

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Summary of key details for our case **Ref 120553** with evidence

1. My wife and I restored and developed 179 Fitzherbert Avenue into The Gables Bed and Breakfast, which we ran for 12 years. We had paid off most of the \$400,000 renovation costs by the time we sold our business.
2. We were recognised for our outstanding service by being featured in The Lonely Planet Guide and the Rough Guide. This is advertising which you cannot buy. A secret shopper reports your business and if you meet the high threshold you are included in these prestigious publications. We were also in the Friars Guide, a high end NZ B&B publication.



Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power



3. We bought 309 Ngahere Park with borrowed funds with the intention to develop an up market lodge with two apartments and a Palladian great room with facilities for meetings and concerts etc. The building platform of 1200 sq metres gave ample room for a classical structure with a medieval style enclosed courtyard.



Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power



The building platform is at the top of the dark green forested ridge



4. Over a period of two years I researched and built a scale model. The brief is still with the architect. I haven't had the heart to retrieve it. The model is now in the Awapuni land fill. The Lonely Planet on hearing of our plans told me they would automatically include us in their publication as soon as we told them we were ready. This was an exciting and valuable endorsement.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power



5. On hearing of the wind farm proposal we put a halt to our plans. We had sold The Gables by this time and spent the next three years in rented accommodation with our furniture in paid storage awaiting an outcome, but all that happened was that we were consistently lied to and fobbed off by both MRP and PNCC.

6. We took the matter of changing our water supply catchment into an industrial zone to court and we lost. We did not know about the secret contract which meant that we had a 3 million dollar price tag on our heads if we were given any assistance whatsoever by PNCC, or that the consultation process we went through was defined in the contract as fake.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

7. When I took Chris Pepper from PNCC up to our building site where I showed him the plans he asked if I was happy for turbines already up at Tararua 3. I said they were not a problem, the implication from him being that we would be safe from any development. Nothing could have been further from the truth. He lied to me. He was fully conversant with the secret, corrupt MRP/PNCC contract but told me nothing about it. Pepper later made a quick exit to escape another renewable energy disaster of his – gas/electricity generation at the Awapuni rubbish tip.
8. While we waited for approximately two years for a conclusion, our investment from the proceeds of the sale of The Gables, and which had been doing very well, suddenly declared its intention to file for bankruptcy and subsequently tanked wiping out 10,000 investors, including major investment houses, Blackrock and Ingalls and Snyder. Our losses from the investment total around one million dollars. We had planned to sell our investment to build the lodge much earlier but, as I stated, the wind farm proposal put our plans on ice as we fruitlessly waited for clarification.
9. It took almost a year to find a buyer for our land, at a big discount on its potential value, as no one wanted to live under a wind farm. The buyer from Wellington stated he did not have plans to build a residence. MRP declined to buy us out despite us being identified by them as one of the most severely affected.
10. Moving to Sydney to take up a job offer I pursued the company bankruptcy in the New York Courts along with other investors and, while we won our case, the outcome has

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

been a failure. Legal fees due at the time put us on the brink of negative equity.

11. Had the government been honest and upfront with us at the beginning we could have sold our land and investment and left the city where I had lived for a total of 49 years. It would have been very hard to ditch our plans, leaving my terminally ill mother and the church in which I had been heavily involved but the alternative of living in a staggeringly intrusive gigantic wind farm would make these life changes minimal by comparison.
12. At all times we were deceived and lied to. Annabell, PNCC lawyer was the gate keeper. The following in as chronological order as possible describes how we were treated.

The following are principally emails which show how we were comprehensively lied to. They were retrieved from a long discarded hard drive which became accessible a few weeks ago. As previously stated the lies by MRP [the government] and PNCC led to our financial ruin.

We were alerted to the wind farm by a chance meeting my wife had with a distant neighbour, Sue Pugmire, who said she had seen the plans and photomontages and that we were severely affected. Omer [see email below] was in no hurry to visit us as the deadline for submissions on the change of purpose to the Turitea Reserve was rapidly approaching.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Sunday, August 06, 2006 8:44 AM
To: Mike Omer
Subject: Re: Turitea wind farm

Thanks Mike, you can call us after 4pm Tuesday if that's OK as we will both be home by then, cheers Paul.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Mike Omer](#)
To: [Paul & Monica Stichbury](#)
Sent: Sunday, August 06, 2006 12:08 PM
Subject: RE: Turitea wind farm

Hi Paul & Monica,

Away from my diary at the moment so will give you a ring on tuesday (hope to have monday off for a long awaited break!)
Look forward to meeting you.

Cheers
Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [<mailto:thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz>]
Sent: Saturday, 5 August 2006 10:29 PM
To: Mike Omer
Subject: Turitea wind farm

Hello Mike, Sue Pugmire has given us your email address and I believe that you will be in Palmerston North next week. We would like to meet you to discuss the wind farm proposal as it affects us. To find a time suitable to us both could you please phone us on 06 353 6331
Regards Paul and Monica Stichbury.

We had no idea there was a secret contract which guaranteed we would fail in our endeavours at every step of the way. All the PNCC, Ministerial and MRP parties we contacted were fully aware of this contract. Their varied responses were to lie, lie, lie.

Below is a summary of this corrupt contract and Variation which I posted on my Twitter account.

These two documents are driving every corrupt act to this day and almost no one outside PNCC's and the Government's inner circle knows it.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

KEY COMPONENTS TO THE TURITEA WIND FARM MRP/PNCC CONTRACT

- TOTAL SECRECY
- FAKE PUBLIC CONSULTATION IF NECESSARY
- MILESTONE PAYMENTS TO PNCC
- PNCC TO PAY MRP – THE GOVERNMENT - **\$3MILLION** IF IT HELPS ANY INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP AFFECTED BY THE WIND FARM
- PNCC TO SUPPORT ALL WIND FARM PARTICIPANTS
- PNCC TO HAVE **UNLIMITED LIABILITY** IF IT CHANGES ITS MIND
- A **VARIATION** FORCES PNCC TO JOIN WITH MRP AND GOVERNMENT MINISTERS TO OVERTHROW ANY COURT DECISION IMPEDING THE WIND FARM

I contacted Chris Pepper at PNCC where I raised concerns about the lack of information for submitters on the change of purpose for the Turitea Reserve from a water catchment to an industrial zone. The document delivered to households in the city was misleading, contradictory and devoid of meaningful information. It contained a slew of barefaced lies in connection with the city's water catchment which were never going to be fulfilled.

This fraudulent document is a prominent element in the conspiracy against Palmerston North.

1. It lauded a proposed eco-park, which was never going to be implemented,
2. Contained deceptive imagery of the Tararua Ranges purportedly from inside the city boundary,
3. Made ridiculous promises which were never going to be kept, including battery powered boating on the city's water supply dams and
4. An Eco lodge right under the turbines.

The Turitea change of purpose consultation document was distributed to households in August 2006 and quickly disappeared. This link takes you to a digital copy.

[reserveconsultationweb](#)

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

You can see from Pepper's reply to me that I was being fobbed off. The fix was in and the wind farm was going to go ahead no matter what *and he knew*.

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [theables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 11:57 AM
To: Chris Pepper
Subject: Re: Turitea wind farm.

Thank you Chris, for your prompt reply and for forwarding on our concerns,
regards
Paul Stichbury.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Chris Pepper](#)
To: [Paul & Monica Stichbury](#)
Cc: [Mike Manson](#) ; [Lorraine Marsh](#)
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 8:32 AM
Subject: RE: Turitea wind farm.

Dear Paul - the current consultation is not about the impacts of a potential windfarm but about allowing the use of part of the Turitea Reserve for windfarming and associated structures. The number, size, and layout of individual turbines is yet to be confirmed as wind testing is still progressing. These issues will be for Mighty River Power to resolve through a resource consenting process.

Council is aware that the windfarm will have a strong visual impact but the resource consent process is the appropriate mechanism for resolving this issue. I note that recent windfarm consents in the area have used the New Zealand Standard for noise from wind turbines (not exactly sure of the name) as a basis for determining noise effects. I have copied my reply to Mighty River Power so that they may contact you about some of these issues.

Regards
Chris Pepper

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [<mailto:theables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz>]
Sent: Monday, 31 July 2006 5:57 p.m.
To: Chris Pepper
Subject: Turitea wind farm.

Hi Chris, I have been looking at the submission form for the Turitea Reserve wind farm but I am not at all happy with the quality of information provided.

- 1/ There is no map to show the location or height of windmills on either council land or on the adjoining land which I have just discovered is earmarked for wind farm development.
- 2/ There is no scale illustration of the visual impact on the skyline.
- 3/ There is no information as to the noise or ground vibration impact on adjoining landowners.
- 4/ There is no proposed route shown for transmission lines.

Could you please direct me as to where I can get this information either in print form or online. The development of private land is I presume contingent on approval being given to use council owned land. My wife and I own a block of land at 309 Ngahere Park road and we were also until recently negotiating to purchase a 20 acre block opposite the Kahuterawa Reserve.

Sincerely
Paul Stichbury.

Caution: The content of this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If it is not intended for you, please email the sender immediately and destroy the original message. You may not copy, disclose or use the contents in any way. Thank You.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Not one of my concerns would ever be addressed even though I contacted MRP directly.

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, August 04, 2006 12:24 PM
To: Lorraine.Marsh@mightyriver.co.nz
Subject: Turitea wind farm.

Hello Lorraine, I understand that an email was sent on to you by the PNCC after I contacted them. In case you missed it here it is. I am hoping that Mighty River Power can provide me with the information I require in order to make an informed decision regarding the plan to put windmills on the Turitea catchment.

Hi Chris, I have been looking at the submission form for the Turitea Reserve wind farm but I am not at all happy with the quality of information provided.

1/ There is no map to show the location or height of windmills on either council land or on the adjoining land which I have just discovered is earmarked for wind farm development.

2/ There is no scale illustration of the visual impact on the skyline.

3/ There is no information as to the noise or ground vibration impact on adjoining landowners.

4/ There is no proposed route shown for transmission lines.

Could you please direct me as to where I can get this information either in print form or online. The development of private land is I presume contingent on approval being given to use council owned land. My wife and I own a block of land at 309 Ngahere Park road and we were also until recently negotiating to purchase a 20 acre block opposite the Kahuterawa Reserve.

Sincerely

Paul Stichbury.

Lorraine Marsh did not reply to my email, or to the email forwarded to her 3 days earlier.

Omer, Marsh and one other MRP employee [first name Paul] turned up on Saturday 12 August 2006. It was obvious that they were there reluctantly and deliberately arrived at our property in Ngahere Park just before dusk, which meant the outdoor meeting would soon be over.

Despite pushing hard for information Omer managed to dodge every question from myself and neighbours [one walked off when like me he realised Omer was lying]. I gave Omer the map from the consultation document and demanded he identify the location of turbines. He made a couple of tiny circles with the pen I provided and that was it. His colleague, Paul, took me aside and told me that a turbine would replace wind farmer John Love's house above our building platform. He found this amusing.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

We later learnt that all the pegs for turbines had already been placed in the ground but as we were obviously getting too close to the truth they were promptly pulled out.

I decided to keep communication open and politely emailed Omer the next day.

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Sunday, August 13, 2006 5:31 PM
To: Mike Omer
Subject: Re: Turitea wind farm

Thank you Mike for bringing the team out to meet us on Sat. It was appreciated. We know you are all only doing your job and it was good to hear that at least there are no plans to place windmills on the ridge right next to our sections.
Cheers
Paul Stichbury.

Neighbours tried in vain to identify this prominent image in the Consultation Document



I asked another distant neighbour, Sue Stewart, for help with this image and forwarded a copy to Chris Dench who lived just below our building platform.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2006 9:26 AM
To: B&M Sprinklers Ltd
Subject: Photo from the top of the Consultation document.
Attachments: Clip.jpg

Chris, FYI

Sue, are you able to accurately place this image ? We have been trying to identify the landscape from the top of Ngahere Park and 4 of us who own property there cannot identify it other than as some kind of generic image. I believe that it is fake and that this was done deliberately to create a vision of a landscape ideally suited to a windfarm, one that is remote and isolated. Note that the Turitea reserve does not appear in the image, neither do Ngawai farm, Turitea valley, Kahuterawa valley, the pine forest and residences in Ngahere Park. The image suggests a range of foothills in the foreground that simply don't exist as far as I can see. (perhaps Higgins contractors secretly moved them) The scale also places the hills behind as very much in the distance
Looking forward to hearing your opinion, or indeed anyone else who is familiar with the area.
Regards Paul.

I emailed Pepper. His reply confirmed the fraud. The view is looking *into the Wairarapa* and this view, which appears to be aerial, is invisible and unrecognisable to any PN resident, indeed to anyone viewing the Tararua ranges from anywhere on the entire Manawatu plain.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

From: Chris Pepper [chris.pepper@pncc.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2006 5:04 AM
To: Paul & Monica Stichbury
Subject: RE: Photo from the top of the Consultation document.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Paul - the photo is taken from the South Range Rd track approximately 4 km from the gate looking south-west towards Arawaru which is the peak in the rear centre of the photo.

Cheers Chris

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [mailto:thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 25 September 2006 3:27 p.m.
To: Chris Pepper
Cc: John Adams
Subject: Photo from the top of the Consultation document.

Hi Chris, this image appears at the top of the consultation document. Could you please tell me where it was taken from as to my eye it bears no resemblance to what I see from our land at the top of Ngahere park, thank you
Paul Stichbury.

Caution: The content of this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If it is not intended for you, please email the sender immediately and destroy the original message. You may not copy, disclose or use the contents in any way. Thank You.

From: "Paul & Monica Stichbury" <thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz>
To: "Chris Pepper" <chris.pepper@pncc.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 17 October 2006 4:36 p.m.
Subject: Turitea wind farm.

Hi Chris, I have just seen today's paper where you state that there has been misinformation about the size of the turbines and their potential visual effects. Could you then please supply correct information as to both size and location of turbines on both the reserve and adjacent land something that has been withheld from the public. This withholding of information has been a major criticism of the submission process. To state now as the mayor has done in tonight's paper that information will be given to the public just as the council is about to make a decision about the reserve is outrageous and confirms what we have always suspected that the whole submission process was nothing but a scam.

Mighty River has told us that the turbines will be 125 m high so I would be interested in hearing from you as to whether or not we have been lied to.

Regards
Paul Stichbury.

Pepper did not reply.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

I asked 30 questions in my submission to the Change of Purpose to the Turitea Reserve. I worded my submission, on advice, in such a way as to placate the global warming fanatics behind this ludicrous proposal. Submissions closed on Monday 4 September 2006.

No one knew about the contract which shafted us and we were submitting with very little meaningful information to go on – this was deliberate, remember the whole process and outcome was rigged. PNCC did not expect the public outcry or volume of submissions. They were forced by us to engage in a submission process as they were going to simply rubberstamp the change of purpose at a Council meeting. The packed submission meetings held in the Convention Centre were an utter farce.

SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED

TURITEA WINDFARM

Firstly, let me make it quite clear that I support wind farms in principle. They can make a valuable, though erratic, contribution to New Zealand's energy needs. Their contribution will however only be a stop gap measure at best.

I do not agree however with the proposed amendments to establish a wind farm in the Turitea Reserve. The submission document is very light on detail. Specifically it lacks:

- 1/ A map showing where the windmills are likely to go.
- 2/ A contour map to show elevations.
- 3/ An artist's impression to indicate the size of the windmills relative to the height of the ranges.
- 4/ A planned route for transmission lines.
- 5/ The size of the development on adjacent private land.
- 6/ The total number of windmills.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

The overall tone of the submission form disguises the lack of specifics by labouring the alleged benefits of establishing an “eco park “If you don't agree with the concept you risk being labeled anti nature. The spin of the submission form however is, in my opinion, to lull the public into thinking that the wind farm is largely confined to the reserve. This is not the case.

Over the past 6 months I have been negotiating to buy a 20 acre block of land opposite the Kahuterawa reserve. This land is part of the Adams family farm which runs through from Greens Road to Kahuterawa Road and to the top of the ranges. The sale has not been pursued as after a valuation was done by Lincoln Charles I discovered early in August to my dismay that both the land my wife and I were interested in and the Adams farm will be dominated by huge windmills on the adjoining land. Subsequent email contact with the Council over this matter has resulted in a meeting with the team from Mighty River Power charged with the implementation of the windmill scheme. They were naturally coy about revealing the full extent of the planned wind farm on private land, but I have since seen a map which shows a further 50 liberally sprinkled on the hills which form the very close backdrop to our property at 309 Ngahere Park Road. Furthermore the windmills will be 125 metres high (approximately 40 stories ,or more than three time taller than the 11 story State Insurance building in Rangitikei Street), indeed taller and more powerful than those at Te Apiti. Some will also be placed lower, in fact close to the level of the marine terrace where our residential rural forest block is located. News of the full extent of the proposed wind farm has I believe been deliberately suppressed so that stage one, the softening of public opinion re the reserve change, can go ahead.

Full disclosure in a democracy is normal practice.

- 1/ Could you please make public the report received by the Infrastructural Well Being Committee which recommends the proposed wind farm?
- 2/ Who wrote this report and what background information can you supply?
- 3/ Will the council make public all correspondence both print and email with private landowners who stand to benefit financially from this planned development?

In my opinion the submission document is a heavily disguised financial prospectus.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

4/ Does the submission document comply fully with the provisions of the Commerce and the Fair Trading Act?

5/ Did the council seek a legal opinion on the submission document before it was distributed to the public and if so who reviewed it?

6/ Is the council aware that prior to submissions closing an access road above the Sledge track was built during the period 14 to 18 th August ?

Economic benefits

I also take issue with the economic benefits touted for the scheme. The wind farm is slated to provide 1 to 2 % of the country's electrical energy needs, but by the same token it could provide 0 to 1 % if you use the formula in reverse.

1/ Where is your independently, unbiased, audited proof that this is so?

2/ You have established a very generous margin for error, is the 1 to 2 % a yearly average or is it one modeled over a longer term, e.g. 10 years?

3/ Exactly what do council employees know about wind farm electricity generation? What qualifications do they have and what experience, if any, do they have in this matter?

4/ Have you read international studies which show wind farms are not delivering the promised benefits?

Mighty River Power on their web site states that the demand for electricity is rising at a compound rate of 2 % per year. A rate of 2% per year growth leads to a doubling time for electricity demand in New Zealand of just 35 years. In fact the doubling time is likely to be shorter than this. This then reduces the contribution of this proposed wind farm to just ½% to 1 % of the country's needs.

1/This raises the question, does such a miniscule production merit the permanent disfigurement of the landscape immediately behind the city?

The consumption of electricity needs to be reduced. There is a culture of unending, increasing consumption. This is ultimately physically impossible. When the last hill is covered with windmills, the last creek dammed, and the last of the country's natural gas is burnt what will we do then? This project is

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

only buying in to the endless consumption model. The only way to mitigate this problem is for the government to show leadership and mandate the installation of solar hot water heaters on all new houses and continue to offer incentives to owners of older homes to do so. If the money earmarked for this project alone was spent on solar hot water heaters the demand for electricity would drop significantly. Furthermore, the increasing cost of electricity will in the future act as a brake on consumption as too would a recession, or worse a depression, caused by the much more important liquid fuels crisis New Zealand faces. The claim that the wind farm will secure the city's electricity supply is manifestly false. Any electricity generated will go into the national grid and be routed North. [Edit 2018: technically not correct]

1/ Would the Council consider actively encouraging rate payers to conserve energy and set reduction targets in the same way that the city now endorses recycling ?

Consultation with neighbours.

The Turitea Reserve Management Plan, March 2006 states that neighbouring property owners will be consulted and contacted on issues that affect them.

This has not happened. The council is not even meeting its own stated obligations. A significant area outside the reserve is zoned rural residential.

You are planning to put a wind farm in a residential area !

The residents of Ngahere Park will be very adversely affected. Property values will decline. We, along with the many others who live and own property in Ngahere Park, bought there for the rural lifestyle and the peace and quiet of the countryside. The new developments in Kahuterawa Road, we believe, will find few willing buyers with a very close backdrop of huge windmills.

1/ What is the number of properties which have rural residential status in the Ngahere Park Kahuterawa area?

2/ What is the potential number of rural residential properties allowing for future subdivision into 1 hectare blocks which would be eligible for building permits?

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

3/ Is realistic compensation to be paid to affected residents should the scheme go ahead?

4/ If so who will fund this compensation?

5/ If no compensation is to be paid for financial loss what legal liabilities could the council face should property owners seek legal redress ?

There are already plans by residents to sue the council for damages and financial loss on an enormous scale should the wind farm go ahead.

Global warming

It is clear that global warming is taking place. This will change our usual weather patterns. We have heard comment that the wind pressure on the ranges in the vicinity of Palmerston North is likely to abate and that there will be more frequent still days. The winds we experience now are apparently likely to move further South.

1/ What studies have been done to either verify or contradict this prior to committing to very substantial expenditure?

Independent energy audit.

The importation of wind mill machinery and their installation over an 18 month period will consume a very substantial amount of energy.

1/ Has there been an audit to determine the true amount required?

This would not only include the energy consumed in the manufacture of the thousands of tons of concrete for the project but also the road works that would need to be undertaken. In respect of the latter five questions that need to be addressed are:

1/ Has the council undertaken a study of the effects of road works and heavy traffic on residents in both Kahuterawa and Greens road?

2/ Have residents been consulted and if not why not?

3/ Will the section of Greens road most affected by construction be closed to the public?

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

4/ Has there been any public notification of future road closures?

5/ How does the council propose to maintain the current rural nature of Kahuterawa and Greens roads in light of the above?

These questions need to be addressed now as it is clear from the Mayor's ringing endorsement of the proposal and the wording of the consultation document that the council's mind is already made up. The consultation process is a farce.

Indeed will the Council take on board the widespread concerns of residents and in acknowledging them show the intelligence and courage to abandon this proposal?

Transmission lines

I believe that it is highly unlikely that land owners will willingly give consent to pylons crossing their land to the substation in Harts Road. Pylons would have a very detrimental affect on the value of property in the area. Who nowadays wants to live anywhere near them?

1/ Have property owners who would be affected been approached over this very important issue?

2/ If they have been approached, what has been their response?

Tourism

Really what is novel about a wind farm? To claim that people will visit Palmerston North to look at windmills is frankly ridiculous. If anything they advertise an unpleasant, windy climate.

1/ Where is your evidence to support the claim that there is a tourism spinoff? What studies have been done?

2/ Name the tourism operators you have approached on this matter.

People from out of town will have one of three reactions.

Either.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

A/ They admire the immense size of the windmills and marvel at the technology and money spent.

B/ They express dismay that a council and SOE should so wantonly trash the environment and use Palmerston North as a case study in what not to do.

C/ They fall about laughing at the utter stupidity of a city planting 90, 410 foot (125 meter) propellers on its hinterland to supply Auckland with electricity.

I suspect the latter two reactions will prevail.

1/ How many windmills do you think would be allowed in the Waitakere Ranges to supply Palmerston North with electricity?

The Manawatu was once covered in dense bush. The minute amount that is left, the city's water catchment no less, is slated to become an industrial "park"

1/ Has the Manawatu not done enough already to provide renewable energy?

Ecological issues

Native forests regenerate without any human intervention. A short walk up Sledge track will verify this as there is strong regrowth since the area was clear felled.

Past administrations have neglected to control animal pests. On our land at Ngahere Park we are successfully dealing to the opossums, so too are other neighbours. Provide residents with the tools to do the job and the cost will be minimal. This year for the first time I have seen Mohua and a Tomtit on our block. Fantail numbers are slowly increasing as rats which predate their nests are also eating the opossum bait. The last remaining native falcons which inhabit the area risk being diced up like so many carrots should the windmills become a reality.

People come before snails. If the wind farm is built and the heated towel rails in Auckland get a reprieve you should also bear in mind that the next big volcanic eruption on the central plateau could easily bring down the national grid and the windmills at Turitea will be spinning to no avail.

Paul Stichbury

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Well there you go. I was from this time on seen as a threat to their secret plans and it must have been about this time that I came under surveillance. Once the fake “consultation” with ratepayers was over [the fake consultation was allowed for in the then secret contract] **I demanded answers on three topics** from Annabell, PNCC lawyer, who had now been appointed as gatekeeper/liar in chief and tasked with swatting away anyone getting too close to the truth [which would trigger the 3 million dollar penalty on PNCC as per the secret contract]

Topic one: Please answer my 30 questions

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [mailto:thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Sunday, 5 November 2006 8:12 a.m.
To: John Annabell
Cc: Shainey James
Subject: Submission process

Dear Mr Annabell,

I made a submission (number 347) on the Turitea reserve change of purpose and in this submission I asked 30 specific questions. Not one of these questions has been answered either orally by the council or in writing. Could you now that the

submission process is over provide me with a prompt written response to these questions. A failure to do so would indicate that the process was neither fair nor robust and that the submitters were simply engaging in an essay writing contest for the amusement of the council as the decision was an already forgone conclusion. Could you also provide me with evidence that my submission was taken seriously and that it had an influence on the outcome of the submission process. I await your reply with interest.

Sincerely

Paul Stichbury.

To avoid triggering the \$3million dollar penalty on PNCC Annabell puts impossible hurdles in my way and uses the threat of demanding payment to silence opposition. This bullying was reported in the Manawatu Standard. I and my wife had paid substantial rates to PNCC over many years.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

From: John Annabell [john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz]
Sent: Friday, November 10, 2006 5:26 AM
To: Paul & Monica Stichbury
Cc: Mike Manson; Chris Pepper; Shainey James
Subject: RE: Submission process

Mr Stichbury,

I advise that, at this stage, it is not proposed to answer the 30 specific questions mentioned in your submission. Those questions were made to the Council in the form of a submission, and the Council's response to that submission is its decision, a summary of which has been sent to each submitter, and a full copy is available on request. Do you wish a copy of this to be sent to you (there is a charge of \$40.00 because of the size of the document)?

We will, however, consider a request for information from you if you formulate appropriate specific questions which also meet the following requirements:

1. Information requested is for information that already exists, and does not require any research to provide it or entail creating new information.
2. Information requested is of a factual or technical nature, and does not entail an expression of opinion or judgment.
3. You are happy to pay the reasonable costs associated with collating and copying any information provided. The rate for each hour involved is \$56.00 per hour.

On receipt of your further advice, a formal decision will be made on your request, and consideration given to what information will be made available.

In relation to the final part of your email, I advise that the Council received copies of all submissions, regardless of whether submitters wished to be heard or not, and in your case, listened to you or asked questions for at least 15 minutes. Like other submission processes, the Council received a wide range of information, but the reality is that the final decision is not always one everybody will agree with. It is up to the Council to consider the information it receives, and to decide how much weight should be given to any piece of information. Further, some concerns raised will be relevant to the consideration of any resource consent application.

John B Annabell
Legal Counsel
Palmerston North City Council

As I had come too close for comfort just 11 days later Annabell declines any future dealings with me, referring me to the Ombudsmen's office, in other words hiding behind a government institution which as we now know in this instance is going to do what it's told.

His first letter to me did not say there was an expiry date on my initial request.

The whole matter is rigged but we don't know it yet. *All the information about the wind farm already existed*, how many turbines and where they were, their height, etc. They just refused to give it to me.

The wind farm had been under secret development since about 1995.
Annabell is lying!

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

From: John Annabell [john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2006 8:58 AM
To: Paul & Monica Stichbury
Cc: Mike Manson; Chris Pepper
Subject: Submission Process and Request for Information

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr Stichbury

On Sunday, 5 November 2006, you wrote to request an answer be prepared to thirty questions mentioned in your submission. In response, I replied that the Council's reply to your submission was its decision, a summary of which has been sent to each submitter, and a full copy is available on request. Copies are also available for viewing at the Customer Service Centre, the City Library, and the libraries at Ashhurst and Linton. Copies can also be provided, on request, at a charge of \$40.

In my response dated Friday 10 November 2006, I advised that it was not intended to answer the thirty questions mentioned in your submission, but that a request for information from you would be considered if you formulated appropriate specific questions which also met the following requirements:

1. Information requested is for information that already exists, and does not require any research to provide it or entail creating new information.
2. Information requested is of a factual technical nature, and does not entail an expression of opinion or judgement.
3. You are happy to pay the reasonable costs associated with collating and copying any information provided. The rate for each hour involved is \$56.00 per hour. Copying charges also apply.

I note that you have not replied in the manner suggested, and I therefore write to formally decline your request, primarily on the basis that your request is, to a large degree, about creating information or expressing a view, rather than providing information that actually exists. Further, you have not confirmed that you would be prepared to pay any reasonable costs incurred.

If you are not happy with this response, you have the right to refer the matter to the Office of the Ombudsmen. Their address is PO Box 10-152, The Terrace, Wellington.

John B Annabell
Legal Counsel
Palmerston North City Council
Private Bag 11-034
Palmerston North
Fax (06) 355-4115
Phone (06) 356-8199 Extension 7103
email: john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Topic two: Where are the turbines? [This topic is more or less contemporaneous with topics one and three]

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [mailto:thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Saturday, 4 November 2006 6:33 p.m.
To: John Annabell
Cc: Shainey James
Subject: Turitea wind farm.

Dear Mr Annabell,
please make available by return email the photomontages of turbines on reserve land. Would you also please provide details as to the size of the turbines. Clearly from the PNCC letter we received today you have this information and now that the council has made its decision you have no legitimate grounds upon which to withhold this information from PNCC ratepayers. Tell me also why the council in reason 4 states "The council considers that further restrictions on the extent of wind farm development are required " Considering there are plans to cover the ranges with turbines from Ashhurst to Tokomaru is this some sort of joke ?
Sincerely
Paul Stichbury.

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2006 12:00 PM
To: John Annabell
Subject: Re: Turitea wind farm.

Mr Annabell,

I find it very curious that the council which is in partnership with MRP should not have access to the photomontages which have clearly been seen by councillors and council staff. You are clearly not able to back up claims in reason 7 in the letter to us dated 3 Nov that the visual " effects will not be as great as people fear " That is a subjective statement .Could you please tell us when you will be able to allay people's fears on this matter ?

Paul Stichbury.

See what's going on here. PNCC through its lawyer can make a subjective statement about visual effects but when challenged to provide evidence tells me to go pound sand.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

----- Original Message -----

From: [John Annabell](#)

To: [Paul & Monica Stichbury](#)

Cc: [Mike Manson](#) ; [Chris Pepper](#)

Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2006 4:12 PM

Subject: RE: Turitea wind farm.

Mr Stichbury,

I advise that the photomontages are not the property of the Council, but belong to Mighty River Power, and that the one set of images loaned to the Council has been returned to that Company. Accordingly, your request for access to this information has also been transferred to that Company, and I anticipate that you will receive a response from the Company in due course.

No comment is or will be made on the other matters mentioned in your email.

John B Annabell

Legal Counsel

Palmerston North City Council

Wait a minute, these photomontages belong to the government via Mighty River Power and the government is answerable to the people. The corrupt contract says otherwise, not that we know. This is fraud writ large *but in secrecy*.

The following was a perfectly reasonable request for our Council officers who work so diligently to provide services to ratepayers who in turn pay their wages.

PNCC announced it was in partnership with MRP but they soon backed off describing themselves in this fashion as they tried to disguise their role as a criminal partner in a contract stripping ratepayers of their rights and tearing up the Local Government Act 2002.

Here was PNCC's opportunity to tell us to sell up and get out of Dodge.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [mailto:thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 9 November 2006 7:26 p.m.
To: John Annabell
Cc: Shainey James
Subject: Photomontages

Dear Mr Annabel,

As there appear to be difficulties in releasing views of the ranges with appropriately scaled images of turbines superimposed on them I offer the following solution to your dilemma. My wife and I are willing for council staff to go to our section at 309 Ngahere Park road to take photos of the ranges to carry out this exercise. There is a gate at the bottom of the road which is usually open so access is not a problem. Of course we would be happy to meet with council staff at our section to be sure that the gate is indeed open although it is an easy enough walk from the bottom of the drive. If you wanted us there this could be on any week day from 2 pm onwards or on a Saturday. To make arrangements you can phone us on 3536331. We can provide you with an 8 mega pixel digital camera if that is of use, although Chris Pepper did tell us that council staff could come to take photos if we wished - this was from a Green's road location. I have already met with Chris Pepper on our building platform so the location is known well enough. The photomontage which you can make will not be compromising Mighty River Power's plans as all we need is approximate locations and numbers of turbines superimposed on the images. The scale and distances, heights etc will be easy enough to work out from topographical maps. The size of the turbines is well known so that is not an issue, but if you wished you could create montages which have a variety of turbine sizes on them to cater for all possibilities. This proposal is offered to you in the spirit of cooperation and to provide you with the opportunity to clear up "misinformation" Looking forward to hearing from you.

Regards
Paul Stichbury.

From: [Paul & Monica Stichbury](#)
To: [John Annabell](#)
Sent: Friday, November 10, 2006 5:14 PM
Subject: Re: Photomontages

Mr Annabel, you state the following

"So while we are always happy to meet residents and talk over issues we cannot take photos of the ranges and then guess where the turbines may be placed as that would be very subjective."

You know perfectly well where the turbines are going, perhaps you have not read tonight's paper. Here is a link.

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/manawatustandard/0,2106,3856640a6003,00.html>

You have advised submitters by mail that the effects are not as bad as people fear. Now that can only be stated on the basis of the decisions made by the council. I repeat my earlier comment and request to you.

"You are clearly not able to back up claims in reason 7 in the letter to us dated 3 Nov that the visual " effects will not be as great as people fear " That is a subjective statement .Could you please tell us when you will be able to allay people's fears on this matter ?"

Paul Stichbury.

Annabell replies on 11 November that no further assistance will be given. Of course we now know why. The email makes it look like a fait accompli but does not directly state this.

What is anyone to make of this? What would these liars actually have to say to anyone who asked for a meeting? What "other issues" are there other than "where are the turbines? and how many are there?" *The size and height of the*

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

turbines had already been decided. MRP had been planning the wind farm for years. We were told the height of the turbines was 125m by MRP on Saturday 12 August 2006.

Mr Stitchbury,

I have referred this request, along with your other recent email about the photomontages, to Mike Manson who advises as follows:

"Council is not the developer and is awaiting a final turbine layout for the Turitea Reserve to be submitted from Mighty River Power. How can we as an organisation take photos and guess the final locations? In addition the developer has not chosen which turbine manufacturer it intends to use and therefore any turbine dimensions from one supplier will be different from another. Also the size of turbine is still being debated by the developer.

- a) PNCC have reduced the area that MRP can investigate in and this will change the placement and number of turbines
- b) MRP are conducting wind assessments and these will determine where the best wind is located and alter any preliminary locations
- c) MRP are reviewing ecological assessments in light of changing areas
- d) MRP are reviewing landscape assessments as always worked on worse case scenarios
- e) MRP are looking into any noise issues in planning suitable turbine locations
- f) MRP are looking into construction impacts and cost benefit analysis

So while we are always happy to meet residents and talk over issues we cannot take photos of the ranges and then guess where the turbines may be placed as that would be very subjective. Council is not conducting an RMA process at this point in time. Council would not be the applicant in any future RMA process if MRP choose to continue.

In summary this is premature and would not provide accurate information upon which residents could rely on and Council would not be comfortable trying to second guess the development."

John B Annabell

Annabell has zero integrity.

He should have recused himself from the cover -up and handed the fraud right back to MRP to implement, but as a highly paid tool of the state he soldiers on.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Topic three: Who is participating in the scheme and where exactly?

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [<mailto:thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz>]
Sent: Tuesday, 14 November 2006 7:59 a.m.
To: John Annabell
Cc: Shainey James
Subject: Request for information

Dear Mr Annabel,
could you please provide me with the following information.
1/ The names of the land owners who are part of the Turitea wind farm scheme.
2/ The legal description of all properties which are part of this scheme.

Thank you
Paul Stichbury.

From: John Annabell [john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2006 8:49 AM
To: Paul & Monica Stichbury
Subject: RE: Request for information

Dear Mr Stichbury

In response to your message below, I advise that the Council is not party to any scheme other than that relating to the proposal for the Turitea Reserve. The Council is the land owner for the relevant land and has an agreement with Mighty River Power to potentially lease land. Other land owners, for land outside the Turitea Reserve, may or may not have made other arrangements with Mighty River Power. The Council is not involved with those arrangements and is therefore unable to comment. Further, the Council itself is not a wind farm developer.

Nonetheless, your request has been transferred to Mighty River Power for their attention. I anticipate that you will hear from that organisation in due course.

John B Annabell
Legal Counsel
Palmerston North City Council
Private Bag 11-034
Palmerston North
Fax (06) 355-4115
Phone (06) 356-8199 Extension 7103
email: john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz

Read the contract. Annabell is lying.

- PNCC knows full well the extent of the project and is committed to helping landowners outside the reserve. The “may or not” statement is a lie.
- The Council knows full well who the private land owners are and is committed in the secret agreement to help them.
- The lease on the reserve is not “potentially” going to happen. It is a fait accompli, another lie to sow doubt in the mind of an enquirer such as

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

myself as to whether the wind farm will proceed and to give false hope that it won't.

- Additionally Mighty River Power is the government, not some other "organisation", but 100% government owned at the time and subject to government whim and direction.
- Of course PNCC had all the details of the wind farm. MRP in its first ground floor office in Linton St actually had all the photomontages pinned up on the wall and we were told that anyone could look through the window to see them. Later realizing they were compromising their security they rented a first floor office at the top of Linton Street.

First MRP office [no fence at the time]



Second MRP office



- This email documentation showing the fraud committed on ratepayers in combination with the exposure of the corrupt contract and the role played by Karen Price would in the Environment Court have scuppered the wind farm.

I made another attempt to draw information from Annabell when a report from Commissioner for the Environment, Dr Morgan Williamson, saw an environmental disaster unfolding on the Tararuas.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [mailto:thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 20 November 2006 9:58 p.m.
To: John Annabell
Cc: Shainey James
Subject: Parliamentary commissioner for the environment

Dear Mr Annabel,

Last Thursday the "Wind power, people and place" report on wind farm developments in New Zealand was released with wide ranging recommendations to central government. Noticably there was considerable discussion about the current and proposed developments on the Tararuas with an obvious concern about the potential for inappropriate effects on the skyline and grossly unfair impositions on residents. Your replies to my correspondence on this subject do not appear to share the same concerns as those of the Commissioner Dr Morgan Williams. However, as you work for a progressive and forward thinking council can I assume that the council will welcome the recommendations made by Dr Williams and change course and immediately implement them ? This will of course mean that the council will then have to engage in a meaningful way with ratepayers and disclose all information relevant to these proposed developments.

I would welcome such a move by the council and it would go some way to heal the rift between citizens, council staff and councillors. However if the council continues on its present course it will compare most unfavourably with the recommendations made by Dr Williams and risk being comprehensively discredited. As it appears that you are now the sole conduit for all matters relating to the proposed Turitea wind farm would you please forward this email to both councillors and staff involved.

Yours sincerely
Paul Stichbury.

His reply below.

From: John Annabell [john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2006 11:38 AM
To: Paul & Monica Stichbury
Subject: RE: Parliamentary commissioner for the environment

Dear Mr Stichbury,

As requested, your email has been sent to elected members and relevant staff. My role has been to coordinate responses to requests for information, given that the Council has now made a decision on the matter concerning the use of the Turitea Reserve.

In relation to the report by Dr Morgan Williams, Council staff have very recently received a copy of this . Council officers receive a number of reports form central government agencies, and are currently considering the contents of the *Wind Power Peopleand Place* report as they would any other report sent to the Council.

John B Annabell
Legal Counsel
Palmerston North City Council

The following email is the result of Annabell's November 12 2006 email to MRP and myself regarding the identity of the other wind farmers.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Note they consult with the wind farming landowners *but not with anyone else*. This is an utter disgrace. It's clear now why they didn't want their names public. At no time were we ever consulted. "Community consultation" is a total lie. It never happened at any time!

From: Sarah Ongley [Sarah.Ongley@mightyriver.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2006 11:37 AM
To: thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz
Subject: Turitea windfarm project - request for information

Dear Paul,

Further to my earlier email (7 December), I can now respond to your below official information request for the names of landowners that are part of the Turitea windfarm scheme, and the legal description of all properties that are part of that scheme.

I must advise that, following consultation with the relevant landowners, Mighty River Power has decided not to release names of the landowners, in order to protect the privacy of the landowners in question (section 9(2)(a) of the OIA).

Release of the legal description of the properties would enable identification of the landowners involved. For that reason, the legal descriptions of the properties are also withheld for privacy reasons (under section 9(2)(a)).

The "Request for Proposal" that Palmerston North City Council prepared at the stage of calling for tenders in relation to the potential wind farm contains information relevant to your request. I understand that Palmerston North City Council is willing to release this document to persons who request it. However (again for privacy reasons) I cannot comment on whether the information contained in that document (regarding private landowners) is still current.

As you are no doubt aware, any resource consent process for a windfarm would commence with community consultation. At that stage of the process the location of the private properties on which a wind farm is proposed would, of course, be made publicly available.

In relation to this decision by Mighty River Power to decline your request, you have a right to make a complaint to the Ombudsman under section 28(3) of the OIA seeking an investigation and review of the decision.

Regards

Sarah Ongley

Legal Counsel
Mighty River Power Limited
Level 19, 1 Queen Street
P O Box 90399
Auckland
DDI (09) 308 8270
Cell 0274 467 917
Fax (09) 308 8209

PNCC and MRP's next move was to apply scare tactics. My wife and I received an email via Sarah Ongley from Chancery Green signed by one Karen Price. We had no idea who Price was but we can now see as overall supervisor of the Turitea project she was clearly operating under the radar. This email and

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

others have disappeared from my old outlook email account. *I did not delete them nor did I have reason to.* Price offered a meeting with Omer and his staff at MRP's Linton Street office to view the photomontages. We were the only affected party to be given this "privilege" We were simply stunned at what we saw. There was absolutely no way this wind farm would get through the Environment Court. The fact that it clearly would fail is of course the very reason it was later called in.

This email in reply to Sarah Ongley acknowledges that we saw the appalling photomontages. She is replying to my ["missing"] email December 7th where MRP is not prepared to cooperate with my request to identify the landowners in the Turitea project.

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2006 12:20 PM
To: Sarah Ongley
Subject: Re: Turitea windfarm project - request for information

Thank you Sarah, I won't pursue this any further. We appreciated seeing the photomontages but sadly they confirmed our worst fears.
Have a good Xmas,
Regards
Paul and Monica Stichbury.

So at this stage a legal challenge which we mounted was the next step as we tried our best to preserve and protect our rights as ratepayers and property owners.

What we didn't know apart from the contract details was that a legal challenge to the wind farm had been anticipated by the government AKA Mighty River Power and budgeted for.

We walked into a trap.

The High Court action between the Friends of the Turitea Reserve and PNCC took place between April 30th and May 4th 2007.

We never saw the judgment issued on July 25th 2007. It was deliberately withheld and not discovered until April 2016.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

The only intimation that there was something seriously wrong was that it leaked out that there was a Variation which meant the parties involved would do all they could to have the wind farm approved but the method was not revealed nor did the very few who attended the court case in Wellington get to know the outrageous details of the contract itself.

Clearly the "real case" was done behind closed doors as evidenced by Baragwanath's reported remarks in this next email from Adrian Cookson who was attempting in vain to help Annette Nixon, a reliable councillor, to ascertain what was really going on.

From: Adrian Cookson [acookson@ihug.co.nz]
Sent: Saturday, December 15, 2007 5:32 PM
To: Annette Nixon
Subject: Re: Fwd: FW: Councillor Issue - Wind farm

Hi Annette,

Thanks for chasing this up - the contract with MRP commits PNCC to literally moving heaven and earth to push the proposal through. You outline that PNCC is 'unable to intervene' in this 'process' and this is before a full proposal has been submitted for Resource Consent. PNCC has to be able to walk away from this plan at anytime and if it can't then it is not living up to it's promises and responsibilities regarding the protection of indigenous fauna & flora and the city's water supply if it's eyes are blinkered to the suspect MRP actions regarding PNCC ratepayers and their desire to obtain consent for this proposal.

Justice Baragwanath in his comments regarding the judicial review of the PNCC decision to change the purpose of the Turitea Reserve highlighted that if the public didn't like the direction PNCC was taking, the best way to stop the proposal was to create some momentum through electing like-minded Councillors. I believe that the electorate has done that and hope that you can work with the likes of Lew Findlay, Mike Feyen, Anne Podd, Bruce Wilson and others to stop this foolishness.

Shall be in touch again in the New Year.

Have a great Christmas.

Adrian.

On Fri, 14 Dec 2007 08:34:08 +1300 (NZDT), Annette Nixon <kiwiannette@yahoo.co.nz> wrote:
> Ata marie Adrian,
>
> PNCC obviously unable to intervene in a process very strategically
> planned by developer, but also unprepared at an earlier stage to have
> sought / negotiated assurances from MRP regarding their future
> actions.
>
> Happy Christmas.
> Annette Nixon
>

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Baragwanath's remarks are outrageous. He capitulated to the Variation as we now know and pretended that the contract with its secret contents was benign and that all we needed to do was elect more amenable councilors who would turn things around and then we would be safe to further our business plan.

Cookson's email was forwarded to us as litigants. The result was once again false hope that we could beat this wind farm, a hope fuelled by Baragwanath's deliberately false but soothing words. He knew who was buttering his bread and who he was illegally, via the Variation, directed to toady to – the executive.

Still nobody other than the main players knows the secret contract is driving everything.

I made an attempt to get the Mayor on side. Beaver [deceased 2017] was a close confidant. I got nowhere with this as it turned out Tanguay was up to her neck in the fraud.

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Saturday, July 14, 2007 6:05 PM
To: rob.bv@clear.net.nz
Subject: Council

Hi Rob,

John Adams forwarded Peter Wheeler's email to me so just a note to thank you for sending it to John. Yes, we have an extremely dysfunctional administration here in PN. Naylor who is a front for a wealthy clique out to feather their nests would be a disaster for the city. Your friend Heather who has worked hard for the city, there is no denying that, has dug herself into an almighty hole over the wind farms. Govt policy in this matter is not aligned with the long term interests or even viability of this city (by that I mean the city stops developing on higher ground and is stuck on the flood plain of the Manawatu River). Perhaps you may be able to help her extract herself and so win a second term. We would be prepared to support her if she were to come out on an environmental ticket and by so doing identify herself with a political faction (by that I mean candidates) that recognises that the wind farms must stop at the Pahaitua track and that alternative energy strategies such as promoting solar water heating and compact fluorescent lighting will more than compensate for turbines which will otherwise wreck people's lives, property values and the environment. Monica and I have seen MRP's photomontages and it's a nightmare for the city , not just for us and our neighbours in Ngahere Park. For Councillors to have approved what is proposed they must have been on crack. Heather would earn a lot of kudos if she now took a position where she acknowledged the substantial and growing opposition and promised a genuine consultation with affected parties with a view to review Council policy.

Failure to make a political accommodation will in my opinion simply open the way for Naylor's mafia and the city will be in an uproar once people in general realise what is happening - by then the contracts will have been let and it will be too late.

Here is our web site to help you familiarise yourself with some of the issues ,that is if you have not already seen it. The photostream on page 2 has text which highlights some of the issues. It is getting a lot of traffic.

<http://www.turiteareserve.org.nz/>

Cheers

Paul Stichbury.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

The Friends of the Turitea Reserve received this email. Once again we knew nothing of the contract's mafia like clauses.

From: Turitea Reserve [turiteareserve@yahoo.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 5:16 PM
To: turiteareserve@yahoo.co.nz
Subject: New & outstanding issues

And so it begins...

Recent news indicates that Mighty River Power are already recommending compensation packages to those living on the South side of the Pahiatua Track during private visits based on the possible windfarm development on the Turitea Reserve. Unfortunately it seems that MRP are failing in their obligation to disclose the extent of the whole development in that it is also planned to stretch down the Pahiatua Track through to the Turitea Valley. It seems that those taking compensation are unaware that most, if not all, vistas will be blighted because of the half truths and ambiguities of MRP. Having signed up for compensation those often living closest to the proposal are then unable to object during the Resource Consent process. Only then are they likely to know the full scale of the proposal. By not objecting, MRP are then able to claim that those that have been paid out are unconcerned with the development. Quite a cunning way to divide those that are concerned about the proposal from those that have potentially most at stake. MRP apparently state that the proposal is a 'certainty' so those living closest by should sign up for compensation sooner rather than later. Unfortunately it seems that some have signed up for compensation without knowing the full story. One has to remember that PNCC are likely to turn a blind eye to this strategy because of their burning desire for the project to take place. Quite frankly, PNCC are getting MRP to do their dirty work for them now, before any full proposal might be laid out for consultation.

Whether any consultation is likely to take place is unknown, but none of the SOEs that have sought local Resource Consents for windfarms have consulted with local communities as a whole with public meetings prior to lodging their intentions with the council. It's essential that you lobby the mayor and your Councillors to find out what's happening and demand that the local ratepayers be informed of the overall scope and size of the proposal before any Resource Consent is lodged. Even better, lobby the mayor and your local Councillors highlighting your concerns over the proposal and seek that it be debated again now that a new set of Councillors are sitting, many of whom openly disagreed with the proposal.

Time is marching on and it would not be unexpected for MRP to proceed prior to Christmas and catch everyone on the hop. Do not be complacent over the ultimate scale of the proposal and how quickly things will start moving in the next few months.

Contact the mayor and your local Councillors using this link -

<http://www.pncc.govt.nz/Council/Council/MayorAndCouncillors.htm>

All the best.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

The punishment meted out to the litigants took the form of legal bills we struggled to pay something the next email addresses. Note we paid up although we were still in debt at this stage and had not sold our B&B business, The Gables.

From: Turitea Reserve [turiteareserve@yahoo.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2007 4:54 PM
To: turiteareserve@yahoo.co.nz
Subject: Outstanding issues.

Dear All,

Despite my best intentions and that of the FOTR executive, we are still short of funds for paying the lawyers the fees for the court action. Personally, Ruth and I are now unable to make the regular payments to keep the lawyers from our tails, and hence we have now been subjected to some rather uncomfortable communications. Ken Johnstone, our lawyer recently wrote to us saying,

'I was of course more than happy to accept instructions in the matter when Fitzherbert Rowe was conflicted out. I tried throughout to keep costs at a reasonable level, although the matter became more complex as it developed. Not long before the fixture date, a concern was expressed on behalf of FOTR in relation to fees, and it was intimated that FOTR might not be able to meet the costs of the litigation. At that point, I made it very clear that I was not prepared to proceed with the hearing when that degree of doubt existed, and I asked Melanie Sargent of Wadham Goodman to talk to FOTR's Chairman and Executive Committee. She did that, and an unequivocal assurance was given that costs would be met in full in due course. Indeed, the response that came back to me was that I was dealing with people of the utmost integrity who would ensure that all costs were paid'

Of course, I never realised that everything would turn out quite the way it did and our costs would be so hard to stomach. However, we have now sought costs for \$3,600 from PNCC for the initial interlocutory hearing and that should take us down to less than \$10,000 outstanding that FOTR still needs to find to pay. I and the Exec Committee have payed an overly disproportionate part of the fees to date; it would be great if others could put their hands in their pockets.

This matter has lingered far too long and I hope that further donations might be forthcoming so that FOTR can start with a clean slate prior to any Resource Consent hearing. Cheques can be made out to 'Friends of Turitea Reserve' and sent to me at the address below or can be made out to 'Wadham Goodman' and sent to their offices on Broadway Ave.

I apologise for asking yet again for further financial contributions - it's not something I take pleasure in doing.

Thanks very much in advance.

Adrian.

20 Amuri Lane
RD4
Palmerston North

355 2715

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Five months later we met with MRP employees

After a very strained meeting with Omer and Henry where Omer told me they wanted a Call-In because the wind farm would not get through the Environment Court I demanded we be bought out and this email elaborated on this.

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [<mailto:thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz>]
Sent: Wednesday, 23 April 2008 9:47 a.m.
To: Mike Omer
Cc: John Adams
Subject: Yesterday's meeting

Hi Mike,
the four of us would like to thank you and Mark for meeting with us yesterday. There is one point however which we did not clear up before you left and that is a timeline for events to unfold in respect of our affected properties. Could you please give us a firm time for negotiations etc to be concluded by. We don't intend to have this drag out and are looking for a very prompt settlement, one to two weeks maximum. This nonsense has gone on for two years already.

Regards
Paul Stichbury.

From: Mike Omer [Mike.Omer@mightyriver.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, May 02, 2008 9:31 AM
To: Paul & Monica Stichbury; John Adams
Cc: Mark Henry
Subject: RE: Yesterday's meeting

Dear Paul and Monica.

Thank you for your email of 23 April. Mark and I were also grateful for the opportunity to meet and discuss the Turitea project with you, as well as with John and Rosemary. We appreciated the openness of the discussion and respect that matters raised in the meeting are to be held in confidence amongst the parties present.

As we discussed at the meeting, I think we all share the frustrations that the delays have caused, albeit from different perspectives. We acknowledge the outcome you sought in respect of your property (as with John & Rosemary). However, as discussed at the time, purchasing of property is not core business for Mighty River Power and therefore I am taking it under advisement before responding further. This obviously suggests we will not be able to resolve any matters in the timeframes you are proposing.

Mark and I would welcome the opportunity to talk with you at any stage, and propose meeting with you again soon.

Regards

Mike Omer
Business Manager
Mighty River Power Limited
DDI: +64 06 354 0957
Fax: +64 06 354 1067
Mobile: +64 0274 923 298
mike.omer@mightyriver.co.nz
www.mightyriverpower.co.nz
Level 1
6 Linton Street
PO Box 1541
Palmerston North

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Buying out our properties would have cost a great deal less than the bonus's routinely paid out to MRP employees - \$3 million in 2010 alone. Omer and co were protecting their patch but also did not want to telegraph the ruin the wind farm will bring to many other property owners.

I followed up on this meeting with Annabell.

From: Paul & Monica Stichbury [thegables.pn.nz@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2008 6:08 PM
To: John Annabell
Subject: Wind farm question

Dear Mr Annabell,

John Adams has copied an email to you to me where he questions whether PNCC has followed the spirit of the Local Govt Act 2002 which states as its purpose:

" to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well being of communities, in the present and for the future".

For close to a year now my wife and I have had our Ngahere Park property on the market and it has not drawn a single offer despite it having arguably one of the best building sites in the Manawatu only 9 kms from the square with views to the Tasman Mountains behind Nelson to the Central Plateau. We have recently changed agencies and have had widespread coverage on the internet. Potential purchasers have been put off by the planned Turitea wind farm. Other neighbours have also been unable to sell. At the time of the Turitea submissions I made a submission where I asked a number of legitimate questions which were not answered, as you may recall, due to Council policies. One of those questions related to what extent the Council was liable to be sued by residents for loss of equity. Are you able now to express an opinion on the Council's vulnerability to a civil law suit in light of the fact that the Local Govt Act specifically aims to protect communities at large rather than cater for the financial ambitions of a very small number of land owners ? The Council entered into secret negotiations with these land owners at the time and here we are in 2008 with the general public still unaware of the true extent of the project. Mighty River Power did of course under duress eventually show my wife and I photomontages, but only of the turbines in the reserve. At a meeting several weeks ago they acknowledged that we as land owners will have a significant problem with the wind farm in respect of noise and visual effects. They have refused to buy us out - please note that at this stage this information is confidential.

My question as to Council vulnerability to a class action law suit is not intended to be vexatious. My wife and I have already suffered significant financial loss as a result of the planned wind farm. Mighty River Power's response to us has been,

" Why don't you build a house ? "

We are not that stupid. Of course if we build a house and the wind farm goes ahead we face an intolerable wind farm towering over us and Mighty River Power can then say we have no grounds for complaint as we knew there was going to be a wind farm anyway ! We would also be sinking equity into a house that in all probability would never find a buyer. Whatever way you cut it we stand to loose.

Looking forward to your reply

Kind regards
Paul Stichbury.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

By this time the endless delays have resulted in us being almost completely wiped out as we could not start our project on our land. What can we do?

Annabell's standard secret contract driven brush off reply

From: John Annabell [john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz]
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2008 12:26 PM
To: Paul & Monica Stichbury
Subject: RE: Wind farm question

Dear Mr Stichbury,

Thank you for your email.

It is not my role to provide legal advice directly to members of the public. I therefore have no response to the comments or questions you raise in your email.

However, if you have any factual questions, please advise and I will consider them as a request for information. Alternatively, if you would like to draw these matters to the concern of the Mayor and Councillors, you may wish to do so by one of the means outlined in the following link:

<http://www.pncc.govt.nz/YourCouncil/CityCouncil/ElectedMembers/Detail.aspx?id=3510>

| JOHN B ANNABELL | Legal Counsel |

Unaware that the Variation determined the outcome of the court case, which we truly thought we would win, attempts to get to the truth continued as the following exchange demonstrates.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

From: John Adams [herman.adams@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2008 5:13 PM
To: Paul & Monica Stitchbury
Subject: FW: Ref. PNCC and Local Govt. Act 2002

Hi Paul

My mate John Annabell is being a bit tardy.
A pleasant reminder! They don't want me to get what I'm requesting.

Cheers

JOHN

-----Original Message-----

From: John Adams [mailto:herman.adams@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 11 June 2008 9:10 p.m.
To: john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz
Subject: FW: Ref. PNCC and Local Govt. Act 2002

Hi John

I was wondering how the search for the information I requested is going, i.e. full details on the research carried out by PNCC that property values increase next to wind farms (as described in the Council decision adopted 30th October 2006) a copy of the Variation on the wind farm agreement and the consultation that occurred on approving the signing of this agreement a copy of PNCC's Policy on Significance and the thresholds applied in the Turitea wind farm proposal PNCC's definition of adjoining landowners as applied in council decision adopted 30th October 2006.

Many thanks in advance for collecting the above information

John Adams

-----Original Message-----

From: John Adams [mailto:herman.adams@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 30 May 2008 5:25 p.m.
To: John Annabell
Subject: RE: Ref. PNCC and Local Govt. Act 2002

Hi John

Thanks for your prompt reply.

I understand the position you have outlined concerning legal matters.

The High Court hearing only considered the legality of PNCC to alter the purpose under the Reserves Act and not any other mechanisms/ processes.

On a factual basis I would appreciate the following:

full details of the research carried out by PNCC that property values increase next to wind farms .

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

a copy of the Variation on the Wind Farm Agreement and the extent of consultation on approving the signing of this agreement a copy of PNCC's Policy on Significance and the thresholds applied.

PNCC's definition of adjoining landowners as applied in as in Council decision adopted 30 October 2006.

Many thanks
John Adams

-----Original Message-----

From: John Annabell [mailto:john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz]
Sent: Friday, 30 May 2008 4:24 p.m.
To: John Adams
Subject: RE: Ref. PNCC and Local Govt. Act 2002

Dear John,

Thank you for your email.

This matter was raised in the High Court hearing, as you will be aware. I do not propose to reply to your questions or comments, as it not my role to provide legal advice directly to members of the public.

However, if you have any factual questions, please advise and I will consider them as a request for information. Alternatively, if you would like to draw these matters to the concern of the Mayor and Councillors, you may wish to do so by one of the means outlined in the following link:

<http://www.pncc.govt.nz/YourCouncil/CityCouncil/ElectedMembers/Detail.aspx?id=3510>

| JOHN B ANNABELL | Legal Counsel |
| Palmerston North City Council | Private Bag 11034, Palmerston North
4442 |
| P: 06 356 8199 | F: 06 355 4115 |
| www.pncc.govt.nz |

-----Original Message-----

From: John Adams [mailto:herman.adams@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 28 May 2008 10:24 p.m.
To: John Annabell
Subject: Ref. PNCC and Local Govt. Act 2002

Dear John

I would appreciate it if could comment on what I have written below concerning PNCC's actions and possible lack of compliance with the Local Govt. Act 2002.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

The Request for Proposal for wind generation in Turitea Reserve put out by PNCC states in section 1.1:

"The Council has also been in discussion and received expression of interest from adjoining landowners to the Turitea Reserve to have their land included in any such development proposal as a single project".

The subsequent consultation document to change the status of Turitea Reserve does not mention this arrangement, i.e. that the turbines proposed in the Reserve and on private land are part of the one project.

People submitting in favour of the change might not have done so if they knew about turbines on private land. In making these arrangements PNCC has favoured a small select number of ratepayers that is not in the spirit of the Local Govt.

Act, i.e. "to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well being of communities, in the present and for the future".

The social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities close to where wind turbines are proposed on private land is not being promoted taking into account the growing difficulty of selling properties in these areas, that is over and above normal market trends.

Section 14.52 in the Council Decision Adopted 30th October 2006 (Alteration to Purpose of Turitea Reserve and Amendments to Management Plan), states that "Council has researched property values upon completion of construction of the Te Apiti wind farm and found the following: there was a 34% increase in Ashhurst property values and a 21% increase in Palmerston North property values (national increase 18%)". Could you please provide me with full details of this research.

How does PNCC consider that this research is valid when it has a vested interest through its contract with Mighty River Power? Would this research be acceptable in court? Has this research been peer-reviewed?

The Council Decision Adopted 30th October 2006 states in Section 18.8:

"That the Council direct the Chief Executive to advise Mighty River Power that the Council expects that in selecting the location and number of turbines on any private land outside the reserve Mighty River Power will ensure that adjoining owners' enjoyment of their properties is not unreasonably adversely affected". Does PNCC mean only the landowners who share a boundary with the reserve? Adjoining landowners is defined as those who share a boundary with the reserve. These are the people who will potentially receive royalties at the expense of other residents in the area who do not share a boundary with the reserve. This is causing divisions that do not promote social well being of the communities concerned. To make matters worse PNCC signed the 'Variation on the Wind Farm Agreement' where it agrees that it will do anything in its powers to ensure the wind farm proceeds.

Furthermore, the significant majority of submissions were against the change even with the potentially misleading and partial information provided. At what point was PNCC contravening the purpose of the Local Govt. Act 2002, i.e. to enable democratic local decision making and action by, and behalf of communities?

Local authorities are required to develop a policy on significance to indicate when an issue is important to the council or community. This policy includes the local authority's general approach to significance and what criteria or thresholds the local authority may apply when considering the extent to which a matter is significant. Does PNCC have available the details of how their policy of significance and the thresholds were applied for the decision on changing the status of Turitea Reserve to pave the way for a wind turbine facility?

The Local Govt. Act and the Resource Management Act are two separate pieces of legislation. PNCC is obliged to follow both. What PNCC put forward in entering contractual agreements with

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Mighty River Power should have been guided by the Local Government Act 2002. Unfortunately, PNCC did not consider its obligations under the Local Govt. Act by consulting first, i.e. before any 'Request for Proposal' and other deals with Mighty River Power. PNCC'S reliance on the RMA to mitigate landscape and other effects is an abandonment of its responsibilities under the Local Govt. Act. What is PNCC's justification for not consulting first?

Kind regards
John Adams

Obviously John Adams got nowhere with his requests.

On Weds September 2008 I participated in a RadioLive interview with MRP CEO Douglas Heffernan. This interview was deleted by the Government as Heffernan lied about the Call-In and the size of the wind farm [it was 4 times bigger than Te Apiti]. He gave specious reasons for the Call-In and Marcus Lush did a competent job in questioning him. The Call-In was just the final step in the fraud based on the corrupt secret contract.

We still did not know about the secret contract and would not know for almost another 2 years. By now my wife and I had been ruined and we did our best to help others.

The interview was miraculously recovered two months ago from a discarded hard drive. If the link does not work [very likely blocked in NZ as have my websites] please contact me and I will burn a CD for whoever is handling this case. I can if needed send hard copies of all email in this document.

<https://soundcloud.com/paul-stichbury/the-turitea-wind-farm-fraud>

- A bonus email shared with me in 2017. PNCC must support the wind farm – see the contract.

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

Annabell flat out lies – see point one. Alison Mildon's questions are getting too close to the truth

From: "John Annabell" <john.annabell@pncc.govt.nz>
To: "Alison Mildon" <miro@infogen.net.nz>
Cc: "Councillors With Email" <CouncillorsWithEmail@pncc.govt.nz>; "Paddy Clifford" <paddy.clifford@pncc.govt.nz>; "Ray Swadel" <ray.swadel@pncc.govt.nz>; "Chris Pepper" <chris.pepper@pncc.govt.nz>; "Mike Manson" <mike.manson@pncc.govt.nz>; "Andrew Brown" <andrew.brown@pncc.govt.nz>; "Virginia Shaw" <virginia.shaw@pncc.govt.nz>; "John Maassen" <JMaassen@crlaw.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 16 January 2009 1:48 p.m.
Subject: Turitea Wind Farm

Hello Alison,

I refer again to your email received on the evening of Monday, 12 December 2009.

I have already replied in a general sense to some of your questions, but, in this email, I address in a little more detail some of the questions you raised. The numbers I have used correspond to the numbers you used for your questions:

1. The ability of the Council to make a submission about activities proposed for the Turitea Reserve, in light of the Ministerial Call-in, is currently being clarified with the Council's legal advisors. Under the Agreement the Council has with Mighty River Power, the Council's public or statutory functions as a territorial authority are preserved, and it is acknowledged in the Agreement that the Council is under no obligation to make a decision that enables the windfarm project to proceed when the Council is undertaking its statutory responsibilities.

See this link for full details.

<https://turiteadocuments.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/pncc-secretly-teams-up-with-the-government-against-city-ratepayers.pdf>

In December 2017 I visited Alison Mildon. She had no idea the secret contract dictated every outcome. She was shocked realizing her massive multiyear effort had all been in vain and that she was an unwitting actor in a kabuki play. By 2009 Annabell had become a practiced liar.

“The Council is under no obligation to make a decision that enables the windfarm project to proceed”

This liar should be struck off.

Palmerston North ratepayers per the contract faced unlimited liability if PNCC decided not to support the wind farm. We are talking hundreds of millions of dollars +++++ here. Has anything like this ever happened in NZ before!!

The persecution continues to this day.

I contacted the incoming government on November 1st 2017 with a suggested course of action *to restore the rule of law*. The outcome was predictable. The

Dealings with PNCC and Mighty River Power

government's spy agencies are being used to cover for the criminality of the judiciary, lawyers and various ministers of the crown.

See attached letters or alternatively these links

<https://turiteadocuments.files.wordpress.com/2018/02/corrected-version-to-hon-david-parker-hon-andrew-little.pdf>

<https://turiteadocuments.files.wordpress.com/2018/02/180129-paul-stichbury.pdf>

<https://turiteadocuments.files.wordpress.com/2018/02/letter-to-minister-of-justice-attorney-general-30-1-2018.pdf>

The facts in this document speak for themselves. Further damning emails no doubt exist between Annabell, Manson, Pepper, Tanguay, Naylor, Maassen, Price, Kenderdine, board of inquiry members, Withers, MRP, the wind farmers on private land, the corporate controlled media and others. They have had plenty of time to delete but these emails can be recovered.

My wife and friends, particularly after threatening behaviour at a public meeting at IPC by wind farmer Joseph Poff [with his wind farm mates lurking in the background], have had concerns about my physical safety. I concur that it has been important to carry on the exposure of this enormous scam from a distance. Millions of dollars are involved and the full force of the government and its agencies has been applied to me.

This case is as serious as it gets. My view of the legal profession and the government in general is unprintable.

Paul Stichbury

19 February 2018