

Before the Selwyn District Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: Proposed Private Plan Change 73 to the Operative
District Plan: Dunns Crossing Road, Rolleston

and: **Rolleston West Residential Limited**
Applicant

Summary of Evidence of Donovan Van Kekem (Odour)

Dated: 28 September 2021

Reference: JM Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)
LMN Forrester (lucy.forrester@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com
T +64 4 499 5999
F +64 4 472 7111

PO Box 993
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch



SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF DONOVAN VAN KEKEM

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My name is Donovan Van Kekem.
- 2 My qualifications and relevant experience are outlined in my evidence in chief (EIC).

SUMMARY

- 3 I have been engaged to provide my expert opinion as to the potential for adverse air quality effects/reverse sensitivity effects on the PC73 Holmes Block development as a result of discharges to air from the Selwyn District Council (SDC) Pines Resource Recovery Park (PRRP) composting operation.
- 4 Note that whilst there are other sources of air discharges in the vicinity of the Holmes and Skellerup blocks which are part of the PC73 application, my evidence is limited to potential effects on the Holmes Block from the PRRP composting operation. Cathy Nieuwenhuijsen has been engaged by the applicant to provide expert evidence relating to all potential air discharge reverse sensitivity effects on PC73.
- 5 I was recently engaged by CRC as a technical peer reviewer of the recent air discharge consent application for the PRRP composting operation. I reviewed the assessment of environmental effects and associated air quality assessment provided in support of the application. I provided expert advice to the applicant and CRC to ensure that the proposed composting operation would meet industry standard odour and dust mitigation and management measures. I also assisted CRC with developing appropriate consent conditions.
- 6 At the completion of my review, I concluded that there was a low potential for adverse air quality effects beyond the boundary of the site. The current Living 3 zoned Holmes Block was included within this review.
- 7 I have read the supporting documentation for PC73, in particular that which relates to odour discharges from the PRRP composting operation. I have assessed whether or not this plan change would change my opinion as to the potential for adverse air quality effects arising from the PRRP composting operation.
- 8 As discussed in my EIC, based on the guidance in the MfE GPG Odour, the sensitivity of the receiving environment will not greatly increase from Living 3 to Living Z. I consider that residents who live in a Living 3 zone will have a similar sensitivity to nuisance odour which is discharged from a composting operation as residents living in a Living Z zone. Furthermore, the expected amenity values within these zones, as outlined in the SDC District Plan, are also similar.

- 9 From my perspective the key question is whether or not having a more densely populated area beyond the 600 m buffer will result in any increase in the potential for adverse nuisance odour effects.
- 10 As stated in my EIC, it is my opinion that there is a low potential for adverse air quality effects from the consented PRRP composting operation on the existing environment, which includes up to six dwellings within 600 m of the operation. The Specialist Environmental Services technical report and assessment of environmental effects which supported the recent SDC application for its current PRRP air discharge consent reached the same conclusion.
- 11 Based on my understanding of the PC73 proposal, there will no longer be any dwellings built within 600 m of the active composting area, effectively increasing the minimum separation/buffer distance from ~500 m to 600 m.
- 12 I also concur with Ms Nieuwenhuijsen that the frequency and duration that winds would blow towards these closest receptors will remain the same. By removing the closest dwellings (i.e. the four dwellings which could legally be established within 600 m of the PRRP) the peak intensity of odour discharged from the PRRP composting operation at the nearest sensitive receptor within the Holmes Block will be lower (due to progressive dispersion of the odour plume). I note, however, any offensive or objectionable odour beyond the PRRP boundary would be a breach of SDC's own consent.

CONCLUSIONS

- 13 For the reasons outlined in my EIC, I don't consider that there is an increase in the potential for adverse odour effects associated with the proposed PC73 re-zoning.
- 14 I remain of the opinion that there is a low potential for adverse odour effects at the Holmes Block even if it is re-zoned to Living Z. If anything, I consider that there will be a lower potential for adverse effects due to the removal of up to four dwellings within the proposed 600 m setback distance.

Dated: 28 September 2021



Donovan Van Kekem