

## Semi – structured Interview Questions: Vodafone

1. Could you advise in general whether you are intending to develop any new telecommunication sites within the QLDC district? If so where would you like these to be?
  - *Yes, Vodafone is continually improving mobile coverage and intends to establish new telecommunication facilities within QLDC.*
  - *At this stage Vodafone is still evaluating coverage and site options. Therefore, no specific locations or numbers have been listed.*
2. Do you think that the current triggers between controlled activities, discretionary, etc are working well? If not would you like these altered, and if so how?

*No I do not. I believe that the network utilities section of your district plan is convoluted and hard to follow. For example I feel that permitted standards should be listed as follows “the following are permitted network utilities throughout the district...telecommunication masts and associated antennas not greater than Xm in height in the Rural Zone”. I do not feel that you should have to constantly change chapters to find out what height is permitted. Other District Plans often use tables which make finding permitted dimensions much easier to follow.*
3. Are the District Plan provisions dealing with height appropriate? If not, what changes would you like to see?
  - *From my experience with using other District Plans in New Zealand I find that the height controls within your District Plan are some of the most restrictive height controls in the country. Especially when compared against the permitted standards within the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities within the road reserve.*
  - *For example a permitted height standard of 5m in residential zones and 8m height in general rural zone is unrealistic. It would be a very rare circumstance that such a facility would ever be established.*
  - *Attached is a summary of the permitted height and width controls for a cross section of Councils in NZ, as can be seen the controls vary significantly from those in the in the Queenstown Lakes District Plan.*
  - *From my experience I believe a realistic height standard is 20m (permitted) in general rural and Industrial zones. In order for a shorter mast to cover certain areas at a lower height it will need to be located in an elevated position (such as on hills and ridgelines) making the facilities more visually intrusive.*
  - *In short “small masts mean more masts”; a shorter mast covers less distance and thus their needs to be more of them to cover the same distance.*
  - *I believe that 10m is a realistic height in residential zones (especially when compared to the NES). Other controls such as height relation to boundary and setbacks can be used to mitigate visual effects from masts especially in residential areas.*

4. Do you have any concerns with the Site Standards listed for utilities, for example the colour and landscaping requirements? If so what changes would you like?
- *No, I feel that landscaping and appropriate colouring are important tools which can be used to significantly mitigate visual effects.*
5. Thinking back on some of the applications you have lodged recently did your initial proposal change after you submitted it to the Council?
- If yes, (i) what changes were made; (ii) why were the changes made; (iii) who requested the changes; and (iv) did you agree with the need for the changes?
- *To be honest it has been some time since an application was last lodged in QLDC (over a year ago).*
  - *However, generally in other parts of NZ, no it's not often that we make changes to proposals.*
  - *But yes, S92 for further information are sometimes required by Councils. However, this is something that has decreased over the years, as both Vodafone and District Councils understand each other and work together.*
  - *Often, with the use of good realistic district plan controls, sites can be selected and designed to avoid the need of significant changes or S92 requests.*
  - *The NES has helped significantly in areas of radio frequency and noise assessment of cabinets.*
  - *One senior level network utility planning contact also helps a lot. I find that this makes the processing of applications faster. By having a good working relationship good applications can be lodged and time frames reduced.*
6. Would you have designed the proposal differently if you did not need to take into account the District Plan's utility provisions?
- If yes, in what ways? If not, why not?
- *This all depends on the site. For example, a 30m mast may provide the best coverage, however if the site is located in a residential area, than this is something we would usually never consider. The natural receiving environment would have to be appropriate, for example if a high voltage power corridor already existed with 40m pylons, than yes, a 30m facility adjacent to the power corridor may be appropriate. At Vodafone providing premium coverage is important to us, but not at the risk of causing adverse visual effects on environment. After all, we too live in the same environment and country.*
7. Who do you believe exerted more control on the resource consent process – yourself as the applicant, or the Council? Why?
- *In QLDC the Council, this is because the controls are so restrictive.*
  - *When an application is discretionary it would be unrealistic to believe that the applicant has any significant control at the first stage in the RMA process.*
8. Do you have any concerns about any applications in terms of how they have been processed, and if so what were these? and how could it have been done better?
- *At this stage no. But as mentioned earlier, my experience with QLDC is limited.*

## Semi – structured Interview Questions: Two Degrees Mobile

1. Could you advise in general whether you are intending to develop any new telecommunication sites within the QLDC district? If so where would you like these to be?

*We have already considered putting one on the hill overlooking Arrow town (beside the existing Vodafone/telecom on the hill), The Remarkables Ski field on site (like Coronet Peak) or possibly on a hilltop facing it may be a future .....and then Wanaka, Cromwell I presume. At the moment I can only confirm:*

1. *A site to cover Arrow Town either a hill top or in town solution (less preferable due to low height and limited coverage)*
2. *More capacity in the central township – Shotover Jet area (Gondola and Deer Farm heights sites are not great for coverage in the central township as they are too high)*
3. *A site in Arthurs Point (Vodafone and Telecom are already there) – linking township to Coronet Peak.*

*Basically we are just looking to make sure we also have sites where Vodafone and Telecom are to match their coverage.*

2. Do you think that the current triggers between controlled activities, discretionary, etc are working well? If not would you like these altered, and if so how?

*There isn't much that should be changed I think... perhaps a greater level of restriction on mast diameter in general to ensure Council has Discretion, particularly in sensitive areas. I would also remove 1.2-2.4m dimensions for microwave dishes from the Controlled status for sensitive zones, in fact I think all antennas above 1.2m in diameter should be Discretionary. I also think there should be minimum boundary offsets of masts from neighbouring residential units*

*i.e. in Christchurch they have a minimum 20m distance requirement of masts from buildings – for their updated Banks Peninsular District Plan they have increased this to 30m*

*At the very least if a mast falls over (unlikely) in a Residential Zone it should not be able to hit a neighbour's house or associated out buildings.*

*I think a minimum of 30m should be adopted in terms of permitted activities/or the height of the mast = 50%*

*Two options - Minimum separation distance 30m from residential unit (or any consented part of in terms of what determines a residential unit e.g. garage, sheds etc) Or Minimum separation distance proposed mast height plus 50%*

*I think 30m is probably better considering it is unlikely that masts greater than 20m will be erected in the QTown area close to residential units.... Unless of course they are then use:*

*30m minimum distance for mast up to 20m in height and if mast is greater than 20m in height then minimum separation distance = mast height (including antennas, lightning strike rods etc etc) + 50% e.g. 25m mast is 25m + 12.5m = 37.5m distant*

### Semi – structured Interview Questions: Telecom

1. Could you advise in general whether you are intending to develop any new telecommunication sites within the QLDC district? If so where would you like these to be?

*Telecom continually upgrades its network to meet new demand and improve the services offered to customers. On this basis, there will be additional telecommunication sites established in the QLDC area, primarily including mobile phone sites and landline and broadband cables and cabinets. As the new sites are required in response to new demand (both in new areas and for additional capacity and services) and to fit in with the existing network, the locations cannot be determined in advance.*

2. Do you think that the current triggers between controlled activities, discretionary, etc are working well? If not would you like these altered, and if so how?

*The majority of new sites recently established have been at the lower end of the consent range (permitted, controlled or discretionary). This is primarily because the designs and sites chosen have placed considerable weight on meeting the district plan requirements.*

3. Are the District Plan provisions dealing with height appropriate? If not, what changes would you like to see?

*The height provisions are complex (being based mainly on zone height plus an additional height allowance). To determine status, more than one rule must be referred to, in addition to the underlying zone rules. Further, the height rules are not well targeted, particularly with respect to outstanding landscapes. Greater flexibility in rural areas that are not listed as outstanding landscapes could be considered (an 8m height limit is unrealistically low). In addition, the rule on height in the "Site Standards" does not make sense. As a start position, Telecom generally seeks the following heights on a nation-wide basis – local conditions would refine these:*

- *Residential – zone height +3m*
- *Industrial – 20-25m*
- *Commercial/suburban commercial – 10-15m*
- *Rural (non-landscape) – 20-36m*

4. Do you have any concerns with the Site Standards listed for utilities, for example the colour and landscaping requirements? If so what changes would you like?

*The site standards are generally poorly drafted and probably do not achieve the intended outcome, particularly if the design complies with all other rules:*

*Setback from boundaries – this is poorly targeted; in that it requires setbacks for almost all masts (they are all over 6m high). This generally achieves very little in terms of mitigation of visual effects.*

*Landscaping – requiring a small amount of landscaping around urban sites or very remote sites provides no realistic mitigation, particularly where this is not required for other buildings in the zone.*

*Height – as stated above, this rule does not make sense, as it does not require any action.*

*Colour – this rule is very uncertain as a performance standard. Firstly, in terms of urban sites, it provides almost no guidance as almost all colours are present in an urban landscape. Secondly, for rural areas, one of the features of the QLDC area is the amount of seasonal variation – sites can often be green in spring, brown in summer and white in winter – this make “blending” with the surrounding environment difficult.*

5. Thinking back on some of the applications you have lodged recently did your initial proposal change after you submitted it to the Council?  
If yes, (i) what changes were made; (ii) why were the changes made; (iii) who requested the changes; and (iv) did you agree with the need for the changes?

*Two applications were recently subject to change, and these changes were both generated by landowner requests.*

6. Would you have designed the proposal differently if you did not need to take into account the District Plan’s utility provisions?  
If yes, in what ways? If not, why not?

*Yes, it is likely that some design aspects would have been different, particularly with respect to landscaping, setbacks and height.*

7. Who do you believe exerted more control on the resource consent process – yourself as the applicant, or the Council? Why?

*No opinion.*

8. Do you have any concerns about any applications in terms of how they have been processed, and if so what were these? and how could it have been done better?

No

9. Are there any other issues?

*QLDC has at times suggested that all mobile phone sites should be located on specified "utility sites". While the planning benefits of co-location are recognised, one of the primary site selection criteria is performance with respect to the location of customers, which is reliant on the wider network design. Given the geographical constraints of the QLDC area and Telecom's existing network design, location on identified utility sites is often not possible.*