To the Environmental Protection Agency  
At Cathryn Bridge  
Manager, Standards and Performance  
Nationally Significant Proposals.

19/10/2011

Dear Ms Bridge,

The Turitea Final Decision raises further serious process issues, two of which I am here bringing to your attention.

This is from the Final Decision, emphasis added.

18-56

“Discussion

[234] The Percy and McBride families will be adversely affected to the extent that the project may be unacceptable from the Tararua viewpoints unless some useful mitigation for these residents can be found.

Other than these reservations, we consider that Turitea is generally compatible with the surrounding rural area of the Tararua District, and this is reflected in the fact that so many rural landowners in the overall area of the site have given their approval to the proposal and only two rural residential Tararua landowners have filed an objection.

This area of the Tararuas does not contain foothills communities. Thus, the wind farm is generally consistent with the relevant rural provisions of the TDP as we were advised of them.”

1/ The claim that so many rural landowners in the Tararua District have given their approval to the proposal is the Board’s utterly false spin.

There was only one Tararua submitter, number 338 Day, who spoke in support of the proposal as he is a beneficiary of the project and at the time was due for 6 turbines on his property. In my view the judge and Board have extrapolated from just one submitter, without any recorded or tabled additional submitter evidence, to make the extraordinary statement “many rural landowners in the overall area of the site have given their approval to the proposal”

2/ The Final Decision is purportedly a legal document and this type of sloppy activism and exaggeration by the BOI is plainly deliberate and unjustified in a report on “the facts”. There is no redress for the victims.

It is a statement made with imperial confidence and oversteps the boundary of binding Environment Court protocols.

There were just three submitters in the vicinity of the downstream effects of the wind farm.

198 Mc Brides
255 Percys
560 Hamiltons

All three opposed the wind farm pointing out the effect on their properties. The Hamiltons have been sidelined and Mr John Wheeler who drew the BOI’s attention to the fact that at least 20 another families are very seriously affected is summarily dismissed by the BOI as a footnote since he dared to change his mind about supporting the project.
Wheeler J. Comments on Draft Report. Mr Wheeler here identifies other families that might be similarly affected to the Percys, but in his first submission he supported the project as a whole.

The Hamiltons state in their submission

“As residence [sic] of the Tararua District these windmills will be in our constant view of the Tararua Ranges and the sound will travel the short distance to our home.”

The Tararua District Council inexplicably did not submit on the Turitea wind farm and the total of just 6 submissions, a mere .85% of the total of 702 submissions, shows a failure by TDC to follow the mandatory requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 to inform its ratepayers of their right to submit in defence of their amenity. Yet from the Final Decision it appears there have been subsequent, behind the scenes, private discussions between the BOI and TDC which did not become testable evidence – indeed how could it when TDC was not a submitter but is nonetheless a party to the community liaison group. What collusion has there been between TDC, MRP and PNCC in light of PNCC’s secret and binding contract, the foundation document for the Turitea wind farm? What is being held back from TDC ratepayers?

The Final Decision also states.

As a result of the comments on the Draft Report process we now realise that the submissions of the McBride family who live at this address were overlooked. How this occurred when in fact the Board is in receipt of four submissions from them is unknown.

This admission by the BOI gives pause as to what other vitally important matters have either been missed by the Board or deliberately ignored as being inconvenient to the purpose of consenting the wind farm come what may. The Board had months to clean up its act and a team of administrators to give assistance. No final photomontage has ever been issued, nor was there one for submitters to comment on in the Draft Decision. No images of infrastructure, transmission lines, transmission towers or substations have ever at any stage been provided to the public.

It is my conclusion that the BOI in its Final Decision has sought legitimacy in obfuscating verbosity and failed.
Its conduct is callous and completely unprofessional.
You just couldn’t make this stuff up.

Paul Stichbury
paulstichbury@gmail.com