

Resource Consent Applications under the
Resource Management Act 1991

An application to discharge contaminants (including odour) into the air from the Roto-o-Rangi piggery at 30 Kairangi Road, Roto-o-Rangi (renewal of existing consent AUTH 136796.01.01)

to irrigate treated piggery waste water onto land and associated discharge to air at 83 and 62 Kairangi Road, Roto-o-Rangi (renewal of existing consent AUTH 136796.02.01)

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CLIVE NORMAN ANDERSEN

Witness introduction and background information

1. My full name is Clive Norman Andersen.
2. I am employed by Waratah Farms Limited (**WFL**) as the Projects and Maintenance Manager. I have been employed in this role for 7 years.
3. In this role I am responsible for supervising a team of six staff that carry out maintenance works for both of the WFL facilities at Ormsby Road and Roto-o-Rangi (**ROR Facility**).
4. I am also responsible for implementing the capital expenditure programme at both facilities. This includes designing buildings, equipment and infrastructure and liaising with external consultants and experts as required. Where necessary I work with Martin Ellis to determine the cost/benefit analysis of different mitigation measures.

Professional Qualifications and Work experience

5. I am originally from South Africa. I am a registered Professional Engineering Technologist, registered with the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA).
6. I have had extensive experience in South Africa with the implementation of large infrastructure projects, working as an engineer for the City of Durban. This has involved working and liaising with large Council organisations, politicians and engaging with community groups at project level. I am very familiar with consent processes and the sensitivities involving rural and urban projects.
7. I spent seven years with the Merchant Navy in South Africa as a marine engineer (Mechanical). Part of my responsibility in that role was the detection of certain gases, notably carbon monoxide.

8. I have always been genetically susceptible to the presence of gases. This exhibits itself by a feeling of lock jaw and then the smell of the relevant gas. I would say I am highly susceptible to the presence of these gases in a number of different receiving environments.

Scope of Evidence

9. My evidence addresses the following matters:
- a. General observations regarding odour on site and beyond the boundary of the ROR Facility
 - b. General observations on the mitigation measures undertaken by WFL
 - c. Response to complaint 21 June 2018
 - d. Site visit 20 November 2018
 - e. Response to complaint 27 November 2018
 - f. Response to complaints 28 November 2018
 - g. General comments on the proposed Resource Consent conditions

General observations regarding odour on site and beyond the boundary of the ROR Facility

On Site Odour

10. In my experience, there is odour on site from time to time. This odour generally is one of three types: pig effluent odour, pig feed odour, or what I term pig body odour. In my opinion pig effluent odour can be particularly offensive if experienced in large quantities, or for a long period of time. I do not consider that this type of odour is present on site for long periods of time or at high intensities.
11. In my experience this odour is intermittent and of short duration. The scale and intensity fluctuate with the activities being undertaken on site. For example, there may be a localised pig body odour in the immediate vicinity when pigs are

being weighed. Alternatively, there may be a localised pig effluent odour when the separator and stirrers are operating. By "localised" I mean within a 30m radius of the pits. These sorts of activities are carried out in a controlled manner, and last for approximately one hour per day, generally in the morning.

Odour Beyond the Boundary

12. In my experience, there is the likelihood of intermittent odour from pig feed and pig bodies. For the reasons outlined later in my statement of evidence, I do not consider there is a high likelihood of pig effluent odour beyond the boundary of the ROR Facility.
13. I would characterise any odour beyond the boundary as being of fleeting duration, largely dictated by the weather conditions at the time and, in particular, the swirling winds in the vicinity of the ROR facility. When present, I would characterise this odour as being a 1-2 out of 6.
14. The environment around the ROR Facility is one that I would characterise as rural, in that there is on occasion odour from a number of different sources, including the dairy and goats farms which are in proximity to both the ROR Facility and 37 Kairangi Road (**the Smith property**).
15. I do not consider that the actual odour or potential for odour to be experienced beyond the boundary of the ROR Facility is persistent or can be considered objectionable.

General observations on the mitigation measures undertaken by WFL

16. As part of my role with WFL, I have been responsible for assisting with, and evaluating, the various mitigation measures that have been undertaken. Those mitigation measures are detailed in the Statement of Evidence of Anthony Bindi Ground.

17. It is my experience that the upgrades undertaken by WFL at the ROR facility in the last seven years have resulted in a significant improvement of odour from the site. It follows that those upgrades have reduced the likelihood of neighbours experiencing significant odour beyond the boundary. This is supported by the fact that there were no odour complaints to the Council from 2012 until after the current application had been notified in 2016. Since notification, the only odour complaints to the Council or to WFL directly have come from the Smith property.

Response to complaint 21 June 2018

18. On 21 June 2018 WFL received a complaint made by Janet Smith. The text message (which was forwarded to WFL by Marius Rademeyer) read:

"Just reported a pig smell – I was inside the house and went out to greet the gas delivery man and he mentioned a smell and of course I reported it".

19. On 21 June 2018 I contacted Rock Gas Cambridge which is the gas company responsible for gas deliveries to the Smith property. I spoke to the Manager. The gas delivery person was out on deliveries. I explained that we had received an odour complaint from Mrs Smith which suggested the gas delivery man had experienced odour while he was at the Smith property. I was interested in talking to him to find out his comments on the type of smell and how bad it was.
20. Later that day I received a voice mail message from the Rock Gas Manager advising me he had spoken to the delivery person who had told him that when he drove up to the Smith property the lady came out and said to him "doesn't it smell like pigs to you". The delivery man said "I guess so" but to him it smelled like any other farm. He wasn't sure what the smell was, he was just being polite in agreeing.
21. I was really surprised to receive a complaint that day as I had just left ROR after checking on the ozone equipment including a perimeter odour check. Upon

leaving I was rather upbeat about the lack of odour after a considerable amount of effort and investment by WFL, that's when I noticed the gas man in the Smith driveway.

22. I had managed to contact Rock Gas and get these comments relatively easily. I was surprised that the Council hadn't also tried to contact Rock Gas as to my mind this provided an excellent opportunity to talk to an independent person regarding the presence or otherwise of any odour at the Smith property.

Site visit 20 November 2018

23. On 20 November 2018 I accompanied Jayne Metcalfe, Jennifer Matthys and Bindi Ground on an informal site visit to the ROR Facility. Although no formal odour assessment was undertaken, Jayne, Jennifer and I did spend time walking along Kairangi Road and in the vicinity of the Smith property.
24. During this time I could detect some intermittent pig feed / body odour beyond the boundary of the property, for a few seconds. I informally rated this as a 2 / 6 in terms of duration and intensity.
25. It seemed to me that the Council's Resource Officer (Jennifer Matthys) was making a determined attempt to try and detect odour.

Response to complaint 27 November 2018

26. On 27 November 2018 WFL received a text message from Janet Smith advising of an odour complaint. There were two text messages sent as follows:

12.26pm: Pig smell now at 12.30 my son Terry here rate [sic] it 2 – it was now gone as the wind has got a little stronger

[WFL response – is it still occurring?]

12.28pm: Yes but the wind has taken it away – my son Terry here – about 10 minutes of smell.

27. On 27 November 2018 I was on site at the ROR Facility in the morning until about 11:45am. I did not notice any strong odours on site while I was there. There was nothing unusual or out of the ordinary being done on the site during this time. Nothing was operating on site from about 10am onwards.

Response to complaint 28 November 2018

28. At 11.06 am on 28 November 2018 WFL received a text message advising of an odour complaint from Janet Smith. That text message was forwarded to me by Marius Rademeyer.

29. The text read

"Gusty wind and smell – I have a cold so think about a 3 – raining now – pig noise at the same time"

30. At the time that I received the text I was in Te Awamutu. I immediately drove to the ROR Facility, arriving at about 11.25am. I drove up and down Kairangi Road. I could not detect any piggery odour.
31. I then stopped at the Monk's tanker track. The Monk tanker track runs parallel to the driveway of the Smith property. I could not detect any piggery odour.
32. I could hear some noise from the pigs at the ROR Facility. Pigs were being weighed at the time.

33. I met two other WFL staff at the bottom of the WFL driveway and we walked across the road towards the Smith property. We walked halfway up the Monk tanker track. I could not detect any piggery odour. I could smell a vegetative or mulch type of smell. At the time the wind was blowing from the ROR Facility towards the Smith property.
34. Within the boundaries of the ROR Facility I could smell methane near the flare in the piggery, but I could not smell any piggery odour beyond the boundaries of the ROR Facility.
35. At the time no equipment such as separators or activities such as hosing/flushing were being carried out on site.
36. Later that evening at about 8.50pm that night I was advised that a further complaint had been received by text from Mrs Smith. I drove out to the ROR Facility, arriving at about 9.00pm. I drove up and down Kairangi Road in the vicinity of the ROR Facility. I also went up the Monk's tanker track next to the Smith property. I could not smell any piggery odour. I could smell slight vegetative odour.
37. I then went and walked around the piggery buildings within the ROR facility. Again, I could not smell any piggery odour. I checked the weather data at the ROR Facility which showed no wind since 7.00pm. I left the ROR Facility at about 9.30pm.

General comments on the proposed Resource Consent conditions

38. I have reviewed the conditions that have been proposed in the Section 42A Report in order to address odour effects beyond the boundary of the ROR Facility. I make the following comments:
- a. I agree that proposed condition 11 (covering pit 1 and 2) may have some effect on the reduction of odour effects on site and thereby possibly a reduction of the potential for odour effects off-site.

- b. However, it's difficult to justify the costs of complying with conditions 11 for a consent of only five years duration, particularly in light of the fact that the current consent review process has taken over two years to get to a hearing and involved substantial costs to WFL.
- c. I don't think the timeframes in condition 12 (odour mitigation strategy) are realistic. Three months may be a more realistic timeframe to put together information on conditions 10 and 11, I consider that the remaining items in this condition require at least 6 months upon completion of the OMS in order to be meaningfully researched, considered and reported on.

Concluding comments

- 39. It is my view that WFL has responded professionally and practically, adopting a long term sustainable view in every instance regardless of our views on the credibility of the complaints. This has involved considerable investment of both time and money.
- 40. It is my view, based on my own experience and observations, that any odour effects beyond the boundary of the ROR facility are of a limited scale, intensity, frequency and duration. I do not consider that the odour effects could be considered "objectionable" taking an objective approach to that term.
- 41. I have ultimately come to the view that there is nothing that WFL could do to address the perceived effects of the ROR Facility for Mrs Smith.

DATED: 5 December 2018



C N Andersen

