National Grid, and controlling buildings, structures and earthworks within a defined National Grid Yard.*
- 3. Controlling subdivision within a defined National Grid Subdivision Corridor.*

4. *Controlling subdivision, buildings, structures, earthworks and activities sensitive to gas transmission infrastructure within a defined Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor*
5. *Controlling noise sensitive activities within a defined Highway and Railway Noise Overlay.*
6. [Controlling building heights in close proximity to existing telecommunication antenna.](#)

And, add as *Matter of discretion if the standard is breached*, the following words to standards:

- LLRZ-S3;
- MRZ-S3:
- HRZ-S3;
- CCZ-PREC2-S2;
- MCZ-S1;
- LCZ-S1;
- NCZ-S1;
- HOSZ-S2;
- MAZ-S2;
- QUARZ-S1;
- SMZ-S1; and
- TEDZ-S1

[any effects on any telecommunication antenna, and subsequent consultation with the network operator of that antenna](#)

Concluding Comments

71. There are no further matters which I consider require consideration for this hearing.



Tom Anderson

4 September 2026

Commented [TA1]: Confirm when evidence is lodged

Appendix A: Submissions Addressed in the Infrastructure s42A Report where Officer's Recommended Relief is accepted

Submission	Provision	S42A Recommendation
311.2	Definition of <i>antenna</i>	Accept
311.3	Definition of <i>cabinet</i>	Accept
311.5	Definition of <i>customer connection line</i>	Accept
311.7	Definition of <i>infrastructure</i>	Accept
311.9	Definition of <i>network utility operator</i>	Accept
311.10	Definition of <i>regionally significant infrastructure</i>	Accept in Part
311.13	Definition of <i>upgrading</i>	Accept in Part
311.17	INSD-O1 Infrastructure: Integration	Accept
311.18	INSD-O2 Infrastructure: Coordination	Accept
311.19	INSD-O3 Infrastructure: National and Regional Significance	Accept
311.21	UDSD-O4 Urban Form and Development: Location of Urban Development	Accept in Part
311.22	Introduction – other regulatory requirements	Accept
311.23	Introduction – Relationship with other chapters	Accept in Part
311.24	INF-O1 Benefits of infrastructure	Accept
311.25	INF-O2 Adverse effects of infrastructure	Accept
311.26	INF-O3 Infrastructure availability and capacity	Reject
311.27	INF-O4 Transport network	Accept
311.28	INF-P1 Recognise benefits of infrastructure	Accept in Part
311.29	INF-P2 Provide for infrastructure	Accept
311.30	INF-P3 Planning and delivery of infrastructure	Accept
311.31	INF-P4 Technological advances	Accept in Part
311.32	INF-P5 Adverse effects of infrastructure	Accept
311.33	INF-P6 Consideration of the adverse effects of infrastructure	Accept in Part
311.34	INF-P7 Upgrading and developing the transport network	Accept in Part
311.35	INF-P9 Upgrading and developing infrastructure in natural hazard overlays	Accept in Part
311.40	INF-P14 Upgrading and developing infrastructure in the Active Street Frontage Overlay	Accept in Part
311.41	Rules Introduction	Accept

Submission	Provision	S42A Recommendation
311.42	INF-R1 Operation of infrastructure involving radiofrequency fields	Accept
311.43	INF-R2 Operation, maintenance, repair, and decommissioning of infrastructure	Accept in Part
311.44	INF-R3 Upgrading of infrastructure, excluding transport network infrastructure, and gas and transmission pipelines over 110kV	Accept
311.45	INF-R4 New vehicle access tracks and extensions to existing vehicle access tracks ancillary to infrastructure	Accept
311.46	INF-R5 Temporary infrastructure and temporary electricity generators and self-contained power units to supply existing infrastructure	Accept
311.47	INF-R6 Signs associated with operating, maintaining, and repairing, or developing, upgrading and decommissioning of infrastructure, not including signs for the purpose of operating the transport network which are located in road reserve or rail corridor	Accept
311.48	INF-R7 New cabinets (not regulated by the NESTF)	Accept
311.49	INF-R8 New infrastructure located within existing buildings	Accept
311.50	INF-R10 New underground structures other than pipelines	Accept
311.51	INF-R11 New antennas or aboveground mounted equipment attached to existing support structure or buildings (not regulated by the NESTF)	Reject
311.52	INF-R12 New support structures including telecommunication poles, with or without associated lines (not over 110kV), antenna or aboveground mounted equipment (not regulated by the NESTF)	Reject
311.53	INF-R13 New customer connection lines and support structures (not regulated by the NESTF)	Reject
311.55	INF-R25 Infrastructure not otherwise provided for or subject to any other rule in chapter	Accept
311.56	Assessment matters for Restricted Discretionary Activities	Reject
311.57	Standards	Accept in Part
311.58	INF-S1 Radiofrequency fields and electric magnetic fields	Accept
311.60	INF-S3 Underground infrastructure	Accept
311.61	INF-S4 Cabinets located within road reserve or the rail corridor	Accept in Part
311.62	INF-S5 Cabinets not located within road reserve or the rail corridor	Accept

Submission	Provision	S42A Recommendation
311.64	INF-S7 Size – Support structures not regulated by the NESTF	Accept in Part
311.65	INF-S8 Location – Support structures	Accept
311.67	INF-S10 Height – Building mounted antennas not regulated by the NESTF	Accept
311.68	INF-S11 Temporary Infrastructure - Duration	Accept
311.69	INF-S12 Customer Connection Lines	Accept
311.70	INF-S13 Signs	Accept
311.71	INF-S14 Buildings and structures, other than cabinets or support structures	Accept
311.72	INF-S15 Road design	Accept in Part
311.73	Table 1: Street tree specifications	Accept in Part
311.74	INF-S16 Earthworks – Slope, height, depth, and location	Accept in Part
311.75	INF-S17 Earthworks – Area limit, including trenching	Accept in Part
311.78	PINF-O1 Adverse effects on infrastructure	Accept