

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT  
AT CHRISTCHURCH**

**I TE KŌTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA  
KI ŌTAUTAHI**

**ENV-2024-CHC-36**

**UNDER**

The Resource Management Act 1991  
(the **Act**)

**IN THE MATTER**

of an appeal pursuant to clause 14 of  
Schedule 1 of the Act

**BETWEEN**

**TE RŪNANGA O MOERAKI, KĀTI  
HUIRAPA RŪNAKA KI PUKETERAKI,  
TE RŪNANGA O ŌTĀKOU AND  
HOKONUI RŪNANGA**

**First Appellants**

(continued overleaf)

---

**NOTICE OF WISH TO BE PARTY TO PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO  
SECTION 274 OF THE ACT**

**7 JUNE 2024**

---



**GALLOWAY COOK ALLAN LAWYERS**

Bridget Irving/Simon Peirce

Bridget.Irving@gallowaycookallan.co.nz

Simon.Peirce@gallowaycookallan.co.nz

PO Box 143

Dunedin 9054

Ph: +64 (03) 477 7312

Fax: (03) 477 5564

**AND**                    **TE AO MARAMA INCORPORATED  
ON BEHALF OF WAIHOPAI  
RŪNAKA, TE RŪNANGA O  
ŌRAKA APARIMA, AND TE  
RŪNANGA O AWARUA**

**Second Appellants**

**AND**                    **TE RŪNANGA O NGĀI TAHU**

**Third Appellants**

**AND**                    **OTAGO REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**Respondent**

**AND**                    **AURORA ENERGY LIMITED,  
NETWORK WAITAKI LIMITED  
AND POWERNET LIMITED**

**Section 274 Party**

**NOTICE OF WISH TO BE PARTY TO PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO  
SECTION 274 OF THE ACT**

To: Registrar

Environment Court

Christchurch

1. Aurora Energy Limited (**Aurora Energy**), Network Waitaki Limited (**Network Waitaki**) and PowerNet Limited (**PowerNet**) (together **EDBs**) wish to be a party to the following proceeding: *Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou, Hokonui Rūnanga, Te Ao Marama Incorporated, Te Rūnanga o Ōraka Aparima, Te Rūnanga o Awarua, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu v Otago Regional Council*, ENV-2024-CHC-36.
2. The proceeding relates to an appeal to the Environment Court on a decision on the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement (**PORPS**) made by the Otago Regional Council.
3. The EDBs submitted on the PORPS, including on matters subject to the proceeding:
  - (a) Aurora Energy Original Submission 0315 and Further Submission FS003153.
  - (b) Network Waitaki Original Submission 0320 and Further Submission FS003203.
  - (c) PowerNet Original Submission 0511.
4. The EDBs also have an interest in the proceedings that is greater than the public generally as jointly they supply electricity to all the homes, communities, business and emergency services in Otago:
  - (a) Aurora Energy is the largest network operating in Otago and supplies approximately 92,000 customers across two non-contiguous networks in Dunedin, Central Otago and the Queenstown Lakes District.

- (b) PowerNet is a network management company which is contracted by OtagoNet Joint Venture to maintain and operate its network. That network is largely to the north and south of Dunedin, servicing towns south from Waihola, Balclutha, Lawrence and Clinton, and towns to the north of Dunedin including Waitati, Palmerston, Macrae Mine and Ranfurly.
  - (c) Network Waitaki serves customers in north Otago and parts of the Canterbury region with the network extending from the Mackenzie Basin around Omarama and Ōhau to Oamaru.
- 5. The EDBs are not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308D of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 6. The EDBs are interested in all of the proceeding.
- 7. Without limiting the generality of the EDBs interest, they have a particular interest in the following issues:
  - (a) Energy, infrastructure and transport: EIT-INF-P13A - Managing the effects of infrastructure, nationally significant infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure within the coastal environment
  - (b) Coastal Environment: CE-O5 – Activities in the coastal environment
- 8. The EDBs support the majority of the Appellant's relief as set out in their reasons on appeal, including in particular the "ki uta, ki tai" approach, a resource management approach which emphasises the holistic management of integrated elements within the natural environment. However, for the reasons that follow, there are aspects of the relief which the EDBs consider will create practical difficulties with the operation, maintenance, development and upgrade of their respective distribution networks. Where relief is indicated as being in opposition to, it is done so with a view of seeking to provide for the functional needs and operational needs of the network, much of which is regionally significant, and all of which is critical to the function of everyday life.
- 9. The EDBs oppose the relief sought for the following reasons:

- (a) The EDBs perform a critical function through the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the electricity distribution network. These networks provide the link between the National Grid and electricity consumers.
- (b) Parts of the EDBs networks have been recognised as regionally significant infrastructure and all of the network is a lifeline utility for the purpose of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Given the importance of this infrastructure, it is imperative that the PORPS recognise and provide for the ongoing operation, maintenance development and upgrade of the network.
- (c) The purpose of the PORPS is to achieve the purpose of the Act through issues, policies and methods which achieve integrated management of natural and physical resources of the whole region. As a consequence, it is important that regionally significant infrastructure and lifeline utilities be recognised as an activity which can occur be located in a range of environments.
- (d) Activities seeking to locate near the existing electricity distribution network have the potential to compromise the function of the network, foreclose opportunities to upgrade the network for the benefit of the wider community, as well as to create risks to the health and safety of people in close proximity to the network.
- (e) The relief sought by the Appellant has the potential to create reverse sensitivity effects and/or compromise the operation, maintenance, development or upgrade of the electricity distribution network which may have a functional need or operational needs to locate in areas of concern to the appeal.
- (f) The EDBs seek to ensure that the relief sought by the Appellant does not give rise to unintended consequences for the management of their networks in the region.
- (g) The relief sought in respect of CE-O5 appears to be directed to protecting customary fisheries. However, the relief has been framed in broad terms and purports to “avoid adverse

environmental and cultural effects” generally. The relief is supported to the extent that it applies to the protection of customary fisheries.

- (h) With respect to the electricity distribution network, the relief sought to amend EIT-INF-P13A to direct effects be addressed by HCV-WT-P2 can be provided for by way of the bespoke effects management hierarchy that has been sought by the EDBs in their proceeding.

10. The EDBs agree to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.



Solicitor for Aurora Energy, Network Waitaki and PowerNet

Dated 7 June 2024

Service details for the EDBs

Attention	Bridget Irving / Simon Peirce
Address	Gallaway Cook Allan Lawyers 123 Vogel Street, Level 2 DUNEDIN 9054
Telephone	(03) 477 7312
Fax	(03) 477 5564
Email (preferred)	bridget.irving@gallawaycookallan.co.nz simon.peirce@gallawaycookallan.co.nz

*Advice*

If you have any questions about this notice, contact the Environment Court in Auckland, Wellington, or Christchurch.