

Kim Morgan

**From:** Arnold Chamove [ynnovate@bordernet.co.nz]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 22 February 2009 2:49 p.m.  
**To:** TuriteaCallin  
**Cc:** turitea@mightyriver.co.nz  
**Subject:** Turitea Call In



Dr Arnold Chamove BA, MA, PhD, MPhil, FIBiol, CPsychol, DSc  
 RD 4, Palmerston North 4474  
 06 2555 889

Submission concerning **all** applications—Support

Our experience in natural **vegetation clearance** (i.e., slips) is that the clearance is invisible in about three years. Also such disturbance is a natural occurrence in New Zealand and gives different pioneer species a chance to develop. This comment includes **earth works associated with tracking and roading**.

As in the **discharge of cleanfill to land**, it also gives the operators or the public the opportunity to seed the area with rare indigenous vegetable species and with species providing food for bird life. It also gives researchers (e.g., at Massey University or local Crown Research Institutes or local schools) the opportunity to research regeneration of indigenous plant and animal species from a substantial area (which could be funded at minimal [NZ\$5,000] cost by Might River Power Ltd). The discharge of stormwater gives the opportunity to create a more diverse landscape, specifically housing for small native fish and crustaceans; and provide the opportunity for controlled research into stream clearance by the above establishments. The **discharge of dust to air** will be beneficial to surrounding vegetation; modern farming practice uses rock dust as a very slow release fertilizer with a balanced chemical nature. Such discharge will act like very small volcanic activity, in aiding vegetation growth. This discharge will also provide the opportunity for controlled research into such dust effects by the above establishments.

The Palmerston North City council invited and encouraged Windfarm applications. Our form of government, like the UK but unlike that of the USA, elects representatives to use their own judgment to carry out policy. Councils do not carry out frequent referenda like in the USA. Our representatives have said we the people of Palmerston North want Windfarms. It is unfair now to go back on that "contract" and put new restrictions on those Windfarm companies chosen by the Council, restrictions above that implied in the original invitation. Our "word" means something in Palmerston North.

The ranges were not recognized as a **Significant Natural Feature** (SNF) until windfarms were proposed. When homes or radar domes or radio masts or sheds or trees were to alter this SNF, no one said anything. Suddenly turbines (not homes or radar domes or radio masts or sheds or trees) are offensive, but only within the argument of this submission. When advertising a home for sale, "view of turbines" is a positive feature; when advertising Palmerston North, "views of turbines" are a positive feature; and for tourists "views of turbines" are positive. This appears to me to be inconsistent, especially when turbines are considered a positive addition to the landscape in other countries. Were it to be a negative feature, then one would expect a persistent reduction in house prices with view of turbines, and this is not found in overseas research (only a temporary reduction, a fact well-known to property speculators). Unbiased evidence suggests that this "modification of a SNR" will be in a positive direction, for world populations of both animals and humans, for animals and human populations in New Zealand, and for local populations.

The only valid objection to any such proposal is that the construction and operation of windturbines will damage the property and the peace of nearby homes. The other objections I have heard appear either spurious or contrary to scientific evidence or a minority opinion. I submit that the government should indemnify nearby property owners against such damage or irritation. As things now stand, any damage to property or violation of agreements or breaking of laws are only settled by recourse to the courts, an unequal battle as we have found out in the past to our substantial cost.

Although we are directly adjacent to three windfarms, we do not anticipate any benefit to us of such farms; we only anticipate (and have experienced from existing windfarms) substantial loss of income, increased work discomfort to our employees, and further (we have experienced) un-

23/02/2009

recompensed damage to our property from windfarms (e.g., persistent damage to fences, dumping of trash and spoil). Nevertheless, based on our first-hand experience in Ethiopia and other African countries, and based on scientific studies of worldwide population increase, we feel it irresponsible and immoral to sit on a positive natural resource (which will benefit world human and animal populations as well as the proximal and distal people of New Zealand) and to selfishly say, "Not near us". Personally, we do not want turbines on our boundary, but turbines are overall a good thing, and so my submission is in favour of their construction.

I do not wish to be heard as my submission does not contain any scientific data; only my considered personal view as someone who has nothing to gain and much to loose.

We have copied this to Mighty River Power Ltd.