

Steve Rice

From: TPCallin [TPCallin@mfe.govt.nz]
Sent: Friday, 21 September 2007 6:11 p.m.
To: rice-resources-ltd@clear.net.nz
Subject: FW: Grid Upgrade Submissions

RECEIVED ON
21 SEP 2007
0107

From: anonymous@createhosting.net.nz [SMTP:ANONYMOUS@CREATEHOSTING.NET.NZ]
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2007 6:07:56 PM
To: boisub@notowers.co.nz
Subject: Grid Upgrade Submissions
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Catherine Joy Burton
Phone: 09 292 4183
Email: catherine@nzmerchants.co.nz
Yes: I/we wish to be heard in support of my/our submission at the public hearing, and expect I will need between one and two hours to present my evidence. I would like the location of the portion of the hearing which will receive my evidence to be held in a local venue near to where I live.
submitter: Catherine Joy Burton
A: copy of this submission has been emailed to Transpower.
Scope: This submission covers all notices of requirements and applications for resource consents relating Transpower's applications that will be heard by this Board of Inquiry. The references are NORs 27619, L07089, DES0011/07, RMR200621, DN/0006/07, 240/021, RM070209, and resource consents 34102, 34370, 34372, 34373, 34711, 34712, 116902, 116903, 116904, 116905, and any other NORs or resource consent applications that may subsequently be filed or altered. We oppose all of these NORs and applications for resource consent.
Re: This submission relates to the notices of requirement and/or applications for resource consent, lodged by Transpower New Zealand Ltd for the North Island Grid Upgrade Project, and identified above.
Remote Name: 219.89.114.144
Date: 21 September 2007

Address:

60 Gelling Road

Ararimu

RD3, Papakura

South Auckland

Reasons:

I am completely opposed to Transpower's intention to build this un-needed line, as the demand growth projections of the Electricity Commission (2007 SOO) do not justify its construction. The scale and capacity of this proposed 400kV capable line is completely out of alignment with the expected requirements for transmission capacity into Auckland to meet demand growth in the next 40 years. The potential new generation capacity likely to be constructed in the Auckland region in the next 40 years has been grossly underestimated in an attempt to justify this line as one of national significance and urgency.

Better equal benefit alternatives to this proposed line are available that have a much reduced environmental impact, such as more generation in the Auckland region, duplexing and reconductoring of the Whakamaru A, B and C lines, use of HVDC transmission technology which will be less obtrusive and easier to underground, more extensive use of undergrounding of HVAC lines, and consideration of new conventional small scale 220kV transmission lines.

I oppose this line being built on a 65 metre wide easement, when a 600 metre wide easement, free of houses and workplaces, should be required as a precautionary principle to reduce future health risks and environmental impacts.

I oppose large scale HVAC transmission lines being built on narrow 65 metre wide easements because of the EMF emissions and ionized particle emissions that will come from this line, which have been proven to cause numerous diseases, including childhood leukaemia.

I oppose these applications because Transpower has falsely (and perhaps criminally) tried to justify the need for this line being built by using out of date and inaccurately high demand growth forecasts (2005 SOO), have not included the cost of environmental impacts in their justifications, and are providing misleading and inaccurate costings of the real alternative options to this line that should be considered.

I oppose these applications because this huge pylon option seems to have been chosen because it seems to be the cheapest option - however, anybody in business will tell you that the cheapest is very seldom the best option and you always end up paying more to fix the cock up you made in the first place by going with the cheapest option. "How do you feel about going to the moon in a rocket built by the lowest tender?" Neil Armstrong.

I oppose these applications because when the rest of the world is moving away from this old technology we are expected to embrace it - why when we have the opportunity to use the latest technology would we choose this old ugly technology.

I oppose these applications because there are better local alternatives - we live in a sunny country and every household in the country has a roof - better to spend money on solar panels so that people are at least partially self sufficient for at least their hot water. I appreciate that this may not be in transpowers interest, but it is in the national interest.

And I oppose them because they will be a blight on our beautiful New Zealand landscape - and once they are there we will never get rid of them. We are very proud of our scenery and many make their living from the fact that it is there and unspoiled - the rest of us just get to enjoy it on a daily basis. Our scenery should be enjoyed by New Zealanders and visitors alike - huge and ugly constructions of this size will be very hard to ignore and in some areas, get away from - tourist industries will be materially damaged. We should learn from history - many beautiful and historic buildings that had stood for generations in both London and Auckland were allowed to be pulled down by big developers and big business and replaced by big ugly steel and glass structures before enough people realised what was being lost - our landscape and our clean and green image should not suffer the same fate.

Therefore:

I seek the following decision from the Board of Inquiry. That the application for Notices of Requirement and Resource Consents should be turned down completely, and Transpower directed to investigate generation, conservation and transmission alternatives that will avoid this line being built under any circumstances.

I explicitly do not want the Board of Inquiry to approve the applications subject to conditions - I want the applications turned down in whole.