Before the Selwyn District Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: Proposed Private Plan Changes 81 and 82 to the Operative District Plan: Dunns Crossing Road, Rolleston

and: **Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited** and **Brookside Road Residential Limited**
Applicant

Summary of Evidence of Donovan Van Kekem (Odour)

Dated: 12 September 2022

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

chapman tripp

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF DONOVAN VAN KEKEM

1 My full name is Donovan van Kekem. I am the managing director of NZ Air Limited.

2 I have assessed the potential for odour reverse sensitivity as a result of the Proposed Plan Changes PC82 and PC81. Specifically, I have assessed the potential for odour discharged from the PWTP, PRRP composting operation and the Tegel breeder farm to result in adverse/nuisance odour effects within these proposed developments.

3 All of the experts agree that the presented published setback distances which are applicable to the PWTP are appropriate. As PC82 (and PC81) are well beyond these published setback distances I consider that there is no substantive odour reverse sensitivity effects on these developments associated with the existing and proposed PWTP operations (up to 120,000 PE).

4 I also note that for largest WWTP operations across New Zealand there are consistent or smaller setback distances to that proposed for these developments.

5 With regards to the Tegel breeder farm, should the proposed PC82 development be approved this odour source will be removed from the existing environment resulting in an improvement/reduction in potential adverse odour effects in the existing receiving environment.

6 When assessing the potential for odour reverse sensitivity effects as a result of the proposed PC82 and PC81 developments, the aspects to be considered are more substantive as this development is to change land zoned as rural to residential. This changes the sensitivity of the land from 'low' to 'high' (as defined in the MfE GPG).

7 Should odour be observable beyond 600 m from the PRRP composting operation within PC82, then the matter to be considered is whether or not this odour would be considered as offensive within this more sensitive zoning.

8 The air quality experts agree that the use of published separation distances is an appropriate method for determining the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on an existing industrial air pollutant emitter.

9 The published separation distance guidance documents state that these distances should be used as a conservative starting point and that a site specific assessment can be used to provide a more accurate/appropriate separation distance for any given case.

10 There is a high degree of variability in the published separation distances, and there are significant differences between the PRRP composting operation with regard to other composting operations (primarily the lack of leachate collection and treatment and the restriction on when windrows can be turned). Therefore, in my opinion, it is appropriate for a site specific assessment to be undertaken to define a more appropriate, site specific, separation distance.

11 I have used the following assessment tools to undertake a site specific assessment of the potential radius of odour effects from the PRRP composting activities:

a) An assessment of local terrain and meteorological conditions;

b) Industry experience of similar composting operations in New Zealand;

c) A comparison of the PRRP operations against best industry practise for a composting operation of this size and nature;

d) A community odour survey; and

e) An odour scout survey.

12 I have used the above lines of evidence to support my expert opinions on whether or not the proposed odour setback/separation distance of 600 m is appropriate for the PC82/PC81 developments.

13 The experts (Mr Bender, Mr Iseli and I) agree that under normal operating conditions the PRRP composting operation will not result in odour which is offensive or objectionable beyond 600 m.

14 Mr Iseli and my opinions differ from Mr Bender on whether or not reverse sensitivity effects could occur during upset conditions at the PRRP composting plant.

15 With regards to upset conditions in the composting operation, I consider that the likelihood that:

a) A windrow turns anaerobic (i.e. SDC fail to follow the BPO in the ODMP),

b) SDC turn the windrow during wind conditions which are prohibited in the ODMP;

c) The wind direction is blowing towards PC82; and

d) The odour volume/intensity is sufficient enough that the plume will extend beyond 600 m from the source,

is very low to non-existent.

16 Furthermore, as this situation would only occur when SDC is in breach of its consent conditions, I do not consider that this is a relevant situation which should be considered when assessing potential reverse sensitivity effects on the PC82 and PC81 developments.

17 After considering all of these lines of evidence I conclude that the potential for odour to be observable within PC82 is low and as such the potential that adverse odour effects to occur in PC81 is also low. For this reason, in my expert opinion there is no substantive odour reverse sensitivity effects on the Proposed Plan Changes associated with odour discharges from the PRRP composting operations or the PWTP operations.

18 Furthermore, I consider that should PC82 be approved, the removal of the Tegel breeder farm will provide a benefit/reduce the potential for odour effects in the existing environment.

Dated: 12 September 2022

_____

Donovan van Kekem