

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 JULIE MEADE ROSE IN REBUTTAL
FOR TRANSPOWER NEW ZEALAND LIMITED
(Social impact peer review)**

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

Introduction

1. **MY** name is Julie Meade Rose. I wish to present rebuttal evidence to the statements of evidence of:
 - (a) Ms Di Lucas, on behalf of South Waikato District Council (**SWDC**); and
 - (b) Mr Michael O'Connor, on behalf of Matamata-Piako District Council (**MPDC**).

I address each submitter below.

Ms Di Lucas on behalf of South Waikato District Council

2. **AT** paragraph 37 of her evidence, Ms Lucas refers to Dr Phillips' conclusions at paragraph 212. She notes that "*considering the cultural integrity of the communities associated with the Arapuni-Tokapuhi landscape, I consider the assessment to be inadequate.*"
3. I consider Dr Phillips' assessment in his evidence, based on his experience in rural (and urban) contexts in New Zealand over 22 years and his analyses of statistical, consultation and fieldwork data for the proposed upgrade, and qualified in his rebuttal, to be sound for not just the communities associated with the Arapuni-Tokapuhi landscape, but any of the population groups along the route.
4. **AT** her paragraph 44, Ms Lucas states that at paragraph 31 of my evidence in chief I identified some information gaps in my review.
5. **AT** paragraph 31 of my evidence in chief, I acknowledged the absence of community surveys in Dr Phillips' assessment. I noted at paragraph 32 that "*due to the negative reaction from several individuals and groups to the project, the methods that have been used are appropriate.*" Valuable information has been gained however from many people and a wide range of sources, and all data has been checked. I also noted that the methods used "*... have been applied appropriately and provide adequate information for an assessment of effects to be made.*"

6. **AT** paragraph 47 of her evidence, Ms Lucas states that her landscape assessment does not support my conclusion at paragraph 107 of my evidence in chief. I concluded at paragraph 107 that *“Effects from the operations phase, mainly the on-going maintenance of the transmission lines, are anticipated to be minor or negligible.”* It is not clear to me from reading her evidence what Ms Lucas’s assessment actually is. Her comments appear to be contradictory. While she considers *“...the attachment to the landscapes of Arapuni – Te Waotu – Tokapuni, their traditions of landowner care and decision-making, ...”* (at paragraph 47) she also notes (at paragraph 46) that *“with the Waikato power scheme on their western boundary, the peoples of South Waikato are very familiar with electricity generation and transmission structures.”*

7. **IN** my view, if people of South Waikato move, should the transmission line be constructed, they are likely to relocate to an area with an acceptable visual landscape. If people stay in South Waikato, should the transmission line be constructed, then they are already familiar with electricity generation and transmission structures as Ms Lucas states. In this regard, I concur with Dr Phillips’ statement (paragraph 277 of his evidence in chief) that *“Once constructed, any infrastructure like the proposed line is effectively part of the environment and is factored in to people’s thinking about a location.”* This environment includes the waterfall and picnic area in Section 14 of the proposed overhead line, and which Ms Lucas also refers to in her paragraph 47.

Mr Michael O’Connor, on behalf of Matamata-Piako District Council

8. **AT** paragraph 2.1 of his evidence, Mr O’Connor states that he undertook a survey of landholders in the Matamata-Piako District Council (the word “area” needs to be added), who will have the proposed line running through their properties. He states that the survey addresses the effects of the proposed line on agriculture in the district.

10. **MR** O’Connor states that he sent survey forms to 49 affected landholders and had 10 responses, which as Dr Phillips’ rightly indicates at paragraph 54 of his rebuttal evidence, is a response rate of only 20%. Mr O’Connor indicates that although time restraints prevented him from following up on non respondents *“the messages conveyed in the responses still give a very good indication of people’s feelings.”* While results may be indicative of the feelings of those affected

landholders' who responded, they are by no means representative of the sample undertaken, the reasons for which Dr Phillips has indicated.

Julie Meade Rose

14 May 2008