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 7 – Other Topics

---

SPEAKING NOTES - TOM ANDERSON

ON BEHALF OF

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

---

15 October 2026

SPEAKING NOTES

i. My name is Tom Anderson. I am a Principal Planner and a Director of Incite, a resource management consulting firm, and am providing expert evidence on behalf of Chorus, Connexa, FortySouth and Spark (the telecommunication companies) who lodged submissions on the Proposed Hutt City District Plan (PDP).

ii. My evidence in chief sought amendments to Rule TREE-R3 and SUB-S8.

iii. I have reviewed the rebuttal evidence of Hutt City Council's officers on both of these point, and note that the amendments I sought to TREE-R3 are now recommended to be accepted, whilst the amendments sought to SUB-S8 continue to have recommendation of rejection.

iv. Given there is now agreement on the wording for TREE-R3, I focus today on SUB-S8.

v. I continue to seek wording for SUB-S8 largely similar to that detailed at Paragraph 25 of my evidence in chief. One amendment is proposed to that wording, in that I am no longer seeking amendments to subclause 1, and instead incorporating the outcome into subclause 2.

vi. The amendment is as follows:

Amend SUB-S8 as follows:

SUB-S8 Telecommunications

1. *Open access telecommunication connections with sufficient capacity ~~(as confirmed by both the fibre and mobile network operators)~~ must be ~~provided~~ available to service each new allotment.*

2. *All new allotments must have provision for suitable telecommunication connections as follows:*

    a. *Where a connection to a fixed telecommunication line (fibre broadband) is available, all new allotments must be provided with a connection at the allotment boundary; and.*

    b. *~~Where no connection to a fixed telecommunication line (fibre broadband) is available,~~ sufficient wireless network capacity (as confirmed by the mobile network operators) must be available to serve all new allotments.*

Matters of discretion if the standard is breached:

1. *The extent to which the proposed telecommunications supply is sufficient for the development or activity it serves.*
2. *Alternative provision of telecommunications services.*
3. *Any site constraints that make compliance impracticable*

vii. The amendment is necessary as subclause 1 refers to open access networks, which fibre is, but mobile networks are not. The amendment to subclause 2 ensures that all new allotments have the option of both fixed and wireless telecommunication services, which is important as, and Mr McCarrison can talk more to this, people are more often than not having broadband in homes and businesses (delivered by either fibre or wirelessly), but use their mobile phones for calling. As I understand it, traditional calls on mobile phones solely rely on mobile networks, and do not go through the broadband connection within a home or business. They need to have coverage and capacity from an antenna. I do note however that technology within handsets is advancing to a point where more recent models can use a broadband connection to make calls (knowing as wifi calling).

viii. In his rebuttal evidence on Subdivision, Mr Wesney continues to recommend rejection, noting that *publicly available network coverage and service availability information, together with information on existing telecommunications infrastructure and the proposed servicing arrangements, may assist in demonstrating that telecommunications services are available to new allotments*[1].

ix. Coverage maps are publicly available. However, coverage is only one aspect of wireless telecommunications. Capacity within that coverage also needs to be considered. As I understand it, each cell that provides wireless coverage only has a certain bandwidth that it can supply. As data use and calling increases, by both existing and an increase in density of users within that cell, the capacity of the cell reaches a limit and then fails. The most obvious outcome of this is peoples calls appearing to fail for no reason when you are in an area that has coverage. I am sure most of us have experienced that at some point.

x. The best determinant of capacity are the radiofrequency engineers who look after each cell, hence why I seek the consultation with the mobile network operators in the relief sought. They

[1] Paragraph 4.28 of Mr Wesney's Subdivision Rebuttal Evidence.

can then determine whether or not antennas that service that cell should be upgraded, or the cell should be divided in two, with a new facility constructed. What the amendment is seeking is that decision regarding coverage and capacity is made proactively – i.e. when intensification is occurring, not reactively. At the moment, this happens reactively after a cell starts failing.

xi. I have sought advice from the mobile network operators as to whether SUB-S8 could suggest that any subdivision over a certain number of allotments would trigger consultation with the mobile network operators. I have been told that as each cell has different constraints, there is no ability to fix a number.

xii. I consider there to be parallels in capacity constraints with three waters infrastructure. As such I turned to the three waters chapter of the Proposed District Plan to determine what the methodology was for addressing capacity constraints regarding water. I note capacity is a policy matter which also forms a matter of discretion. In my experience of undertaking a number of multi unit residential subdivisions and land use consents in Hutt City, as well as Wellington and Porirua which have a similar framework to the PDP, the simplest way of determining either compliance with the permitted provisions or knowledge to address any capacity constraints is to consult with Tiaki Wai prior to applying for resource consent. Whilst this is not explicit in the PDP, it is in my view, best practice.

xiii. Essentially, with my proposed amendment I am seeking a similar best practice outcome for telecommunications. As consultation with mobile network operators has not been traditionally been done by developers, I consider direction in the plan to be necessary. As such, I continue to seek amendments to SUB-S8.



Tom Anderson

15 October 2026