

Dr N Smith
Minister for the Environment

11th October 2011

Dear Dr Smith

Ref. Final Report and Decision of Turitea Wind Farm (Sept. 2011)

I have raised with you in previous correspondence, although addressed to Judge Newhook, the issue of the binding contract between PNCC and Mighty River Power. I have shown how this contract has reduced PNCC's role as a territorial authority to that of a lap dog doing MRP's bidding at the expense of the legally binding social contract with the ratepayers it is meant to serve. The issue of this contract does not stop with the Turitea Wind Farm, however.

Mighty River Power is, as you will be aware, applying for resource consent for the Puketoi wind farm. This wind farm is in a very sparsely settled area and unlikely to attract much opposition. I do not intend to oppose it.

The issue of the contractual agreement with PNCC, though, is driving another issue of vital importance to residents in the Kahuterawa valley. MRP is applying for consent to run the transmission lines from Puketoi through the Turitea Wind Farm and down Kahuterawa valley. This requires consent from PNCC to surrender two kilometres of PNCC reserve land for this connection to be made.

Obviously this had been planned much earlier without the knowledge of valley residents other than the landowners who have taken payment for the transmission route. Judge Kenderdine makes this disingenuous statement in the Final Decision.

“From an infrastructure perspective, the transmission lines required for the project will have significant effects, but we note that landowners have granted permission where these are located on private land”

No photomontages have ever been provided and residents are unaware that the increased capacity of the transmission lines will mean monster 52 metre towers marching down a beautiful valley, which is zoned rural residential.

This gross deception is driven by the Turitea Wind Farm Agreement and the Judge and Board have simply gone, nudge, nudge, wink, wink.

I emailed Mr Annabell at PNCC for information on the discussions between PNCC and MRP and have heard nothing to date. Although I will be certain to hear from Mr Annabell, it will very likely be after Puketoi submissions close on October 17th. This correspondence is attached.

MRP have stated what is their “preferred route”, however there are alternative routes for the transmission lines and I will be making a recommendation to that effect, as PNCC under the contract with MRP is not able to fulfill its statutory role to either properly inform ratepayers of this resource consent application or to monitor or enforce consent conditions.

This debacle is a national disgrace and is more reminiscent of the third world conduct.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Stichbury

paulstichbury@gmail.com

