

File No: WGN190198 [36059]
31 January 2020

Minutes from the second Pre-Hearing Meeting for NCI Packaging NZ Ltd's application for a discharge to air permit relating to the production and coating of aluminium aerosol cans and tin plated steel cans

Held: 29 January 2020 at 6:00pm
Location: NCI lunch room, 62/66 Montgomery Cres, Clouston Park, Upper Hutt 5018
Attendees: Rhys Kevern (Technical & Compliance Manager) and Shane Flitcroft (Plant Manager), NCI; Kirsty van Reenen, Claire McKevitt (processing officer), and Rachael Boisen Round, GWRC; Jill McKenzie, Regional Public Health (Submitter); Ann Devlin (Submitter); Dorothy Pink and Nicola Ratahi (Mountbatten Grove residents).

1. Introduction

Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Actions from pre-hearing meeting #1

Claire provided a summary of the actions agreed to and completed since the first hearing meeting (also provided by email on 4 November 2020);

- The residue/deposits on neighbouring houses was investigated and a technical response provided by Jeff Bluet (for GWRC). Jeff advised that it was unlikely that the residue/deposits were linked to NCI's operations.
- GWRC undertook a review of their incident notification system and advised that all fake calls through to the 0800 hotline during the review period were recorded and passed on to the duty officer.

Claire also provided a summary of the other matters addressed by Jeff Bluet in his memo dated 26 November 2019 (attached). Nicola and Dorothy requested they be included in all correspondence as they had not received the PDP memo.

Action: GWRC to include Dorothy Pink, Nicola Ratahi, Glenys Check and Trevor and Dianne Messer in any further correspondence about the application.

3. Discussion points

General discussion about:

- NCI's investigation/report on January 2020 odour
- January 2020 odour notifications and Claire's findings
- Discussion on the odour experienced "chronic" vs "acute" odour and what this means

- Potential conditions of consent

Claire explained that due to the high number of **odour notifications received in January**, GWRC requested NCI to provide a report on the weather conditions and NCI operations at the time of each odour notification. Rhys briefly discussed his report. Rhys noted that it is hard for them to investigate when NCI receive a notification hours after the odour has occurred. Rhys said there can be periods of months where there is no odour complaints and he didn't think the odour was **chronic** (in reference to Ministry for the Environment (2016) Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Odour). Claire noted that the report demonstrated that NCI's report showed that about 50% of the odours were from NCI.

Rhys explained that in their application they applied to not include a condition of consent requiring a **technology review** for odour. However if they were going to be required to undertake that again, that it would be best to be completed after 10 years (with a consent duration of 20 years). Technology didn't change very quickly so Rhys considered this timeframe appropriate. The previous technology review looked only at mitigation options for odour. No options were considered appropriate to implement as a result of the previous review.

Claire provided a summary of GWRC's investigations during January. The duty officers experienced bursts of odour. Claire asked the residents whether their **experience of the odour** was similar:

- Nicola explained her experience of the odour from NCI and said that sometimes the odour can come in bursts and sometimes it can be a weaker smell for longer period.
- Ann explained her experience of the odour events during January 2020. She rang GWRC's 0800 number multiple times. It comes in bursts lasting about 6 – 10 minutes. She can't stay in the garden and work through it. Ann said another 10 years is too long to put up with the smell from NCI. People don't want to sell their homes and if they do it changes the dynamic of the street (due to homes becoming rental properties). The prices of homes could drop. Ann also noted that she thought there several months in 2019 where notifications to the 0800 number were not getting logged by GWRC.
- Dorothy said her experience of the odour was similar to Nicola and Ann's. On the 7 and 13 January 2020 she rated the odour 8 out of 10.

Jill was asked whether RPH were concerned about the **health effects** from the discharge. Jill explained that she is confident that the discharge is not having physical health effects as the concentration of contaminants in the emissions are so much lower than the accepted guideline values. She acknowledged that there can be physiological effects from odour. RPH's consultant reviewed the model during the last consent process and any deficiencies identified were addressed by NCI. Jill acknowledged that different people have different experiences/responses to the same odour, but that she was comfortable there were no direct health impacts regarding the level of chemicals.

There was a general discussion about **possible mitigation measures**, in particular the use of an afterburner. Rhys and Shane explained that while it was likely to reduce odour this was not an option for the applicant due to the cost of running the afterburner.

Planting a row of trees along the property boundary was accepted as an option that was unlikely to mitigate odour to any degree as the discharge is from a stack (not at ground level) and the trees would take a long time to grow to a height that formed any kind of barrier.

Increasing the stack height was discussed. It was acknowledged that this could result in displacing odour and have effects on the residents in Kingsley Heights. Rhys confirmed that modelling the effects from an increase in the stack height could be undertaken.

Using water-based coating (instead of solvent-based) may be an option but were still in the process of being developed by NCI's international supplier. It was also not known whether using water-based coatings would still create an odour.

The use of scrubbers or a biofilter were also discussed but Rhys explained that these were not known to be good for mitigating odour.

4. Agreed actions and next steps

Rachael explained that the options from here are:

- For the submitters to withdraw their wish to be heard if they were in a position to do so. She explained that draft conditions could be provided to the applicant and submitters for considering. The consent would not go to a hearing if Ann and RPH withdrew their wish to be heard.
- Go to a hearing

Ann explained that her concerns would be addressed if there was no odour from NCI. She also wanted the consent to go to a hearing so someone independent of the people in the room would make the decision on the application.

Rhys and Shane explained that there will never be no odour from NCI even if they implemented further mitigation measures. Rhys asked what the timeframe would be for going to a hearing. Kirsty explained that GW would put together a timeline and provide the applicant and submitters with a copy, it would likely be a couple of months before a hearing could be held.

Action: GWRC to prepare a timeline with the dates for exchanging information and evidence and a potential date for a hearing and provide this to the applicant and submitters.

GWRC and NCI thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 8:00pm.