

SUBMISSION

Roger Everson

I am a resident within Manukau City living at 104 Highridge Road, Clevedon.

My property is within 300 metres of the proposed new transmission lines, which will be visible to me for about 20 kilometres. There is an existing transmission line following much the same alignment as that now proposed.

The general amenity of the area is rural with some larger lifestyle blocks running dry stock. The outlook to the south west of my property is of forest cover on the Hunua Catchment reserve area. I have extensive views to the north and west but I am not so situated that my home intrudes into the landscape any more than my neighbours.

I chose and purchased my property in 2001 with the intention of being settled in a predominantly rural area integrated into the natural environment.

I was aware that the original native cover has been significantly modified from that which would have originally existed, and the current amenity is grassy paddocks with scattered houses, gullies with remnant native and exotic vegetation and some hedgerows along the fence-lines. This is a restful and quiet natural environment even with the existing transmission line. This is because those lines follow existing gullies and have clearly been located there to minimise the harsh visual intrusion of their skeletal structures.

I have seen the proposed alignment which appears not to be located in the gullies or intended to integrate with the existing transmission line. As it is, the line will be the most conspicuous feature in the landscape because it is completely un-natural. The proposed towers are 50 metres high whereas the existing line has towers of 25 metres high. Consequently the new towers will dominate and attract attention away from all the natural features presently visible to me in relative harmony. Its location will simply introduce clutter and the stress of significant un-natural structures in an otherwise restful scene.

Now I am conscious of the importance and significance to the nation of getting electricity to Auckland. Our national wellbeing is determined most significantly by the quality of its infrastructure of which electricity is a significant contributor. But it strikes against our most dearly held natural heritage values when the natural landscape is impacted in this manner.

I note that the Herald of 28 August carried comment of the proposed national policy statement on electricity transmission to the effect that high voltage power lines should be buried beneath roadways, and I would add otherwise located so as not to intrude into the skyline (as seems to always be the case with wind power generation) and preferably be located in rural areas within network utility corridors identified on the District Plan. In residential zones the location of new roads can be made to follow such network utility corridors and thus avoid the undesirable actual and perceived effects of the services themselves. In my opinion the co-ordination of such utilities and planning for them is not being co-ordinated to the detriment of the natural image we espouse for our country. Perhaps whatever decision is made in regard to the current proposals should be made subject to the proposed National Policy Statement.

My opposition is not to the principle of conveying electricity but where and what is being done to do it. In this day of consultation, I would have expected to have been approached because of the proximity of my property to the proposed line, and I would have expected that the assessment of effects required would have shown that I am an affected party. I am asking to be consulted on proposed mitigation of the adverse effects from loss of amenity that I believe will occur.

I would like it to be explained to me on-site exactly where the line will go at and what facilities will be constructed. I also expect the applicants to have explained the issues of macro and micro location of the facility as it intrudes into my views and what mitigation will occur.

I have not been approached by the applicants or its agents and I consider this to be unfair, if not unreasonable. Until I understand that it is unreasonable to improve on the location of the lines or the aspects of the height of the towers I remain opposed. Associated with the identification of the proposal, I ask to have explained to me the proposed mitigation for the effects to me and my property. Until this occurs, I will remain opposed.

Yours faithfully

Roger Everson
30 September 2007