

**Board of Inquiry
Hauauru Ma Raki Wind Farm Proposal**

In the matter of the Resource Management Act 1991

And

In the matter of resource consent applications by Contact Wind Limited
in respect of the Hauauru Ma Raki Wind farm Proposal

And

In the matter of notices of requirement and a resource consent
application by Contact Energy Limited for transmission
infrastructure related to the Hauauru ma Raki Wind Farm
Proposal

Brief of Evidence in chief of Elizabeth Ann Wright

1 My name is Elizabeth Ann Wright. I am a farmer owning a property with my husband Eric Bernard Allan at 1441 State Highway 22 Opuatia. We have owned part of our property for 23 years. Our original purchase was in part motivated by the views in all directions but particularly to the South. We could not afford to build a home until 1966 but in the meantime we undertook extensive planting for shelter, stock protection and beautification. We extended several of the three existing ponds and over the years have added new ponds so we have a total of thirteen. Together with the associated planting these have had the effect of increasing bird life. When we built our house we employed an architect well known for his work in rural and coastal environments to design a house which took advantage of the outstanding views especially to the South, and which would fit into the landscape. Our house is cedar clad. In 2000 (approx) we purchased the adjoining block to the South on SH22. This property fitted in with our own but also because it had limited house sites we did not want another purchaser to build a house which would spoil our view. Ironically such a site is precisely where the much more intrusive pylons are intended to be situated. Our property is a beef and sheep farm. We also crop some areas from time to time.

2 We have been involved in discussions with Contact Energy and other land owners since October 2007 when Contact advised us of the proposal. We have attended several meetings at the Wairamarama Hall and met with Wayne Mills and others at our property on several occasions. Contact's photographers have also taken a photomontage from our property (see attached).

3 We have also had discussion with our neighbour Stephen Markham with whom we share an airstrip.

4 The effect of the proposed siting of two pylons and associate wiring from the property on the other side of SH 22 (Lochiel) to the property of Mr. Bruce Middleton to the east of us would be as follows
Farming operations. These are described in detail in the evidence of my husband Eric Bernard Allan

B Visual and landscape effects on us as owners and on travellers on SH 22 and New Zealand's reputation for unspoilt landscapes.

5 I would like to comment further on the evidence in chief of some of Contact's witnesses.

Frances Chanel Geoghegan Volume 1 Page 14 Para 68/69 dealing with period of commissioning and lapse period of 10 years.

I consider that this is an excessive period for landowners to be in limbo not knowing whether the project will proceed and therefore being limited in planning for their properties. A request for a lapse period of four years would be appropriate in my opinion.

I also note that Contact Energy's Half Year Report to 31 December 2008 signed by Grant King Chairman and David Baldwin Managing Director states on page 3 "the current economics of wind will require energy prices to rise before execution of wind projects would be justified.....and Contact is preparing its projects for execution when market conditions support them." This preparation should not be at the expense of, and impinge upon the rights of land owners such as ourselves.

Page 16 Paragraph 77. The economic viability of undergrounding does not in my opinion override the desire of the people of New Zealand to maintain an attractive and unsullied landscape.

Wayne Mills Volume 1 Pages 10 to 20 Development of compensation proposals for land owners.

Whilst noting that adequacy of compensation will not be considered by the Board of Enquiry Mr. Mills elaborates in detail on compensation methodology. We do not wish to comment extensively on this matter but wish to state that we have our own view which we would promote vigorously should this become an issue.

Page 24 Para 89 to 90 and Para 118 Top dressing. See comments on our farming operation.

Christopher Davis-James Volume 2 Pages 53 -55 there is no suggestion that removal of pylons would be part of decommissioning.

We request that the Board of Inquiry includes appropriate conditions if resource consent is granted.

Helen Yorke Volume 2 page 000002.p(x11) we note there was no discussion with us about any change to the transmission corridor.

Graeme John Black Volume 3. I would like to comment that Mr. Black as a landowner in favour of turbines has been greatly advantaged by the professional assistance he has received from Contact's lawyers in preparing his submissions. It is unfortunate that landowners who oppose aspects of Contact's proposal, such as ourselves, are unable to afford such professional assistance in preparing such submissions.

Henry Kent Volume 3. We oppose overhead lines but support undergrounding of cables. Page 6 Para 24 the narrower easement required for underground cables would be extremely advantageous for our ongoing farming operations.

Para 25 In regard to partial undergrounding I understand that there were 23 properties which were scheduled to have pylons on them if the wind farm proceeds and the planned pylon path is followed. (See evidence of Wayne Mills page 30.) I also understand that in the past two years Contact has purchased a number of properties which are intended to

have pylons on them and that they have reached a financial settlement with a number of other land owners.

I do not know how many pylons are effected by these arrangements or what number of properties are effected, However if Contact had overhead pylons on these properties and undergrounding across SH 22 and on the remaining properties this would make a substantial difference to the cost of undergrounding figures which have been supplied and which Contact maintains are prohibitive. Therefore undergrounding should be considered as a serious alternative.

Para 28 In regard to comments on undergrounding of cables in Europe and in other countries we note that in a letter to us from Mr. Wayne Mills dated 3/4/2008 Mr. Mills stated very high cost ratios in the USA and Japan and said, significantly in our view, that the decision to bury cables in those countries and in Europe is driven by two factors- a lack of space (e.g. densely populated urban areas) or environmental restrictions that do not permit the construction of overhead lines. I would urge the Board of Enquiry to take a stand for the future and impose such restrictions in this instance to promote the beauty of our New Zealand environment.

I would also comment again on the inability of individuals such as ourselves to commission any independent research into issues such as the costs of undergrounding versus overhead wiring.

Timothy Allan Crichton Volume 3. We refer to our previous comment relating to Wayne Mills and compensation proposals.

Gavin Craig Lister Volume 4 Page 63 Paragraph 229(b). I consider Mr. Lister has underestimated the effect of the pylons on our view. He acknowledges the effect as "high" but fails to mention that one of the pylons will protrude considerably above the skyline ruining views from the house.

Page 63 paragraph 229 (c). I disagree with the statement that "while views are attractive they are not particularly noteworthy". He would say that, wouldn't he!! However it is very common for tourists, local and from overseas to stop at our gate and also further south to take photographs and to remark on the beauty of the outlook.

Page 67. Visual amenity from Public Views. We note that Contact has not provided photo evidence of views looking south where the public views would be most affected. We have had signs on our property for the past eighteen months drawing attention to these views. Perhaps the prominence of these signs prevented Contact taking photos in that area!!

Appendix 1 page 000088. I would point out that our house is grey cedar, not light coloured block. It is not orientated to the north east away from the line (see page 63 para 229 where Mr. Lister describes the house correctly as built to take advantage of views towards the alignment). It is orientated equally to the south east.

It is difficult to see how screen planting would mitigate the view of the view of the pylons. To do so trees would need to be planted directly outside our sitting room and main bedroom windows. Extensive planting would in fact take away the view the house was built for, would be unsightly and could destabilize the bank below the house.

Page 000094 contradicts what is stated on 000088 and supports my evidence.

David Black Volume 6 pages 22 and 23 Auditory effects. I have no expertise in this area but I note that Mr. Black does not comment on any effect on animals (sheep and cattle) which would be grazing around the pylons. The Board of Inquiry should obtain evidence from independent veterinarians and the SPCA. It is noted that Mr. Black does not have any veterinary qualifications.

Page 27 indirect effects Para 115, I have been unable to locate the conditions referred to. It would be unreasonable for individuals to bear costs to changes to farm machinery and fencing and for injuries for stock caused by the applicant.

Pages 25 and 26 Electrical fields. There is no mention of cattle and Mr. Black's statements relating to horses do not inspire confidence in the welfare of farm animals. Also if horses react adversely this could seriously limit farming options and resale possibilities.

Page 32 Para 141 appears to contradict paragraph 105 in particular.

Overall Mr. Black's evidence as to the ongoing welfare of farm animals is unconvincing.

Stephen Daysh Volume 7. Consents duration is requested to be unlimited. As stated in relation to Mr. Geoghegan's evidence four years is recommended as appropriate.

Volume 8 pages 00022 3 and 4 Landscape mitigation on private land. See previous comments on Mr. Lister's evidence on mitigating major effects on landscape in our case.

Conclusion

- 1 I request that my evidence should be considered in conjunction with that of my husband Eric Bernard Allan. I am totally in agreement with his evidence but have taken my own individual approach in regard to some areas in part because I have had more time to try to read and absorb the totality of Contact's evidence.
- 2 I do not oppose the provision of energy to the country by means of wind farms/ turbines but consider a national strategy in regard to effected landscapes should be finalized before approval is granted for the current project.
- 3 I do oppose overhead pylons and wires for the reasons outlined. I request the Board of Enquiry, if it approves the wind farm to make a condition that

undergrounding must occur at the very least across SH 22 and all properties whose owners oppose overhead transmission.

- 4 Should approval of the wind farm and pylons be granted there should be stringent provisions relating to decommissioning and removal of pylons within a specified brief period of time and a bond to cover this contingency lodged with an appropriate authority such as the Regional Council.
- 5 I would emphasise my opinion that while in theory the Board of Enquiry provides a robust method of assessing the evidence provided by Contact Energy the fact is that individual submitters such as ourselves have neither the resources nor the time to engage expert witnesses to provide an alternative view to those of Contact. In our case this is particularly so in regard to the costs and drawbacks of undergrounding power. We therefore believe that we are severely disadvantaged in this process.
- 6 The health and safety of our animals is also a matter of major concern which is insufficiently addressed in Contact's evidence.