

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 DAVID ALEXANDER CAMPBELL BAMFORD IN
REBUTTAL FOR TRANSPOWER NEW ZEALAND LIMITED
(Tourism and recreational issues)**

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 David Alexander Campbell Bamford. I wish to present rebuttal evidence to the statements of evidence of:
 - (a) Mr James Mylchreest on behalf of the Maungatautari Ecological Island Trust;
 - (b) Ms Di Lucas on behalf of South Waikato District Council (**SWDC**);
 - (c) Ms Sally Peake on behalf of Auckland Regional Council (**ARC**) and Franklin District Council (**FDC**);
 - (d) Mr Geoff Copstick and Ms Kate Brennan;
 - (e) Ms Nicky and Mr Mark Auld; and
 - (f) Ms Mary Buckland on behalf of Waipa District Council.

2. I address the evidence of each submitter below.

Mr James Mylchreest on behalf of the Maungatautari Ecological Island Trust (Submission number 1077)

3. **IN** part 5 of his evidence, Mr Mylchreest states that, should the Upgrade Project proceed through the Special Landscape Character Area of Maungatautari and Lake Karapiro, it will have a negative impact on New Zealand's "clean green" image, and any diminution to the landscape qualities of Maungatautari could potentially reduce visitor numbers to the project, thus having a general negative economic impact and specifically impact on the Trust's ability to become self-sustaining.

4. **IN** response, I note that at its closest point the Maungatautari Ecological Island Reserve is approximately 2 kilometres away from the proposed line. The current ARI-PAK A line travels along a similar route to the proposed line, although the proposed line diverts further away from Maungatautari at Tower 313.

5. **AS** discussed at paragraphs 101 and 102 of my first statement of evidence, it is recognised that the Maungatautari Ecological Island Reserve has high conservation values and receives recreation and tourism use. In this regard, I estimate that the Maungatautari Reserve would currently receive between 10,000 and 20,000 visitors a year. However, I understand that there are at present no visitor or track counters at the Reserve to provide an exact figure. This number is therefore derived from site visits and interviews with those familiar to the Reserve.
6. **AS** the reserve is surrounded by developed farmland and accessed by road, the proposed line is not out of character with regard to other New Zealand rural areas that have powerlines or transmission lines. The reserve itself is high-quality mature forest, and once in it, there are few opportunities to glimpse the developed area beyond.
7. **IN** my view, the proposed line will not deter visitors, both international and domestic to this important ecological reserve. Nor do I consider that the proposed line will influence the economic viability of the Maungatautari Ecological Reserve Trust. I also note that the reserve has developed despite the close proximity of existing transmission lines in the area.

Ms Di Lucas on behalf of South Waikato District Council (SWDC) (Submission number 0799)

8. **AT** paragraph 70 of her evidence, Ms Lucas states that:

"The photo (attachment 35) from Arapuni Road just above the proposed Arapuni Crossing of the route (and Tower 32) is the view on the main route for the many tourist buses that travel daily from Waitomo Caves to Rotorua. The structures would cross this important public and tourist view of Maungatautari at an oblique angle, around 600 metres away."

9. **IN** response, I acknowledge that this road is used by many tourist buses that travel daily from Waitomo Caves to Rotorua. As the buses travel from Waitomo Caves to Rotorua when they pass Tower 32 and the Arapuni crossing, it is highly unlikely they will see Maungatautari as it will be behind the

tourist bus. I also consider it unlikely, due to time constraints, that tourist buses would stop at this site.

10. **AT** paragraph 71, Ms Lucas raises Mr Lister's analysis of any tourist experience on the Arapuni Road. I note that I have addressed this issue in my first statement of evidence at paragraphs 103-105 where I describe the use of the area by tourists.
11. **AT** paragraph 84, Ms Lucas notes the Waikato River Trails project will be impacted by the proposed line at Lake Karapiro.
12. **IN** response, I have acknowledged in my first statement of evidence (paragraphs 105 and 156) that the Waikato River Trail does go close to the river and Lake Karapiro. This trail will pass areas that currently have Transpower lines and other transmission lines nearby. An example is the current placement of towers in recreational high use areas at the Moana Road Reserve where rowing regattas are often held. I also note that the Waikato River Trail, that is already established near Arapuni with its associated hydro facilities, does not appear to deter current walkers.
13. **AT** paragraphs 118-220, Ms Lucas raises the "*important aspect of the Arapuni to Tokapuhi area, ... as a place of recreation*".
14. **IN** response, I acknowledge that recreation does occur in this area. Some of this is on private land such as at Waipa Stream and on access to Reserves. Other areas for recreation include the Waikato River trail that is already established between Arapuni Dam and Jones Landing. Recreational use on the current Waikato River trail, at Arapuni does not appear to be impacted by hydro facilities at Arapuni Dam.

Ms Sally Peake on behalf of Auckland Regional Council (ARC) and Franklin District Council (FDC) (Submission numbers 1065 and 1048)

15. **IN** paragraph 23 of her evidence, Ms Peake concludes that there will be low effects for visitors and users of the park although future development (including removal of vegetation outside the park) may change the extent and magnitude of effects.

16. **IN** response, I agree with Ms Peake about the low effect of the proposed line on park visitors. I noted in paragraph 78 of my first statement of evidence that the park entrance is about 800 metres (directly) from the proposed line and the current (ARI-PAK A) line. The existence of the proposed new line in this location is therefore highly unlikely to deter people from using the park from this entrance.

Mr Geoff Copstick and Ms Kate Brennan (Submission numbers 0405 and 0406)

17. **MR** Copstick and Ms Brennan, at paragraphs 161 to 163 of their revised evidence, comment on tourism and recreational issues. In paragraph 162 they say that "*Mr Bamford ignores completely the recreational activities engaged in on, or near lifestyle blocks. Many lifestyle block owners enjoy outdoor recreation including, but not limited to, horse riding, walking, hunting and biking. These activities are closely connected to the amenity value of the properties they own. To detract from their ability to enjoy these activities is to remove some of the amenity value from their properties.*"
18. **IN** response, I disagree with the comment. In my first statement of evidence I have regularly mentioned the importance of recreation in rural areas. An example is paragraph 41 where I note "*that recreation is important to New Zealanders in a wide variety of settings from urban areas to the wilderness and ... both on public and private land.*"
19. **MR** Copstick and Ms Brennan also state, at paragraph 163 of their revised evidence, that "*Mr Bamford repeatedly asserts that the presence of the proposed line would be no worse than the existing ARI-PAK line.*"
20. **IN** response, I consider that the proposed line will not have a detrimental impact on recreation use in the vicinity of the proposed line.

Ms Nicky and Mr Mark Auld (Submission number 0826)

21. **AT** paragraph 4 of their evidence, Ms and Mr Auld state that "*Environmental effects of introducing mammoth third world pylon technology to beautiful NZ is a disgusting insult to the "Clean Green" image marketed overseas for the tourist dollars and products.*"

