

Phone (Residential) +64-9-424 0134
Mobile: +64-27 492 5189
email kdbirt@gisborne.net.nz

K. D. Birt
P O Box 830,
Whangaparaoa
WHANGAPARAOA 0943
30 November 2019

From the Local Government Liaison Officer

Eden Edwardson
Support Assistant
District Plan Department.

Re: Questions Raised at the Amateur Radio Submission 72 Hearing.

Dear Eden,

I feel that some of the replies I gave to one or two of the questions asked by the Hearings Commissioners were not as lucid or as helpful as they could be. If it is appropriate, can you please hand this letter on to the commissioners?

- 1) Regarding how the Rules concerning the Auckland Council Unitary Plan came into existence, I gave a fairly glib reply that “They came out of left field”. Expanding on this, NZART had been requesting a “Basic set of provisions that would not require a Resource Consent” (with the Tauranga rules given as an example) and the Council Planners were adamant that they wanted all ARCs to be “Restricted Discretionary”. I have no way of knowing what happened in the Hearing Panel deliberations, but I would guess that in order to provide a compromise to both parties, they decided to just import the rules which had been decided in another Environment Court case in another large city – Wellington.
- 2) As Whangarei Commissioners correctly observed, the Amateur Radio Configuration rules in the Unitary Plan talked mostly about poles, but did allow for other structures in (25) (b). The Hearing on Definitions occurred much earlier in the Plan process –the definition on Height, and the definition on Buildings both allow something larger than a pole, but unfortunately, these definitions themselves are not exactly in harmony.
- 3) The Unitary Plan Definition on Height allows poles to be at Zone Height, plus one third. In residential zones, this is $8\text{m} + 2.66\text{m} = 10.66\text{m}$. In Rural Lifestyle Zones this becomes 12m. But the 18m rule applying to poles attached to buildings for one 102mm pole survives.
- 4) On the Commissioners’ question of whether 18m would suffice in Whangarei, we said yes, it would be acceptable. The point is that ALL antennas are a compromise, and 20m masts are themselves a compromise. An 18m mast is slightly more of a compromise, but it would be acceptable.
- 5) The very last question raised by the Commissioners concerned what, exactly, was the provision in the proposed Plan Change? The answer given by Council Planners was a great shock to NZART – that aerials had to conform to the “building bulk and location provisions of the underlying zones”. Re-reading the S.42A report we now recognise that it did, in fact, mention this. Now that we understand what this provision means, we would like to add some additional matters for consideration:
 - a. Any metallic object located close to an aerial, significantly degrades the performance of that aerial. That applies to every metallic roof material used in housing, and also to all houses that use steel framing.

- b. Driving around Whangarei, it will be observed that virtually every TV antenna is mounted one to two metres ABOVE the roofs of the dwellings. There is a very well established technical reason for this.
- c. If the principle persists that aerials may effectively be no higher than Zone Height, then the corollary is that if anyone wants terrestrial TV reception, then the roof of their dwelling would need to be below the specified Zone Height. Is this an unintended consequence of the proposed rule about aerials?
- d. Every District Plan for which NZART has provided submissions over the last 10 years has made a provision that aerials (not just amateur aerials) may be between 2 and 5 metres above Zone height – even the Auckland Unitary Plan. Could it be that all these councils recognise the requirement that aerials must be above the height of obstructions?



Douglas Birt. MBA, BE(Elec), CMEngNZ.