

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 Cathy Nieuwenhuijsen (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 CATHY NIEUWENHUIJSEN

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My name is Cathy Nieuwenhuijsen.
- 2 I am a Senior Air Quality consultant at Golder Associates New Zealand Limited, now owned by WSP. I have been engaged by Rolleston West Residential Limited (the Applicant) to provide evidence on odour related matters associated with the proposed rezoning of approximately 160 hectares of land in two separate locations on Dunns Crossing Road, Rolleston (the proposal). I have visited publicly accessible areas in the surrounds of these sites on the 17th September 2021.
- 3 In this summary of my evidence, I summarise my evidence in chief (dated 13 September 2021) which focuses on matters within my expertise, including a discussion on potential reverse sensitivity odour effects due to the Proposal and mitigation of potential odour effects via setback distances.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE IN CHIEF

- 4 I reviewed the consented and existing activities in the vicinity of the blocks. The activities include the Pines Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) and Rolleston Resource Recovery Park (RRRP), which have the potential to impact on the Holmes Block, and the Tegel Breeder Farm, located off Dunns Crossing Road, that has the potential to impact on the Skellerup Block. From this review, I recommended housing setbacks on the Holmes and Skellerup blocks, and these setbacks have been adopted into the plan change application. These are shown in Figure 1 of my evidence in Chief.
- 5 My evidence focuses on areas of disagreement between the council expert, Mr Bender, and myself.
- 6 I understand from the evidence of Mr Bender that he agrees with all my recommended setbacks with the exception of the composting operation. For the composting operation, I understand that Mr Bender is primarily concerned with upset conditions that can be expected in a composting operation.
- 7 With regard to the composting operation, my original assessment included with the application, was based on a smaller composting operation than subsequently was consented in May 2021. Therefore, I have considered whether or not the setback distance is sufficient to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.
- 8 I have evaluated this from two aspects, the potential for odour effects on the current receiving environment and the potential for dwellings on the Holmes block to increase the sensitivity of the receiving environment to the extent that it results in reverse sensitivity effects.

- 9 Regarding the potential for offsite odour effects, based on my desktop-based review, of the composting operation, its management plan and conditions of consent, I consider that at the maximum consented throughput, there is likely to be observable odour on occasions beyond the RRRP site boundary, and on occasions it is possible that this may cause an offsite effect that is more than minor for the current receiving environment (including the houses allowed under the existing ODP). Therefore, in my opinion, further onsite mitigation at the RRRP is likely to be required for the current receiving environment for the RRRP to comply with the requirements of its resource consent.
- 10 With regard to whether this proposal changes the sensitivity of the receiving environment; I have considered the number and location of houses currently allowed under the existing ODP, and those proposed under this plan change application. On balance, I consider that the proposal (including the 600 m setback from the active composting area) does not change the receiving environment from that which is currently established or can be established under the current plan zoning. This is due to the current number of potential and existing dwellings compared to the Proposal which while increasing the number of houses within, say 700 m from the site, it also reduces the number of potential houses within 600m of the composting operation.

CONCLUSIONS

- 11 There are a number of activities that occur in the vicinity of the proposal, these activities have the potential to result in odour that is detectable beyond the activities' site boundary. The proposal has the potential to change the sensitivity of the environment surrounding these activities and therefore has the potential to result in reverse sensitivity effects. This has been mitigated by adopting setback distances. Except for the composting setbacks, Mr Bender has concurred with the proposed setbacks
- 12 With regard to the setback from the composting operation, I consider the existing (current zoned) environment is equally or more sensitive (due to potentially closer houses) to these odour effects than the proposed zoning. Therefore, the proposal does not change the sensitivity of the environment.

Dated: 28 September 2021

Cathy Nieuwenhuijsen