

Attn Jenny Walton,

I am 100% opposed to the implementation of the approval and construction of the 220/400V line on 70m pylons.

On a personal basis, the corridor for these lines encroaches into my property, which is a Chestnut Orchard with approx 2000 trees spread over 40 acres and ready for production. The corridor will necessitate the removal of a shelter belt that will render many of the trees useless. To date Transpower will

(1) Not offer any compensation for the Loss of Income.

(2) shift the pylons 100m south in order not to destroy my business. Transpower maintain that to have the pylons in a straight line has less impact on the environment - what utter rubbish.

My house will be within 100-200m of the lines and regardless of what Transpower think is a safe distance, I refuse to subject my family to the emission at such a close distance. As the property is not subdivisible, it is impossible to build again on the property..

The Electricity Commission under Roy Hemmingway told Transpower their proposal was unacceptable. The Labour Government terminated Mr Hemmingway's contract and the decision changes. Don't treat people as idiots and try to substantiate there was no government intervention. You will be telling untruths.

The Electrical Commission has mandates under law to ensure a reliable and secure electricity supply to NZ and to see the expenditure is most cost effective when compared to alternatives - the approval given by the Commission is unlawful in both respects.

Please advise the prices paid by Transpower to acquire land. To date they have paid double market value on several properties. Has this been costed in to the equation and how are these costs to be recovered? Originally Transpower stated that \$100 million was set aside for purchases. How much has been spent on how many properties and how much more is to be spent?

Why has the Electricity Commission allowed Transpower to use the 2005 SOO future demand forecasts, rather than the updated 207 SOO forecasts?

The decision is unlawful and must be declined. This is not a unanimous mandate and should result in a "no" decision, the Board resign and pass the decision to the Government, instead of acting as an Independent Commission, which they are clearly not.

Thank you,  
Dennis Dare  
Clevedon