

169

SUBMISSION ON MIGHTY RIVER POWER LTD APPLICATIONS FOR RESOURCE CONSENT

Section 145 of the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Freepost Call In Ministry for the Environment PO Box 10362 The Terrace Wellington 6143	RECEIVED 20 FEB 2009	Email: turiteacallin@mfe.govt.nz Fax: 04 439 7705 [Note: If you are emailing or faxing your submission, please mark in the subject line: 'Turitea Call In']
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

This submission relates to the applications for resource consent lodged by Mighty River Power Ltd for the Turitea Wind Farm proposal as identified on the next page.

CLOSING DATE AND TIME FOR SUBMISSIONS: 5.00 PM MONDAY 23 FEBRUARY 2009

Title: Mr (Mrs) Miss Ms (Please circle the appropriate title(s) or print clearly below)

My/Our Full Name(s): Tania Rose McBride

Postal Address: 577 Parallel Rd, RD3 Cambridge

Work Ph: _____ **Home Ph:** 07 834 0644 **Cell:** 027 640 7818

Work Fax: _____ **Home Fax:** _____ **Email:** _____

Please tick the relevant boxes on the next page to identify whether you are making a submission on all applications for resource consent or just some of them (please identify).

Please also indicate on the back of this form (✓) whether you support, oppose, or are neutral in relation to the applications. If you are making a submission only on parts of an application for resource consent, please note this when specifying the reasons for your submission.

The reasons for my/our submission are: _____ *If you are attaching further information tick for yes*

Please see attached sheet

Please use more pages if you need to.

I/we seek the following decision from the Board of Inquiry (provide precise details including the nature of any conditions sought):

For the consent to be declined, and the submission refused.

Please use more pages if you need to.

Use a clear tick in the appropriate box below (✓)

I/we wish to be heard in respect of my/our submission (to speak at the public hearing).

I/we DO NOT wish to be heard and hereby make my/our submission in writing only.

Signature(s): [Signature] **Date:** 16/2/09.

(Signature of submitter, or person authorised to sign on their behalf is required. Note signature is not required for electronic (email) submissions. If this is a joint submission by two or more individuals, each individual's signature is required.)

Use the tick boxes below to indicate the called-in applications for resource consent that your submission concerns.
Use a clear tick in the appropriate box or boxes (✓).

I/we make my/our submission concerning all applications for resource consent below

OR

My/our submission only concerns the applications for resource consent that I/we have ticked below:

Support Oppose Neutral

Manawatu-Wanganui (Horizons) Regional Council – Land-use Consents	Support	Oppose	Neutral
104553: for vegetation clearance and land disturbance in rare or threatened habitats, near streams and on highly erodible land throughout the general wind farm site.		✓	
104554: for the construction of a double culvert in an un-named tributary of the Kahuterawa Stream as shown on the included map.		✓	
Manawatu-Wanganui (Horizons) Regional Council – Discharge Permits	Support	Oppose	Neutral
104555: for the discharge of dust to air from the concrete batching plants to be located as generally shown on the included map.		✓	
104556: for the discharge of dust to air from the mobile crushing plant throughout the general wind farm site.		✓	
104557: for the discharge of wastewater from two operations and maintenance facilities to land to be located as generally shown on the included map.		✓	
104558: for the discharge of stormwater from substations to land to be located as generally shown on the included map.		✓	
104559: for the discharge of cleanfill to land in the form of spoil disposal sites throughout the general wind farm site.		✓	
104560: for the discharge of stormwater from roads, turbine platforms and other areas to land.		✓	
Palmerston North City Council – Land-use Consents	Support	Oppose	Neutral
RC0068: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to establish and operate a wind farm in the areas within the Palmerston North city jurisdiction as generally shown on the included map to undertake earthworks associated with tracking and roading, turbine construction and associated buildings in the areas within the Palmerston North city jurisdiction as generally shown on the included map for the western side of Pahiatua Aokautere Road not meeting access requirements at the location shown on the included map for the storage of diesel (10,000 L) in bunded areas outside the Turitea water supply catchment, generally located at the two substation laydown areas shown on the included map, that exceeds the 0.2 effects ratio maximum in the rural zone for the construction of a 220 kV electricity transmission line and substations as shown on the included map. 		✓	
Tararua District Council – Land-use Consents	Support	Oppose	Neutral
1448: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for a wind farm (which is not listed as a permitted or controlled activity) in the areas within the Tararua District as generally shown on the included map for land disturbance of more than 200 m³ of soil and cleanfill material associated with tracking and roading, turbine construction, spoil disposal and other associated works in the areas within the Tararua District as generally shown on the included map for upgrades to South Range Road and the construction of new site access at the location shown on the included map for turbine and wind monitoring mast structures not meeting height requirements within the Tararua District for the modification of a Significant Natural Feature in Schedule 3.3 (ie, Tararua Ranges Ridgeline) for not meeting noise requirements for clearance of indigenous vegetation in the areas within the Tararua District as generally shown on the included map. 		✓	

NOTE: A copy of this submission form MUST also be sent to Mighty River Power Ltd at:

Freeport – MRP
Mighty River Power Ltd
PO Box 445
Hamilton 3240
Attention: Stephanie Froggatt

Or email turitea@mightyriver.co.nz or fax (07) 857 0192

I/we have sent a copy of my/our submission to Mighty River Power Ltd as per Section 96(4) of the RMA.



Ministry for the
Environment
Manatū Mo Te Taiao

New Zealand Government

While our current address is at Cambridge, this only temporary, our normal place of residence is 933 Makomako Road, Pahiatua, which we own.

1. **CONSULTATION:** We are greatly disappointed with Mighty River Power's claim of consultation with neighbouring property owners since 2006 (section 8.3.11) our properties northern boundary is less than 200 meters from the proposed wind farm boundary on Makomako Road yet we have had one visit in the later part of 2008 from a MRP representative, which is woefully inadequate considering the size and magnitude of this project and the effects that we are going to suffer.
2. **ROADING:** Information in section 4.6.2 Road Network, is incorrect, this section of road still accommodates a passing lane and is painted and signposted as such. Removing it would only lead to further traffic congestion and impatient drivers taking unnecessary risks on a very tight and winding piece of road that is subject to frequent adverse weather conditions. Excavating any of the existing rock face (to the east) to improve the line of sight, which is Very limited could lead to destabilisation of the the face and create persistent slipping during wet weather as is experienced in the Manawatu Gorge as the rock breaks up and fractures easily.
3. **NOISE:** Persistent noise from the turbines is going to make our lives a misery, and what effects will this have on our 3 young children, being downwind of these things is just going to be unbearable, we see in the consent application to the Tararua district council MRP are applying for consent "for NOT meeting noise requirements", this is unacceptable as our home is going to be only 1500m from the turbines.
4. **ECOLOGICAL:** We believe there has been insufficient research done regarding the impact this proposal will have on native bird life and vegetation the placing of such a project into a very fragile native reserve is absurd and should not have proceeded as far as it has.
5. **VISUAL:** This proposal is going to greatly affect the surrounding areas and regions , while some of the district councils may consider this part of the Tararua Ranges not to be an "Outstanding Significant Landscape" it is nevertheless the main visual relief for Palmerston North City and surrounds.
6. **LOCATION:** The location of the turbines is far too close to a lot of homes, (and ours), this is going to drastically reduce our enjoyment and amenity value not to mention our property value should it even be possible to sell it.
7. **COMPENSATION:** Are we going to receive compensation for having this monstrosity forced upon us ? for the sleepless nights & loss of property value. While the farmers whose land the turbines are going on will receive a royalty, yet it is our view that they are going into,What do we get?.
8. **CONSENT LAPSING PERIOD:** (section 1.5) Request for a 10 year resource is unacceptable, would you like to have a project of this size being carried out in your backyard for this long, 5 years is more than long enough, either MRP have the resources or they don't. Especially as they have sought to bypass normal RMA procedure and have this project "called in" to speed things up.
9. **GENERATION:** (section 4.1.2a) We see that MRP consider a capacity factor of 45% to be

appropriate for the Turitea proposal and compare it to overseas wind farms, why did they not compare it to the Te Apiti windfarm which is only a few kilometres away and generates at only 35% ?

10. COST: What is this project going to cost now that our dollar has drastically fallen against most of the currencies we trade with, while there is some merit to wind generation this will not stop the need to provide reliable back-up generation and what form and at what cost will this be ? The money spent would be put to better use building more reliable generation facilities.

T McBride

Tania McBride 16/02/09