

# **Contact Energy Limited – ‘Hauāuru mā raki’ Waikato wind farm project**

## **Summary of Submissions**

November 2008

Project Name: 'Hauāuru mā raki' Waikato wind farm – Summary of Submissions

Date of this version: November 2008

Status of Report: Final

This Report was prepared by: David Hill MA, MNZPI, Director  
Rebecca Scannell BRP (Hons), Grad NZPI, Consultant  
Emily Toh BPlan (Hons), Grad NZPI, Consultant

Hill Young Cooper Ltd

PO Box 8092

The Terrace, Wellington

p: 04 473 5310

f: 04 473 5307

e: r.scannell@hyc.co.nz

Hill Young Cooper Ltd

PO Box 99847

Newmarket, Auckland

p: 09 529 2684

f: 09 5204685

e: d.hill@hyc.co.nz

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
1.1	THE PROJECT.....	4
1.2	RESOURCE CONSENTS APPLIED FOR.....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>STATUS OF SUBMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1	HEARING OF SUBMITTERS.....	7
<b>3</b>	<b>SUBMITTERS' LOCATION</b> .....	<b>8</b>
3.1	SUBMITTERS' GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION.....	8
<b>4</b>	<b>REASONS FOR SUBMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>9</b>
4.1	CATEGORY 1 – EFFECTS ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT.....	10
4.2	CATEGORY 2 – SOCIAL AND CULTURAL EFFECTS.....	12
4.3	CATEGORY 3 – ECONOMIC EFFECTS.....	14
4.4	CATEGORY 4 – EFFECTS ON AMENITY.....	16
4.5	CATEGORY 5 – REGULATORY, STRATEGIC AND PROCESS ISSUES.....	19
4.6	CATEGORY 6 – OTHER.....	22
<b>5</b>	<b>DECISIONS SOUGHT</b> .....	<b>23</b>
5.1	DECISIONS REQUESTED.....	23
5.2	CONDITIONS REQUESTED AND SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE MITIGATED.....	23
	<b>APPENDIX 1: LIST OF SUBMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>27</b>
	<b>APPENDIX 2: SUBMITTERS' POSITION ON INDIVIDUAL APPLICATIONS</b> .....	<b>30</b>

# 1 Introduction

---

## 1.1 THE PROJECT

Contact Wind Limited and Contact Energy Limited ("Contact") are proposing to build a new 180-turbine wind farm – known as Hauāuru mā raki (Waikato Wind Farm). The wind farm is proposed to be located along 34 kilometres of the North Island's west coast from approximately four kilometres south of Port Waikato to Te Akau, some eight kilometres north of Raglan.

Hauāuru mā raki will produce up to 540 megawatts (MW) of electricity, and includes the construction, operation, maintenance, replacement, renewal and upgrading of a 220 kV transmission line, three substations, a switching station, and associated support structures, equipment and facilities.

The resource consents applied for are listed in section 1.2 below.

Hon Trevor Mallard called in Contact's proposal on 20 August 2008, under section 141B of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the RMA"), and referred the matter to a Board of Inquiry. The resource consent applications for the Hauāuru mā raki proposal were publicly notified by the Minister on 20 September 2008 and submissions were called. Receipt of submissions closed at 5pm on Monday 3 November 2008.

The Minister appointed a Board of Inquiry on 28 August 2008.

The Minister received 96 submissions on Contact's proposal. In accordance with the RMA, these submissions were referred to the Board of Inquiry. Six of these were late submissions received after the deadline. All late submissions were accepted by the Minister.

This document provides a summary of the submissions received on Contact's proposal. The full submissions are available as PDF files on the Ministry for the Environment's website.

---

## 1.2 RESOURCE CONSENTS APPLIED FOR

### Franklin District Council – Land-use Consents

- L08052:** all activities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of a wind farm
- L08053:** the re-opening and operation of Whitford Quarry including rock crushing and processing
- L08054:** two concrete batching plants
- L08055:** up to three public viewing areas (including signage) and associated parking areas
- L08056:** improvements to local roads

### **Franklin District Council – Notices of Requirement for Designation**

- L08057:** Orton Switchyard and ancillary facilities
- L08058:** Limestone Downs Substation and ancillary facilities
- L08059:** single circuit 220 kV transmission line linking the southern district boundary to Limestone Downs Substation
- L08060:** double circuit 220 kV transmission line linking Limestone Downs Substation to Orton Switchyard
- L08061:** double circuit 220 kV transmission line connecting Orton Switchyard to the existing Huntly/Otahuhu A transmission line

### **Waikato District Council – Land-use Consents**

- LUC00005/08:** all activities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of a wind farm
- LUC00005/08.01:** two concrete batching plants
- LUC00005/08.02:** improvements to local roads

### **Waikato District Council – Notices of Requirement for Designation**

- DES0012/08:** Matira Substation and ancillary facilities
- DES0013/08:** Te Akau Substation and ancillary facilities
- DES0014/08:** single circuit 220 kV transmission line linking Matira and Te Akau Substations to northern district boundary

### **Waikato Regional Council (Environment Waikato) – Earthworks Consents**

- WRC 117912:** earthworks, roading and tracking associated with construction, operation and maintenance of a wind farm
- WRC118074:** soil disturbance associated with re-opening and operation of the Whitford Quarry

### **Waikato Regional Council (Environment Waikato) – Water take Consents**

- WRC 117913:** to take up to 104 m<sup>3</sup> water per day at a rate of up to 1.2 L/s from the Waikawau Stream
- WRC 117914:** to take up to 94 m<sup>3</sup> water per day at a rate of up to 1.1 L/s from the Kaawa Stream
- WRC 117915:** to take up to 79 m<sup>3</sup> water per day at a rate of up to 0.9L/s from the Waikaretu Stream
- WRC 117916:** to take up to 96 m<sup>3</sup> water per day at a rate of up to 1.1 L/s from the Waikorea Stream

**WRC 117920:** to take up to the full flow from an unnamed spring at the Whitford Quarry

**Waikato Regional Council (Environment Waikato) – Streambed Works Consents**

**WRC 117921:** to construct and maintain an arch culvert in a tributary to the Te Umukaraka Stream

**WRC 117922:** to construct and maintain a culvert in a tributary to the Tauterei Stream

**WRC 117923:** to construct and maintain a 14 m bridge over the Waimai Stream

**Waikato Regional Council (Environment Waikato) – Discharge Consents**

**WRC 117924:** to discharge process water and stormwater from the Whitford Quarry and a concrete batching plant to land and to the Waikaretu Stream

**WRC 117925:** to discharge process water and stormwater from three concrete plants to land

**Waikato Regional Council (Environment Waikato) – Earthworks Consents**

**WRC 117927:** to undertake earthworks activities for the three substations, a switch yard, transmission lines, and ancillary facilities.

## 2 Status of Submissions

The decisions sought by the submissions received on the proposal are shown in the table below. The submission form prepared by the Ministry for the Environment included a list of all of the consents and notices of requirement for which application was made. The form asked the submitter to tick "support", "oppose" or "neutral" for each application. As some of the submissions received were not on this form, the decision sought by the submitter was derived from the content of their submission.

Decision sought	No. of submitters	Percentage
Support all	29	30.2%
Support selected	2	2.1%
Neutral	7	7.3%
Oppose all	21	21.9%
Oppose selected	22	22.9%
Mixed	13	13.5%
Not stated	2	2.1%

In later tables the following symbols are used to represent a submitter's position.

Decision sought	Symbol
Support	S
Neutral	N
Oppose	O
Mixed	M
Not stated	NS

### 2.1 HEARING OF SUBMITTERS

Of the 96 submissions received, 48 (50%) stated that they wished to be heard, 42 stated that they did not wish to be heard and 6 did not state their preference.

In later tables the following symbols are used to represent whether a submitter wished to be heard.

Wish to be heard?	Symbol
Yes	Y
No	N
Not stated	NS

## 3 Submitters' Locations

Appendix 1 outlines further administrative details of the submissions and is sorted by the order in which submissions were received.

---

### 3.1 SUBMITTERS' GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

The general geographical distribution (by address of submissions received) is shown in the table below.

Area	No. of submitters	Percentage
Franklin District	26	27.1%
All other Auckland Region	34	35.4%
Waikato District	26	27.1%
Hamilton City	3	3.1%
Tauranga	1	1.0%
Wellington	4	4.2%
Christchurch	2	2.1%

## 4 Reasons for Submissions

To help assess the reasons for submissions a number of broad categories were created. These categories were not used by submitters but were developed for reporting purposes. The six categories used are defined in the table below.

Category	Definition
<b>Effects on natural environment</b>	Includes water quality/quantity, renewable energy and CO <sub>2</sub> emissions, ecosystems/particular species, geotechnical, and general environmental effects.
<b>Social/cultural effects</b>	Includes health and safety, people's wellbeing and livelihood, recreation and community effects. Also includes cultural effects on tangata whenua, spiritual effects and effects on heritage.
<b>Economic effects</b>	Includes effects on employment, profit and tourism, property values and issues of compensation. Also includes infrastructure-related matters.
<b>Effects on amenity</b>	Includes visual effects such as location, size and shadow flicker, effects on views and character, noise, traffic, waste and dust.
<b>Regulatory, strategic and process issues</b>	Includes consistency with relevant national, regional and local regulatory documents, strategies and legislation. Includes procedural issues e.g. use of call-in, timeframes, consultation, quality of application and consideration of alternatives. Also includes other wider strategic issues.
<b>Other</b>	Includes reasons not falling into the above categories.

Each of these categories is covered in more detail in the sections below. Effects include both beneficial and adverse effects. It is important to note that most submissions covered more than one category of effect; this can be seen in the table in Appendix 1. In most cases each submitter offered a number of reasons for their submission.

Inclusion in each effect category means that some aspect of the submission referred to the category, but it does not mean that the submission covers all of the issues within that category as defined above.

In the table below the percentage of submissions that referred to each category is noted. As each submission could cover a number of categories, the percentages do not add to 100.

Category	No. of submissions	Percentage
Natural environment effect	37	38.5%
Social/cultural effect	33	34.4%
Economic effect	48	50.0%
Amenity effect	53	55.2%
Regulatory/strategy/process	38	39.6%
Other	10	10.4%

Further information on each category, the submissions that noted the category and the submitters' main themes is provided below in sections 4.1 to 4.6.

#### 4.1 CATEGORY 1 – EFFECTS ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

As noted above, the category "effect on natural environment" includes all submissions that made reference to the following:

- water quality and quantity effects;
- renewable energy;
- CO<sub>2</sub> emissions;
- effects on ecosystems and/or particular species; and
- geotechnical effects.

The category also covered all other general environmental effects which were not noted under another category such as amenity.

With regard to positive environmental effects, many submitters noted that an increase in the amount of renewable energy produced in New Zealand was beneficial. A number of submissions also noted that a decrease in dependence on fossil fuels and the avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions from power generation was a reason to support the proposal.

To the contrary, other submitters expressed their view that the proposal's construction and operation are not environmentally friendly. Some submitters noted that the proposal required a large amount of resources in the construction phase and therefore could be considered unsustainable. Others considered that there could be large effects on the ecosystem and waterways as a result of construction. Habitat loss was another concern.

Concerns for bird and bat strike were also prevalent with submitters noting that the migratory path of birds could be interrupted.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
34	Ball, Gavin & Janice	O	Y	Air pollution from construction dust.
7	Bobekova, Elvira	S	N	Renewable energy.
22	Boyden, Gregory Michael	S	N	Renewable energy, would minimise greenhouse gas emissions.
56	Caird, Miranda Jane	O	NS	Potential for bird and bat strike and interruption of migratory paths.
94	Carr, John*	M	NS	Ecological effects including bird strike. Effects on water.
10	Collard, Clement Alban	S	N	Environmentally friendly.
78	Department of Conservation	M	Y	Potential adverse effects on indigenous avifauna, fauna, vegetation and streamlife from collision, displacement, habitat loss, barrier effects and water take. Cumulative effects. Investigations were inadequate and suggested mitigation is insufficient.
79	Franklin District Council	N	Y	Concern with stormwater runoff and effects on avifauna and ecology.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
49	Granshaw, Christine Anne	O	Y	Insufficient study of effects on birds and bats. Possible effects on whitebait from works in watercourses.
13	Hamilton, Angus James	S	N	Renewable energy.
6	Harford, Andrew Sinclair	S	N	Clean and renewable.
9	Hohenberger, Peter	O	Y	Not environmentally friendly.
36	Holterbrinck, Judith	S	N	Green and sustainable.
23	Horton, Richard	S	N	Green and reduces dependence on fossil fuel.
19	Jackson, John Hughlings	S	N	Renewable energy.
18	Jackson, Rosemary Anne	M	N	Renewable energy.
2	Karaka, Mr Samuel Patuone Wiremu & Thompson, Mr Richard	O	Y	Insufficient research into ecological effects of water take and discharges to water.
28	Kiernan, Seamus	O	Y	Potential pollution of farm's water supply.
41	Land, Thomas William	S	N	Help reduce climate change.
50	Macnab, Robert Fraser	M	Y	Need better assessment of using resources like water.
64	McInness, Susanne Mavis	S	N	Sustainable and renewable.
85	Ministry of Economic Development	N	Y	Environmentally responsible power generation.
80	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	S	Y	Minimal environmental impact. Sustainable. Mitigation of the effects of climate change.
47	Opie, Karen	O	Y	Effects on birds, bats, other habitat and ecosystems.
26	R E & P D Townshend Foundation Trust	O	Y	No environmental credibility over whole-of-life. Coastal protection and erosion issues.
15	Shorten, Herbert Benjamin Hewitt & Nola May	S	N	Clean.
37	Smith, Richard Frederick	O	Y	Compromise to indigenous ecosystems, loss of habitats, effects of water abstraction & discharges to water, erosion, sizeable carbon footprint.
21	Sumner, Matthew	S	N	Renewable energy.
70	The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA)	S	Y	Will have a positive effect on climate change. Will avoid the emission of additional CO <sub>2</sub> from electricity generation.
17	The New Zealand Heavy Engineering Research Association Inc	S	Y	Increase in renewable energy generation while decreasing CO <sub>2</sub> emissions. Has the potential to have a low environmental impact.
58	Thomas, Benjamin Barry & Wendy Louise	M	N	Taking of water for concrete plants could put environment under strain.
83	Waikato District Council	N	Y	Concerned with mitigation of adverse effects on the coastal environment, landscape, ecology and archaeology. Concerned with cumulative effects of wind farms on the coast.
60	Walter, David & Pam	O	Y	Environmental effects of transmission lines, pylons and turbines can not be adequately mitigated.
55	Williamson, Terry	M	Y	Construction of wind farm will consume a lot of resources and have huge carbon footprint.
5	Yates, Alistair Ronald	S	N	Renewable energy reduces fossil fuel dependence, more electricity for electrified public transport.
8	Yates, Mark Kingston	S	N	Renewable energy reduces fossil fuel dependence.
93	Yates, Scott & Robin*	S	N	Renewable energy reduces fossil fuel dependence.

\*denotes a submission received after submissions officially closed

## 4.2 CATEGORY 2 – SOCIAL AND CULTURAL EFFECTS

This category was defined as including the following:

- effects on health and safety;
- effects on people's wellbeing and livelihood;
- recreation and community effects;
- cultural effects on tangata whenua;
- spiritual effects; and
- effects on heritage.

Positive social and cultural effects mentioned by submitters were that the electricity provided by the proposal was important for people's wellbeing, that wind farms have less effect on fewer people than other alternative energy sources, and a general community benefit.

Most of the submissions in this category raised negative effects. Health risk from electromagnetic frequencies and from low frequency noise was noted often in the submissions received. The uncertain and possibly long-term nature of these health effects were particularly noted.

Loss of lifestyle and enjoyment for residents and visitors was another common theme. Submitters noted that people are often attracted to the area because of its rural nature. Transmission lines, turbines and large scale construction were not considered to be consistent with a rural lifestyle by many submitters.

Other submitters expressed concern that access to their property would be affected.

The unknown legal and financial implications of having transmission lines on their properties was an issue of concern to potentially affected landowning submitters.

Potential for significant adverse cultural effects for tangata whenua and the destruction of archaeological characteristics, historical sites and waahi tapu sites were also noted.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
42	Allan, Eric Bernard	O	Y	Health concerns.
68	Austin, Julian & Beverley	O	NS	Water supply to property could be compromised by access road.
34	Ball, Gavin & Janice	O	Y	Health issues for farm workers and animals. Intrusion on privacy of occupants during construction/maintenance. Effects on lifestyle & livelihood.
56	Caird, Miranda Jane	O	NS	Potential health effects from subsonic and higher frequency sound waves. Stress over saleability of properties. Adverse effects on cultural landscape.
94	Carr, John*	M	NS	Will have impact on historical landscapes.
78	Department of Conservation	M	Y	Adverse effects on archaeological and historic sites.
79	Franklin District Council	N	Y	Concerned with farm protection, archaeological sites, shadow flicker, radio communication interference, human health and safety, recreation, tourism and social and cultural values.
61	Gemmell, Richard Maurice	M	Y	Health effects from electro magnetic frequencies.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
76	Hansen, Kenneth Allan	O	NS	Loss of lifestyle and enjoyment for residents and visitors.
11	Johnstone, Rachel Sarah	S	NS	Community benefits.
77	Jones, Brian Douglas & Marian Winifred	M	Y	Health risk from electro magnetic frequencies.
74	Keir, Jaynie Myril	O	NS	Loss of lifestyle and enjoyment for residents and visitors.
28	Kiernan, Seamus	O	Y	Effects on access to property.
75	King, Dr Richard	O	NS	Loss of lifestyle and enjoyment for residents and visitors.
39	Kokonga Farms Limited	M	Y	Potential legal and financial responsibility placed on farm. Potential adverse health effects.
50	Macnab, Robert Fraser	M	Y	Need better assessment of social impact.
59	Mandeno, Peter Woodward	O	Y	Disruption to life from negotiations over property. Health, wellbeing and safety effects.
57	New Zealand Historic Places Trust/Pouhere Taonga	M	Y	Potential impact on archaeological sites.
80	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	S	Y	People rely on electricity for wellbeing. Wind farms have comparatively fewer effects on fewer people than other alternative energy sources. General public support for windfarms.
47	Opie, Karen	O	Y	Close to a rural community. Potential effect on historic, cultural and archaeological sites.
46	Partridge, Linda Myrtle	O	N	Will not be able to enjoy property and live off land. May be cut off from communications.
63	Partridge, Joe	O	NS	Adverse effects on health and lifestyle.
26	R E & P D Townshend Foundation Trust	O	Y	Adverse effects on local communities.
96	Reeves, Alistair & Ann*	O	Y	Will destroy their livelihood.
69	Rutherford, Lucille	O	NS	Loss of cultural heritage of landscape.
37	Smith, Richard Frederick	O	Y	Spiritual and cultural values, impact on archaeological sites.
54	Sunset Views Ltd & Rimani Farms Ltd	O	Y	Will reduce recreational enjoyment of property. Will disrupt community.
40	Tainui Awhiro Ngunguru Te Po Ngunguru Te Ao Management Committee	O	Y	Significant cultural impacts for Tangata Whenua. Would destroy many archaeological characteristics and wahi tapu sites of major significance. Probable adverse health effects with regard to noise.
58	Thomas, Benjamin Barry & Wendy Louise	M	N	Reference made to community benefit; do not see how this will be achieved.
83	Waikato District Council	N	Y	Concerned with mitigation of adverse social and cultural effects.
65	Walker, Raymond John	O	Y	Concerned for safety and security of house.
90	Ward, Darren Phillip & Lorae Carolyn	O	N	Collateral damage to rural community (e.g. roadworks and traffic).
43	Wright, Elizabeth Ann	O	Y	Health impacts of transmission lines are uncertain.

\* denotes a submission received after submissions officially closed

### 4.3 CATEGORY 3 – ECONOMIC EFFECTS

For the purpose of this report and summarising submissions, economic effects were considered to include:

- employment;
- profits;
- tourism; and
- property values.

The economic effects category also includes all issues to do with compensation of land owners and/or affected parties and infrastructure-related matters.

A small number of submitters thought the wind farm may increase tourism. Others also thought that the proposal would bring revenue and jobs to the area. Some noted the efficiency and economics of wind farms as a positive, and that it would be economically viable and close to energy demand.

Other submitters expressed contrasting views on these matters. Some believed that the proposal would have an adverse effect on tourism and other businesses which are in some way dependent on the natural environment. Others believed that wind farms are an inefficient way of producing energy and may be uneconomic. Some also noted that the wind farm would be far away from New Zealand main energy demand.

Devaluation of property was a very common issue. This was expressed by submitters who were directly affected by the proposal (i.e. would have the transmission line on their property) and those where the turbines or transmissions lines would be visible or have perceived or real effects. Some submitters noted that compensation was not adequate or not offered to enough people.

It was noted that the proposed transmission lines would restrict aerial aspects of farming such as top dressing which would then cause a loss of income. The construction of the proposal was also noted as possibly affecting the ability of farms to operate.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
42	Allan, Eric Bernard	O	Y	Pylons would prevent top dressing on farm affecting profit, and would affect cultivation and cropping. Reduction in property value.
34	Ball, Gavin & Janice	O	Y	Pylons will restrict farming practices and future business endeavours.
62	Black, Graeme John & Philippa Mary	S	Y	Upgraded roads would bring tourism to beaches.
53	Bradley, Clayton & Shelley	O	N	Decrease in property value and saleability. Would open up area to further development.
56	Caird, Miranda Jane	O	NS	Potential decrease in land values.
67	Church, Colin Noel	O	Y	Wind farms are comparatively inefficient.
10	Collard, Clement Alban	S	N	Close to areas requiring energy.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
86	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Auckland Province) Incorporated	M	Y	Will improve security of supply to Auckland and Northland.
79	Franklin District Council	N	Y	Concerned with mitigation of any adverse economic effects.
61	Gemmell, Richard Maurice	M	Y	Effects on farming and alternative incomes e.g. tourism. Negative effects on farm values. Need to promote NZ's clean image.
48	Granshaw, Robert Duncan	N	Y	Possible delays for commuters between Tuakau Bridge - Port Waikato Rd during construction
82	Grant, Duncan Thomas & Ross Catherine Anne	O	Y	Detraction from Raglan tourism.
25	Hall, Noel, Karen & Melissa	O	Y	Property devaluation.
76	Hansen, Kenneth Allan	O	N	Adverse effects to Raglan tourism and other businesses dependent on natural environment. Devaluation of property. Wind farms are inefficient.
89	Hansen, Martin Fronde & McConnell, Nancy Anne	O	Y	Proposed compensation is inadequate.
9	Hohenberger, Peter	O	Y	Not financially profitable.
4	Horsley, Mr Robert & Tennille	S	N	In a windy area.
23	Horton, Richard	S	N	Aligns with clean green image.
11	Johnstone, Rachel Sarah	S	N	Farming benefits.
77	Jones, Brian Douglas & Marian Winifred	M	Y	Reduced property values. Cost to taxpayer.
74	Keir, Jaynie Myril	O	N	Adverse effects to Raglan tourism and other businesses dependent on natural environment. Devaluation of property. Wind farms are inefficient.
28	Kiernan, Seamus	O	Y	Devaluation of property.
75	King, Dr Richard	O	N	Adverse effects to Raglan tourism and other businesses dependent on natural environment. Devaluation of property. Wind farms are inefficient.
39	Kokonga Farms Limited	M	Y	Would restrict aerial aspects of farming. Would interfere with farming operations causing loss of income. Devaluation of property. Lack of indemnification.
41	Land, Thomas William	S	N	Residual income and jobs for the community.
59	Mandeno, Peter Woodward	O	Y	Adverse effects on farming operation. Property devaluation.
85	Ministry of Economic Development	N	Y	Good economic viability.
80	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	S	Y	Security of competitively priced electricity. Local economic benefits e.g. job generation.
63	Partridge, Joe	O	NS	Adverse economic effects on property.
45	Peterson, Paul Victor	O	Y	Foreign owned company.
26	R E & P D Townshend Foundation Trust	O	Y	Huge cost. Will not be viable financially in future. Lack of transparency over compensation methods. Location is not close to end users.
44	Rally of New Zealand Limited	N	Y	Effects on the route for Rally New Zealand.
95	Rasmussen, Gary Alexander*	O	N	Will not be able to topdress property because of transmission wires.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
91	Ravensdown Fertilisers*	O	Y	Proposed transmission line will affect ability of Ravensdown to operate their quarry. They could not quarry near the proposed pylons although they have mineral rights for the adjacent properties.
96	Reeves, Alistair & Ann*	O	Y	Is an inefficient and expensive way to generate energy.
12	Rupapere, Jean & Tommy	M	N	Potential effect of water take on farmers in times of drought.
15	Shorten, Herbert Benjamin Hewitt & Nola May	S	N	Area has a strong wind resource.
37	Smith, Richard Frederick	O	Y	Possibly uneconomic.
54	Sunset Views Ltd & Rimanui Farms Ltd	O	Y	Turbines will limit potential future house sites on property.
40	Tainui Awhiro Ngunguru Te Po Ngunguru Te Ao Management Committee	O	Y	High probability that property values will fall - need a mechanism to address the issue.
31	Telecom New Zealand Limited	N	Y	Effects on Telecom infrastructure and cable network.
17	The New Zealand Heavy Engineering Research Association Inc	S	Y	Reliable and predictable energy source. Could give work to many different New Zealand sectors decreasing NZ's trade deficit.
58	Thomas, Benjamin Barry & Wendy Louise	M	N	Possible property value effects.
92	Ullrich Aluminium Co. Ltd*	S	Y	Would provide continuous stable supply and cost of electricity for manufacturing.
83	Waikato District Council	N	Y	Concerned with mitigation of recreation and tourism effects.
90	Ward, Darren Phillip & Lorrae Carolyn	O	N	Massive cost when no real financial incentives for households to become energy efficient.
55	Williamson, Terry	M	Y	Contact Energy may not have the best interests of New Zealand in mind.
43	Wright, Elizabeth Ann	O	Y	Decrease in tourism because of ugly transmission lines. Airstrip on property will no longer be usable.

\*denotes a submission received after submissions officially closed

#### 4.4 CATEGORY 4 – EFFECTS ON AMENITY

Category 4, effects on amenity, includes all submissions which noted issues to do with:

- visual impacts (i.e. location, size and shadow flicker);
- effects on views;
- effects on character;
- noise effects;
- traffic effects;
- waste effects; and
- dust effects.

Almost all of the submissions that noted these kinds of effects were in opposition to the proposal. However the proposed improvements to roads were identified by some submitters to be a positive effect on amenity.

Visual and noise effects were the amenity effects most commonly mentioned. With regard to visual effects, it was not just the visual effects of the turbines that were a concern, but also the effects of the transmission lines and pylons that were prevalent. Many of the submitters believed that all or at least part of the proposed transmission line should be underground. Other concerns related to having manmade structures in a pristine environment and the fact that constant movement could be distracting.

Noise effects and the uncertainty around these was also a common theme. Many submitters suggested that mitigation should be required, for example if the noise effects are found to interrupt sleep.

Traffic effects related to the construction of the proposal were another strong theme. Submitters feared that the traffic associated with construction would affect the safety of their roads and reduce their ability to use the roads for activities such as cycling. There were also concerns about the noise generated as a result of this traffic.

Many of the submissions that commented on construction effects such as noise, dust and traffic also noted the length of the construction period of 4-5 years being a significant amount of time.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
42	Allan, Eric Bernard	O	Y	Pylons and wires near 1441 SH2 Opuatia would affect outstanding view from road and house and interfere with vegetation.
34	Ball, Gavin & Janice	O	Y	Adverse effects on rugged landscape. Impediment to views from house. Construction traffic and noise.
73	Barry, Peter Lawrence	O	N	In clear view of a residentially zoned community.
35	Bernard Brown Family Trust	O	Y	Significant visual effects from dwelling. Inadequate landscape and visual assessment.
53	Bradley, Clayton & Shelley	O	N	Significant effects on views from dwelling. Noise at 35 decibels is unacceptably loud. Light pollution day and night. Out of scale in landscape. Effects on historic landscape setting. Detraction from rural character and enjoyment.
33	Brown, Reuben	O	Y	Visual domination of landscape day and night. Inadequate visual effects assessment, not recognising landscape significance.
56	Caird, Miranda Jane	O	NS	Visual impact on an outstanding landscape, in particular Whale Bay. Effects on natural character, amenity, farming values.
94	Carr, John*	M	NS	Loss of landscape values and sense of place. Loss of rural character. Landscape between Port Waikato and Limestone Downs could be considered to be outstanding.
67	Church, Colin Noel	O	Y	Landscape effects - ugly, too large.
32	Conquest, Dennis	O	N	Impact on views from Whale Bay.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
52	Deane, Christopher Gary, Kerry Anthony & Mark Peter	O	Y	Detraction from amenities, increased traffic during construction, visual pollution, change to character of locality.
51	Deane, Mark Peter & Agnes Agatha	O	Y	Detraction from amenities, increased traffic during construction, visual pollution, change to character of locality.
78	Department of Conservation	M	Y	Adverse effects on natural character.
88	Divett, Gregor James	O	N	Visual effects from house and by surfers at Raglan.
79	Franklin District Council	N	Y	Concerned with mitigation of adverse visual effects on rural and coastal landscape and cumulative effects. Concern over traffic and construction effects.
61	Gemmell, Richard Maurice	M	Y	Visual pollution from overhead lines.
49	Granshaw, Christine Anne	O	Y	Adverse visual impact in area of natural beauty. Simulations are misleading. Traffic volumes will affect character. Lines should be underground.
82	Grant, Duncan Thomas & Ross Catherine Anne	O	Y	Loss of visual amenity in Raglan area and for individual property. Effects of lights.
87	Grey, Joanna L.C.	O	N	Visual pollution.
25	Hall, Noel, Karen & Melissa	O	Y	Noise, nuisance and visual effects.
76	Hansen, Kenneth Allan	O	N	Aesthetic/visual impact.
89	Hansen, Martin Fronde & McConnell, Nancy Anne	O	Y	Obtrusiveness of pylons and lines.
19	Jackson, John Hughlings	S	N	Improvements to roads and infrastructure.
18	Jackson, Rosemary Anne	M	N	Improvements to roads.
11	Johnstone, Rachel Sarah	S	N	Improved roads and resources.
77	Jones, Brian Douglas & Marian Winifred	M	Y	Adverse visual impact on views/aesthetics. Vehicle and dust nuisance.
74	Keir, Jaynie Myril	O	N	Aesthetic/visual impact.
28	Kieman, Seamus	O	Y	Visual impact, dust, waste, traffic.
75	King, Dr Richard	O	N	Aesthetic/visual impact.
39	Kokonga Farms Limited	M	Y	Adverse visual/amenity effects, noise, vibration effects, damage to roads and farm.
50	Macnab, Robert Fraser	M	Y	Need better assessment of noise, traffic and visual effects.
59	Mandeno, Peter Woodward	O	Y	Destruction of natural beauty of property.
47	Opie, Karen	O	Y	Adverse effects on amenity, rural & natural character, landscape. Overly large.
46	Partridge, Linda Myrtle	O	N	Humming noise from switching station. High visual impact.
63	Partridge, Joe	O	NS	Adverse visual effects of switching station and pylon.
71	Paulsen, Stephen & Donna	NS	N	Noise may be an issue. Traffic during school commuting times needs to be addressed.
45	Peterson, Paul Victor	O	Y	Too large and monocultural.
26	R E & P D Townshend Foundation Trust	O	Y	Construction disturbance. Overhead structures are inappropriate in rural setting. Visual and noise effects.
95	Rasmussen, Gary Alexander*	O	N	Would spoil landscape of limestone rolling hill country.
96	Reeves, Alistair & Ann*	O	Y	Will destroy a landscape of significant beauty.
69	Rutherford, Lucille	O	NS	Major impact on visual amenity/natural landscape.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
37	Smith, Richard Frederick	O	Y	Unsuitable location. Effects on natural character, outstanding landscape, aesthetic values. Transmission lines should be underground. Traffic, noise, radio frequency and shadow flicker effects.
54	Sunset Views Ltd & Rimanui Farms Ltd	O	Y	Large scale. Turbines will reduce amenity values of property and dominate outstanding landscape as viewed from coast. Will change rural character. Earthworks will modify landforms. Traffic disruptions and television transmission disruptions.
40	Tainui Awhiro Ngunguru Te Po Ngunguru Te Ao Management Committee	O	Y	Significant visual and noise effect. Background noise measuring insufficient.
58	Thomas, Benjamin Barry & Wendy Louise	M	N	Potential noise and visual effects. Noise and traffic effects associated with construction period.
83	Waikato District Council	N	Y	Concerned with mitigation of effects on landscape and visual amenity, road and traffic safety, construction, shadow flicker, noise, radio frequency and human health.
66	Waikaretu School Board of Trustees	O	Y	Turbines will distract school children (visual and noise). May be negative consequences on learning. Visual aspects may make it hard for the school to recruit principals. Increased traffic may affect school bus.
65	Walker, Raymond John	O	Y	Adverse visual effects on landscape, rural character by turbines, poles and road realignment. Road noise during construction. Low frequency, tonal noise effects of turbines. Construction traffic delays. Affect ability to ride bikes on road. Possible effects on television and radio reception.
60	Walter, David & Pam	O	Y	Noise and visual effects can not be mitigated.
90	Ward, Darren Phillip & Lorrae Carolyn	O	N	Pylons unsightly. Size of the project will affect natural beauty of large coastal area.
55	Williamson, Terry	M	Y	Visual domination of coastline.
43	Wright, Elizabeth Ann	O	Y	Transmission towers and lines ugly and will overwhelm beautiful outlooks.

\*denotes a submission received after submissions officially closed

#### 4.5 CATEGORY 5 – REGULATORY, STRATEGIC AND PROCESS ISSUES

The definition of this category includes the following issues:

- consistency with relevant national, regional and local regulatory documents, strategies and legislation;
- procedural issues e.g. use of call-in, timeframes, consultation, quality of application and consideration of alternatives; and
- other wider strategic issues.

Some submitters stated that they believed that the proposal was in line with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and other local and central government plans, policies and strategies, for example the New Zealand Energy Strategy.

The contribution of the proposal to helping New Zealand meet its international obligations (e.g. Kyoto Protocol) was raised by several submitters, as was the improvement to security of supply and energy independence for New Zealand. Many submitters saw the proposal as strategically important to the nation.

Conversely, some submitters raised a lack of national strategic direction and ad hoc approach to wind farm location in New Zealand as a concern. These submitters believed that there should be some strategic government leadership which highlighted suitable areas for comprehensive wind development.

Some submitters noted that they believed that the proposal was contrary to the RMA. Others stated that they believed the proposal was contrary to other plans such as District or Regional Plans.

Several of the Councils who submitted on the proposals asked that the Board of Inquiry take due consideration of their Policies and Plans. These submissions also note specific policies and plans and/or rules and objectives that are of particular relevance.

Some submitters were unhappy with the amount and kind of consultation carried out by Contact Energy, and would have liked this to have been more comprehensive. Perceived insufficiencies with the applications for the proposal were expressed by submitters including insufficient information and not enough consideration of alternatives.

Some submitters saw Contact as an "Australian company" and therefore questioned their concern for the New Zealand's landscape and people.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
42	Allan, Eric Bernard	O	Y	Need a national strategy for siting of windfarms. Case by case approach is piecemeal.
34	Ball, Gavin & Janice	O	Y	Contact's Landowners Options Agreement and Transmission easement are worrying for the landowner and need editing.
35	Bernard Brown Family Trust	O	Y	No consultation.
62	Black, Graeme John & Philippa Mary	S	Y	Meet NZ's energy needs.
53	Bradley, Clayton & Shelley	O	N	Inconsistent with s6(b) and s7(c) and (f) of RMA.
56	Caird, Miranda Jane	O	NS	Contrary to district plan's ridgeline policy.
94	Carr, John*	M	NS	Turbines between Port Waikato and Limestone Downs do not meet the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environments's report "Wind Power, People and Place". No government leadership to ensure positive outcomes.
67	Church, Colin Noel	O	Y	No comprehensive strategy for renewable energy. Should not have been called in; District Councils should decide.
78	Department of Conservation	M	Y	Insufficient consideration of alternatives. Insufficient information in application on ecosystem matters. Consents should have been bundled into one non-complying activity. Proposal is contrary to s5, 6(a) and (c), 7(d), (f) and (g) of RMA, and Part 2 is not met. Inconsistent with other national policies/ strategies/ planning instruments.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
38	Glogau, David	S	NS	Important strategically in NZ. Key to supplying energy needed in peak oil time.
82	Grant, Duncan Thomas & Ross Catherine Anne	O	Y	Insufficient landscape/visual assessment and insufficient consultation. s6(a) and (b) and s7(c) of RMA not addressed. Inconsistencies with policies of NZCPS and Waikato District Plan.
14	Hamilton, Andrew	S	N	Energy independence for NZ.
13	Hamilton, Angus James	S	N	Energy independence for NZ.
6	Harford, Andrew Sinclair	S	N	Energy independence for NZ.
36	Holterbrinck, Judith	S	N	Energy independence for NZ.
23	Horton, Richard	S	N	Needed to meet future demand.
39	Kokonga Farms Limited	M	Y	Contrary to Part 2 of RMA. Inadequate consideration of alternative line routes.
41	Land, Thomas William	S	N	Power supply for country.
50	Macnab, Robert Fraser	M	Y	Inadequate community consultation relating to social impact and traffic.
85	Ministry of Economic Development	N	Y	Help meet government objectives and strategies. Contribute to future diversity and security of supply. Relevant under s7 of RMA.
80	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	S	Y	Aligned with purpose of RMA and national strategies. Contribution to international obligations. Improvement to security of supply.
47	Opie, Karen	O	Y	Contradicts Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment report on 'Wind power, people and place'.
26	R E & P D Townshend Foundation Trust	O	Y	Call in decision flawed; unnecessary. Unreasonable timeframe for submissions. Insufficient consultation. AEE is inadequate quality.
95	Rasmussen, Garry Alexander*	O	N	Australian company should not be allowed to spoil NZ landscape.
69	Rutherford, Lucille	O	NS	Should encourage power generation at individual dwelling level instead.
15	Shorten, Herbert Benjamin Hewitt & Nola May	S	N	Wind energy more favourable than nuclear and fossil. Security of supply.
37	Smith, Richard Frederick	O	Y	Inadequate assessment of effects e.g. noise. Contravenes Waikato Regional Coastal Plan and Regional Policy Statement.
54	Sunset Views Ltd & Rimaniui Farms Ltd	O	Y	Inadequate assessment of road improvements.
40	Tainui Awhiro Ngunguru Te Po Ngunguru Te Ao Management Committee	O	Y	Does not meet the requirements of legislation in matters pertaining to tangata whenua - s5,6,7 and 8 of the RMA. Contrary to the operative and proposed Waikato District Plan; a private plan change should be required. Consultation carried out with the hapu was insufficient.
70	The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA)	S	Y	Proposal is consistent with all policies and strategies listed in submission. Is of national significance and value. Would help meet Kyoto Protocol obligations. Security of supply and development benefits.
83	Waikato District Council	N	Y	Concerned that the BOI give due consideration to the plans of the Council.
72	Waikato Regional Council	N	Y	Concerned that the BOI give due consideration to the plans of the Council.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
65	Walker, Raymond John	O	Y	Previous noise report unavailable as destroyed. Little consultation with neighbours who do not own land.
60	Walter, David & Pam	O	Y	Contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA.
90	Ward, Darren Phillip & Lorrae Carolyn	O	N	Lack of willingness to explore alternatives to transmission lines.
55	Williamson, Terry	M	Y	Should be aiming for small generation units (i.e. household turbines and solar panels).
43	Wright, Elizabeth Ann	O	Y	Need coherent government policy on siting of windfarms. Independent report on the cost of undergrounding should be required.
93	Yates, Scott and Robin*	S	N	Need more electricity for when electric cars become common.

\*denotes a submission received after submissions officially closed

#### 4.6 CATEGORY 6 – OTHER

Most of the submissions that were noted under the category of other were placed here because no reason was given for the submitter's support or opposition. However one submitter did only generally state that they were in support of wind farms.

Sub No.	Submitter	Position	Heard	Summary of reasons given
24	Clarke, Andrea	S	N	General support of wind farms.
3	Fang, Du-Yeong	NS	N	No reason given.
16	Horsley, Mr Campbell & Ms Rosemary	S	N	No reason given.
1	Johnstone, Mr Brook David	S	N	No reason given.
84	Matenga, Richard & Juliana	M	N	No reason given.
81	McCabe, Phillip Harold	O	Y	No reason given.
27	New Zealand Manufacturers & Exporters Association	S	N	No reason given.
29	Whitford, David John	S	N	No reason given.
30	Whitford, Lynne Margaret	S	N	No reason given.
20	Woollett, Peter Harold	S	N	No reason given.

## 5 Decisions Sought

As noted in Section 2 above, some submitters indicated that they opposed or supported the whole proposal, while others specified which applications they were interested in. Their reasoning has been summarised in Section 4 above. Other submitters were not necessarily in outright opposition to the proposal but had conditions that they would like to see on the applications if granted, or identified specific issues they wished to be mitigated.

---

### 5.1 DECISIONS REQUESTED

Decisions sought were as follows:

- 29 submitters (30.2%) wanted all applications to be granted;
- 21 submitters (21.9%) wanted all applications to be declined;
- 2 submitters expressed support for selected applications only;
- 22 submitters expressed opposition for selected applications only;
- A further 13 submitters gave mixed responses; and
- 7 submitters expressed neutrality towards all applications.

A breakdown of the numbers in support, opposition and neutral to each individual application is contained in the table in Appendix 2.

---

### 5.2 CONDITIONS REQUESTED AND SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE MITIGATED

49 submitters either indicated that they would like specific conditions added to the application or identified specific issues that they would like to see addressed before consent was granted. These are noted in the table below.

Compensation arrangements to the satisfaction of the submitter were a common request. Specifically, some submitters wanted a wider scope of compensation than was being offered and others wanted the compensation to be calculated in a different manner than that proposed.

Some submitters identified a particular location or part of the proposed wind farm where, if the proposed turbines were to be removed, their concerns (usually amenity-related) would be mitigated. Some submitters were not opposed to the turbines but wanted the proposed transmission lines to be underground, for at least part of their route.

Some submitters were concerned with what would be in the Traffic Management Plan and in particular that commuting to work and school would not be disrupted during the construction period.

Submitters also wanted conditions to be put in place to ensure that if post-commencement monitoring found adverse effects (noise, ecological and construction effects among others), Contact would be required to mitigate these.

Others believed that if the adverse effects of the wind farm were found to be too great or the wind farm became obsolete, that Contact be made fully responsible for the decommissioning of the proposal.

A common submitter viewpoint was that the current application should be rejected but that future applications should not necessarily be ruled out as long as they involved further discussions, more robust assessments and further reports.

Sub No.	Submitter	Summary of conditions sought/specific matters seeking mitigation
42	Allan, Eric Bernard	National strategy needed for siting of wind farms. Alternative route for transmission lines or undergrounded in part/full.
68	Austin, Julian & Beverley	Provide a water bore on property or provide compensation.
35	Bernard Brown Family Trust	Undertake consultation then review application.
62	Black, Graeme John & Philippa Mary	The coast road should be upgraded within 5 years.
53	Bradley, Clayton & Shelley	Compensation arrangements.
33	Brown, Reuben	No turbines within 1km of coastline. Remove turbines between Te Haro Point and Gibsons Beach.
94	Carr, John*	The turbines between Port Waikato and Limestone Downs be removed.
32	Conquest, Dennis	No turbines near Whale Bay. Move closer to Port Waikato.
78	Department of Conservation	Needs 2 years+ pre commencement monitoring and post commencement monitoring. Need ability to remove if adverse effects too high. Other conditions relating to ecological and environmental issues raised.
88	Divett, Gregor James	Remove from three areas closest to Raglan.
86	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Auckland Province) Incorporated	Full compensation and indemnification for landowners both with turbines and transmission towers on land. Ensure adequate noise controls.
79	Franklin District Council	Wishes to have opportunity to review all conditions of consent. Transmission lines to be underground.
61	Gemmell, Richard Maurice	Underground or undersea transmission lines.
38	Glogau, David	Waterless toilets provided in 3 public viewing areas. Height increased to 105m for turbines. Consent implementation term extended to 12 years.
49	Granshaw, Christine Anne	Placement of bond to restore area to natural condition if windfarm is inefficient.
48	Granshaw, Robert Duncan	Traffic management plan to prevent delays in commuters on Tuakau bridge - Port Waikato Rd.
25	Hall, Noel, Karen & Melissa	Compensation for affected people (not just with pylons/turbines on property).
89	Hansen, Martin Fronde & McConnell, Nancy Anne	Underground at least part of the lines from Orton to SH22. Compensation arrangements should compare with those by telecommunications operators instead of under the Public Works Act provisions.
77	Jones, Brian Douglas & Marian Winifred	Underground lines and compensation arrangements. Reduce costs, reduce EMF emissions.
2	Karaka, Mr Samuel Patuone Wiremu & Thompson, Mr Richard	Further research on effects of water take and discharges to water. Discussions with hapu/iwi/community.
74	Keir, Jaynie Myril	Relocate away from coast.
28	Kiernan, Seamus	Mitigation/amelioration of effects. No pollution of groundwater.
39	Kokonga Farms Limited	Extend the designation corridor, require an easement for the corridor and payment of rent and compensation. Limit term to 35 years or less.
50	Macnab, Robert Fraser	Better assessments of visual and social impact. Traffic and water management plans. Noise limitation condition.

Sub No.	Submitter	Summary of conditions sought/specific matters seeking mitigation
59	Mandeno, Peter Woodward	Property (Beaufort Lodge) to be purchased by Contact.
57	New Zealand Historic Places Trust/Pouhere Taonga	Include advice note relating to archaeological sites and HPT approval.
80	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	Use NZS6808:1998 as the basis for setting noise conditions.
47	Opie, Karen	2 year monitoring for birds and bats, further ecological investigation, transmission lines undergrounded.
46	Partridge, Linda Myrtle	More information requested on noise effects and height.
71	Paulsen, Stephen & Donna	Shut down traffic in periods of commuting to schools. Remove turbines if noise is an issue.
45	Peterson, Paul Victor	Reports on NZ wind generation capacity, living organisms, water and pollution. Recommend risk assessment. Acknowledge decommissioning responsibility.
26	R E & P D Townshend Foundation Trust	Many matters mentioned; rejects current application and process used.
44	Rally of New Zealand Limited	Roads to be maintained as suitable for rally. Maintain access for rally.
95	Rasmussen, Gary Alexander*	Put underground wires across property.
91	Ravensdown Fertilisers*	Move transmission line away from the Waikaretu limestone quarry and the adjacent properties.
12	Rupapere, Jean & Tommy	Water take - need sufficient left for farmers in times of drought.
37	Smith, Richard Frederick	Monitoring of earthworks. Limitations on traffic. Archaeological assessment of any sites. 3km buffer zone between turbines and properties. Noise monitoring. Five year implementation of consent limit. Condition stating decommissioning responsibility.
54	Sunset Views Ltd & Rimanui Farms Ltd	Remove 7 of the turbines and provide better design and information regarding roading upgrades.
40	Tainui Awhiro Ngunguru Te Po Ngunguru Te Ao Management Committee	Monitoring controls needed which include marawhenua hapu. A hapu collective liaison roopu needed. A community liaison group also needed. Hapu and community mitigation packages necessary. Need a complaints procedure.
31	Telecom New Zealand Limited	Conditions are listed in the submission related to effects on Telecom's infrastructure and cable network, include: consulting with Telecom, evaluating with Telecom likely induction and EPR hazard, identifying the required mitigation, that mitigation be at Contact's cost and be complete before commissioning, review of effects on Telecom's cables post commissioning.
70	The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA)	Include appropriate conditions that avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.
58	Thomas, Benjamin Barry & Wendy Louise	Needs to be a way to receive or appeal for compensation if there are losses (mental, physical and financial) because of effects.
83	Waikato District Council	Council wish to be scheduled near end of hearing after all non-Council submitters. Has an interest in all conditions outlined in the s92 response dated 3 October 2008. Concerned about how conditions will be reviewed and changed under section 150 of the RMA.
72	Waikato Regional Council	Council wish to be scheduled near end of hearing after all non-Council submitters. Prepared to provide input on conditions.
66	Waikaretu School Board of Trustees	School be consulted regarding Construction Traffic Management Plan. Contact provide funding to school's board to carry out independent monitoring. If issues are found Contact be required to shut down during school day. Contact be required to correct any interference with school communication systems.

Sub No.	Submitter	Summary of conditions sought/specific matters seeking mitigation
65	Walker, Raymond John	Conditions listed, include: Compensation if property value is decreased. Monitoring of noise, effects on TV/radio reception, construction effects, and compliance - Contact to remedy any problems. Conditions relating to construction management, access, turbine appearance, vegetation, consultation at design stage, decommissioning and removal.
60	Walter, David & Pam	Decline turbines visible from property. Decline turbines that may have a noise effect on property. Decline NOR for the transmission line that would cross property.
20	Woollett, Peter Harold	Should complete project quickly to minimise disruption.
43	Wright, Elizabeth Ann	National strategy needed for siting of wind farms. Alternative route for transmission lines or undergrounded in part/full.

## Appendix 1: List of Submissions

The table below gives an overall summary of each submission, sorted by order received.

Sub No.	Submitter	Location	Position	Heard	Reasons for submissions						Conditions sought/ specific matters to be addressed?	
					Environment	Social/Cultural	Economic	Amenity	Regulatory, strategy, process	Other		
1	Johnstone, Mr Brook David	Tuakau	S	N							✓	
2	Karaka, Mr Samuel Patuone Wiremu & Thompson, Mr Richard	Tuakau	O	Y	✓							✓
3	Fang, Du-Yeong	Auckland	NS	N							✓	
4	Horsley, Mr Robert & Tennille	Ngaruawahia	S	N			✓					
5	Yates, Alistair Ronald	Auckland	S	N	✓							
6	Harford, Andrew Sinclair	Auckland	S	N	✓				✓			
7	Bobekova, Elvira	Auckland	S	N	✓							
8	Yates, Mark Kingston	Auckland	S	N	✓							
9	Hohenberger, Peter	Raglan	O	Y	✓		✓					
10	Collard, Clement Alban	Auckland	S	N	✓		✓					
11	Johnstone, Rachel Sarah	Tuakau	S	N		✓	✓	✓				
12	Rupapere, Jean & Tommy	Ngaruawahia	M	N			✓					✓
13	Hamilton, Angus James	Auckland	S	N	✓				✓			
14	Hamilton, Andrew	Auckland	S	N					✓			
15	Shorten, Herbert Benjamin Hewitt & Nola May	Ngaruawahia	S	N	✓		✓		✓			
16	Horsley, Mr Campbell & Ms Rosemary	Ngaruawahia	S	N							✓	
17	The New Zealand Heavy Engineering Research Association Inc	Auckland	S	Y	✓		✓	✓				
18	Jackson, Rosemary Anne	Ngaruawahia	M	N	✓			✓				
19	Jackson, John Hughlings	Ngaruawahia	S	N	✓			✓				
20	Woollett, Peter Harold	Auckland	S	N							✓	✓
21	Sumner, Matthew	Auckland	S	N	✓							
22	Boyden, Gregory Michael	Auckland	S	N	✓							
23	Horton, Richard	Auckland	S	N	✓		✓		✓			
24	Clarke, Andrea	Auckland	S	N							✓	
25	Hall, Noel, Karen & Melissa	Tuakau	O	Y			✓	✓				✓
26	R E & P D Townshend Foundation Trust	Hamilton	O	Y	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
27	New Zealand Manufacturers & Exporters Association	Christchurch	S	N							✓	

Sub No.	Submitter	Location	Position	Heard	Reasons for submissions						Conditions sought/ specific matters to be addressed?
					Environment	Social/Cultural	Economic	Amenity	Regulatory, strategy, process	Other	
28	Kiernan, Seamus	Tuakau	O	Y	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
29	Whitford, David John	Tuakau	S	N						✓	
30	Whitford, Lynne Margaret	Tuakau	S	N						✓	
31	Telecom New Zealand Limited	Wellington	N	Y			✓				✓
32	Conquest, Dennis	Raglan	O	N				✓			✓
33	Brown, Reuben	Raglan	O	Y				✓			✓
34	Ball, Gavin & Janice	Tuakau	O	Y	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
35	Bernard Brown Family Trust	Raglan	O	Y				✓	✓		✓
36	Holterbrinck, Judith	Auckland	S	N	✓				✓		
37	Smith, Richard Frederick	Tuakau	O	Y	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
38	Glogau, David	Auckland	S	NS					✓		✓
39	Kokonga Farms Limited	Auckland	M	Y		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
40	Tainui Awhiro Ngunguru Te Po Ngunguru Te Ao Management Committee	Raglan	O	Y		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
41	Land, Thomas William	Auckland	S	N	✓		✓		✓		
42	Allan, Eric Bernard	Auckland	O	Y		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
43	Wright, Elizabeth Ann	Auckland	O	Y		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
44	Rally of New Zealand Limited	Auckland	N	Y			✓				✓
45	Peterson, Paul Victor	Raglan	O	Y			✓	✓			✓
46	Partridge, Linda Myrtle	Auckland	O	N		✓		✓			✓
47	Opie, Karen	Auckland	O	Y	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
48	Granshaw, Robert Duncan	Auckland	N	Y			✓				✓
49	Granshaw, Christine Anne	Auckland	O	Y	✓			✓			✓
50	Macnab, Robert Fraser	Ngaruawahia	M	Y	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
51	Deane, Mark Peter & Agnes Agatha	Tuakau	O	Y				✓			
52	Deane, Christopher Gary, Kerry Anthony & Mark Peter	Auckland	O	Y				✓			
53	Bradley, Clayton & Shelley	Tuakau	O	N			✓	✓	✓		✓
54	Sunset Views Ltd & Rimanui Farms Ltd	Pukekohe	O	Y		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
55	Williamson, Terry	Tuakau	M	Y	✓		✓	✓	✓		
56	Caird, Miranda Jane	Raglan	O	NS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
57	New Zealand Historic Places Trust/Pouhere Taonga	Tauranga	M	Y		✓					✓
58	Thomas, Benjamin Barry & Wendy Louise	Ngaruawahia	M	N	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
59	Mandeno, Peter Woodward	Papakura	O	Y		✓	✓	✓			✓
60	Walter, David & Pam	Auckland	O	Y	✓			✓	✓		✓
61	Gemmell, Richard Maurice	Tuakau	M	Y		✓	✓	✓			✓
62	Black, Graeme John & Philippa Mary	Ngaruawahia	S	Y			✓		✓		✓
63	Partridge, Joe	Pukekohe	O	NS		✓	✓	✓			

Sub No.	Submitter	Location	Position	Heard	Reasons for submissions						Conditions sought/ specific matters to be addressed?
					Environment	Social/Cultural	Economic	Amenity	Regulatory, strategy, process	Other	
64	McInness, Susanne Mavis	Auckland	S	N	✓						
65	Walker, Raymond John	Tuakau	O	Y		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
66	Waikaretu School Board of Trustees	Tuakau	O	Y				✓			✓
67	Church, Colin Noel	Pukekohe	O	Y			✓	✓	✓		
68	Austin, Julian & Beverley	Tuakau	O	NS		✓					✓
69	Rutherford, Lucille	Waiuku	O	NS		✓		✓	✓		
70	The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority	Auckland	S	Y	✓				✓		✓
71	Paulsen, Stephen & Donna	Tuakau	NS	N				✓			✓
72	Waikato Regional Council	Hamilton	N	Y					✓		✓
73	Barry, Peter Lawrence	Raglan	O	NS				✓			
74	Keir, Jaynie Myril	Raglan	O	N		✓	✓	✓			✓
75	King, Dr Richard	Raglan	O	N		✓	✓	✓			
76	Hansen, Kenneth Allan	Raglan	O	N		✓	✓	✓			
77	Jones, Brian Douglas & Marian Winifred	Tuakau	M	Y		✓	✓	✓			✓
78	Department of Conservation	Hamilton	M	Y	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
79	Franklin District Council	Pukekohe	N	Y	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
80	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	Wellington	S	Y	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓
81	McCabe, Phillip Harold	Raglan	O	Y						✓	
82	Grant, Duncan Thomas & Ross Catherine Anne	Raglan	O	Y			✓	✓	✓		
83	Waikato District Council	Ngaruawahia	N	Y	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
84	Matenga, Richard & Juliana	Ngaruawahia	M	N						✓	
85	Ministry of Economic Development	Wellington	N	Y	✓		✓		✓		
86	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Auckland Province) Incorporated	Auckland	M	Y			✓				✓
87	Grey, Joanna L.C.	Wellington	O	N				✓			
88	Divett, Gregor James	Raglan	O	N				✓			✓
89	Hansen, Martin Fronde & McConnell, Nancy Anne	Tuakau	O	Y			✓	✓			✓
90	Ward, Darren Phillip & Lorrae Carolyn	Tuakau	O	N		✓	✓	✓	✓		
91	Ravensdown Fertilisers*	Christchurch	O	Y			✓				✓
92	Ullrich Aluminium Co. Ltd*	Auckland	S	Y			✓				
93	Yates, Scott & Robin*	Auckland	S	N	✓				✓		
94	Carr, John*	Tuakau	M	NS	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
95	Rasmussen, Gary Alexander*	Auckland	O	N			✓	✓	✓		✓
96	Reeves, Alistair & Ann*	Ngaruawahia	O	Y		✓	✓	✓			

## Appendix 2: Submitters' Position on Individual Applications

The Table below notes how many submitters supported, opposed or were neutral regarding each individual application made for the proposal.

Council and Consent Type	Consent Description	Support	Oppose	Neutral
Franklin District Council – Land-use Consents	L08052: all activities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of a wind farm	35	39	13
	L08053: the re-opening and operation of Whitford Quarry including rock crushing and processing	32	24	12
	L08054: two concrete batching plants	32	24	12
	L08055: up to three public viewing areas (including signage) and associated parking areas	32	24	12
	L08056: improvements to local roads	35	26	9
Franklin District Council – Notices of Requirement	L08058: Limestone Downs Substation and ancillary facilities	31	26	12
	L08059: single circuit 220 kV transmission line linking the southern district boundary to Limestone Downs Substation	32	30	9
	L08060: double circuit 220 kV transmission line linking Limestone Downs Substation to Orton Switchyard	31	34	10
	L08057: Orton Switchyard and ancillary facilities	31	30	11
	L08061: double circuit 220 kV transmission line connecting Orton Switchyard to the existing Huntly/Otahuhu A transmission line	31	31	11
Waikato District Council – Land-use Consents	LUC00005/08: all activities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of a wind farm	35	34	10
	LUC00005/08.01: two concrete batching plants	32	24	12
	LUC00005/08.02: improvements to local roads	34	24	10
	DES0012/08: Matira Substation and ancillary facilities	33	25	11
	DES0013/08: Te Akau Substation and ancillary facilities	33	25	11
	DES0014/08: single circuit 220 kV transmission line linking Matira and Te Akau Substations to northern district boundary	32	26	12
Waikato Regional Council – Earthworks Consents	WRC 117912: earthworks, roading and tracking associated with construction, operation and maintenance of a wind farm	34	28	10
	WRC 118074: soil disturbance associated with re-opening and operation of the Whitford Quarry	32	24	12

Council and Consent Type	Consent Description	Support	Oppose	Neutral
Waikato Regional Council – Watertake Consents	WRC 117913: to take up to 104 m <sup>3</sup> water per day at a rate of up to 1.2 L/s from the Waikawau Stream	32	28	10
	WRC 117914: to take up to 94 m <sup>3</sup> water per day at a rate of up to 1.1 L/s from the Kaawa Stream	32	28	10
	WRC 117915: to take up to 79 m <sup>3</sup> water per day at a rate of up to 0.9 L/s from the Waikaretu Stream	32	28	10
	WRC 117916: to take up to 96 m <sup>3</sup> water per day at a rate of up to 1.1 L/s from the Waikorea Stream	32	28	10
	WRC 117920: to take up to the full flow from an unnamed spring at the Whitford Quarry	32	25	12
Waikato Regional Council – Streambed Works Consents	WRC 117921: to construct and maintain an arch culvert in a tributary to the Te Umukaraka Stream	33	22	13
	WRC 117922: to construct and maintain a culvert in a tributary to the Tauterei Stream	33	22	13
	WRC 117923: to construct and maintain a 14 m bridge over the Waimai Stream	33	23	12
Waikato Regional Council – Discharges Consents	WRC 117924: to discharge process water and stormwater from the Whitford Quarry and a concrete batching plant to land and to the Waikaretu Stream	31	29	11
	WRC 117925: to discharge process water and stormwater from three concrete plants to land	32	27	11
Waikato Regional Council – Earthworks Consents	WRC 117927: to undertake earthworks activities for the three substations, a switch yard, transmission lines, and ancillary facilities	33	31	9

Note: The form asked the submitter to tick support, oppose or neutral for each application, or for all applications. As some of the submissions received were not on this form, the position of the submitter was derived from the content of their submission or, if not possible, this submission was excluded from these figures (this applied to 3 submissions).