

BEFORE THE BOARD OF INQUIRY

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of applications for resource consent
and notices of requirement by
Transpower New Zealand Limited for
the North Island Grid Upgrade Project

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF DOUGALL JAMES CAMPBELL IN REBUTTAL
ON BEHALF OF
TRANSPOWER NEW ZEALAND LIMITED
(ACRE model and approach to easement selection and tower move process)**

SIMPSON GRIERSON
D J S LAING / J G A WINCHESTER
TELEPHONE: +64-4-499 4599
FACSIMILE: +64-4-472 6986
DX SX11174: PO BOX 2402
SOLICITORS
WELLINGTON

J S KÓS QC
STOUT STREET CHAMBERS
TELEPHONE: +64-4-472 9026
FACSIMILE: +64-4-472 9027
PO BOX 117
WELLINGTON

Introduction

1. **MY** name is Dougall James Campbell. I wish to present rebuttal evidence to the statements of evidence of:
 - (a) Mr Geoff Copstick and Ms Kate Brennan; and
 - (b) Mr Hugh Vercoe.
2. I address the evidence of each submitter below.

Mr Geoff Copstick and Ms Kate Brennan (Submission number 0405)

3. **AT** paragraph 100 of their revised evidence, Mr Copstick and Ms Brennan state that "*Transpower have decided, on the basis of noise levels, that an easement of 65m is appropriate and have classed all landowners whose land is outside the easement as 'unaffected'. This excludes all landowners whose land is further than 22.5m from the edge of the line from an interest in the proposal.*"
4. **THE** statement that easements widths were determined on the basis of noise levels is incorrect. As stated in my first statement of evidence (at paragraph 78), the noise levels for the Amended Proposal reduced from 45dBA to 40dBA at the edge of the easement due to the use of a triplex conductor. For the Amended Proposal, conductor swing became the design standard that determined the easement width.
5. I also disagree with the statement that Transpower has classed all landowners whose land is outside the easement as unaffected. Transpower identified all landowners within the final route (approximately 500m wide) and the landowners directly affected by the easement (minimum 65m wide) as having an interest in the Upgrade Project. Paragraph 84 through to 91 of my first statement of evidence outlines the consultation process undertaken by Transpower to confirm the easement and tower locations.

Mr Hugh Vercoe (Submission number 1129)

6. **AT** paragraph 2(b) Mr Vercoe refers to Transpower opposing two applications for subdivision consent. He then states that Transpower could challenge any development on his property. The two subdivision consents Mr Vercoe refers to are those by Mr Scott and Mrs Seales. I have addressed those consents, and the framework Transpower has developed for addressing development proposals within the area of the proposed line at paragraphs 114 to 118 of my first statement of evidence.

7. **IN** relation to the Parahiwi farm property, Transpower as a neighbour and potentially affected party of any future subdivision, would consider any development proposal that requires consent, to assess any potential issues arising from such development. As the proposed line does not directly affect the Parahiwi farm property, these issues are likely to relate to ensuring owners/developers are aware of Transpower's Upgrade Project, including the fact that the existing 110kV towers would be replaced by larger towers.

Dougall James Campbell

25 March 2008