

## **ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY**

### **JOINT CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL/ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY COMMITTEE**

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE JOINT CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL/  
ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 18 APRIL 2001 IN  
COMMITTEE ROOM 2, CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL FROM 4.00 P.M.

#### **CONTENTS**

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 14 FEBRUARY 2001  
RECEIVE WORKSHOP SEMINAR NOTES – 14 MARCH 2001
3. MATTERS ARISING – Letter re Bus Layover Rolleston Avenue
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS
5. AIR PLAN POLICIES AND INCENTIVES PROGRAMME
6. MEDICAL WASTE INCINERATION – CONDITIONS AND MONITORING  
OF THE RESOURCE CONSENT
7. AVON HEATHCOTE ESTUARY STRATEGY - UPDATE
8. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
9. NEXT MEETING - 16 MAY 2001
10. CLOSURE

#### **PRESENT**

##### **Christchurch City Councillors**

Crs A Crighton (Deputy Chairperson), D Close (from 4.25 p.m.), E Evans, P Harrow, S Wells (until 5.50 p.m.) and R Wright.

##### **Environment Canterbury**

Crs V Campbell (Chairperson), T K Burke, H G Hay, D R Shand (from 4.10 p.m.), J M Waters, P Yeoman and R B Johnson.

#### **IN ATTENDANCE**

Crs R Booth (from 4.20 p.m.), S Buck (from 4.15 p.m.), Christchurch City Council and Crs R Little and R Johnston (from 4.25 p.m.), Environment Canterbury.

#### **STAFF PRESENT**

##### **Christchurch City Council**

J Fletcher, T Moody and W Brixton.

##### **Environment Canterbury**

J Talbot, E Brussovs and for part meeting P McGuigan, P Gurnsey and M Freeman.

## 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received and sustained from Cr C Manning (CCC) and for lateness from D Shand (EC).

## 2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 14 FEBRUARY 2001

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 February 2001, as circulated, were taken as read and confirmed as a true and accurate record.

Waters/Wright

The notes of the Seminar Workshop held on 14 March 2001, as circulated, were received.

## 3. MATTERS ARISING

The Committee noted the circulated letter from the City Council dated 11 April 2001, which indicated that since there had been no budgeting provision for the Rolleston Cultural Precinct project, that no staff time could be allocated to such work at present. The project would need to take its place in the investigation process phase of City Council business.

It was noted that should the Lichfield two way proposal proceed, then the Rolleston Avenue bus layover could be shifted to Oxford Terrace but that this would not occur inside the next two years. A further concern was the likely increase of tourist coaches in Rolleston Avenue based on increased tourism projections (possibly 50% increase in coach movements).

### ***Resolved***

- (a) *That staff of the two organisations consider the long-term environmental impact of buses and the growth of tourist coaches on Rolleston Avenue.*
- (b) *That this resolution be referred to both the City Services and Environmental Committees of the City Council.*

Yeoman/Crighton

Cr Waters asked if the staff presentation on findings in respect to Owaka Pit had been provided to the Riccarton Wigram Community Board. Staff advised that this had occurred.

Cr Yeoman suggested and moved a motion seconded by Cr Burke, that in view of the ongoing problems with the site that maybe the time had come for more direct action such as instituting independent site lock-up and failing subsequent improvements the appointment of an independent clerk of works. In debate on the motion it was questioned if such action was warranted or in fact legally proper. It was noted that the owner of the site was the City Council's partner in the regional solid waste venture and that some internal discussion may be fruitful.

On balance (and with agreement of the mover and seconder) it was thought more prudent to be less prescriptive and seek investigation of options and methods to improve security and monitoring of the site. This would include ascertaining any land use consents that the City Council may have issued for the activity.

**Resolved**

(a) *That in respect to Owaka Pit that ways be investigated to improve security and monitoring of the site.*

Yeoman/Burke

(b) *That in the event of non-compliance in respect to any resource consents that staff of the two Councils be urged to enforce conditions.*

Wells/Johnson

**4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS**

Nil.

**5. AIR PLAN POLICIES AND INCENTIVES PROGRAMME**

Mr Gurnsey provided a presentation and provided a copy of the overheads to the Committee. He outlined the history of developing the Air Chapter and outlined the summary of policy positions adopted by Environment Canterbury including:

- The interim air quality target for PM<sub>10</sub> of 50 ug/m<sup>3</sup> (the target is interim in that between 33 ug/m<sup>3</sup> and 50 ug/m<sup>3</sup> is considered an alert rather than safe level by MfE. Health effects were also demonstrable below the 33 ug/m<sup>3</sup> level).
- Financial incentives for insulation and clean heating (\$32 million over 13 years).
- Extensive public information/education promoting energy efficiency and advocating voluntary curtailment.
- All enclosed burners installed from 2001 until the end of 2004 meet the 1.5 g/kg emission standard.
- A prohibition on installing enclosed burners in new, and in existing houses using other heating methods from the date of plan notification.
- Prohibit installation of enclosed burners in any house from 2005.
- Prohibit open fires from 2005.
- Phase out enclosed burners 15 years after installation, but not before 2010.
- Exemptions for open fires and enclosed burners in 33 listed heritage buildings.
- Restrict outdoor burning in winter to cases where vegetation cannot be otherwise disposed of.
- Prevent increases in industrial boiler emissions.
- Promote national initiatives to reduce adverse effects of motor vehicle emissions.
- Promote land use planning resulting in land use patterns less conducive to transport pollution.

In addition Environment Canterbury also sought the support of the Christchurch City Council to implement the Air Plan (a copy of these resolutions was circulated by Cr Burke). The following points were made in subsequent discussion.

- Given the substitution of heating methods was the electricity system able to cope with the additional demand expected? Staff indicated that advice had been that it could.
- On the question of moisture content of wood, what contribution would be possible from stronger enforcement of the 25% maximum moisture content? Staff said the required reductions of burners (from current 60,000 to the 20,000 considered sustainable) was on the basis of all meeting the 1.5 g/kg emission rate and use of approved fuel. Also use of wet wood was not an offence, its sale as a fuel was under the TRP. The calculation of sustainable solid fuel appliances was based on the latest emission inventory carried out by Environment Canterbury. The inventory surveyed the fuel use of 1,600 households, and was approved methodology by MfE.
- In response to a question about pellet fires, staff advised that while pellet fires met the emission standard, there was no significant difference between PM<sub>10</sub> production of these and other wood burning appliances. By contrast a gas appliance produced 15 times less PM<sub>10</sub> than a solid fuel or pellet fire appliance.
- It was noted that the phasing out of burners was based on the use and discharge rather than the building consent.
- The contribution and relative efficiency of industrial boilers was clarified.
- The composition and timing in relation to plan notification and the Section 32 (of the Resource Management Act) report was clarified.
- Some Committee members were concerned that the policy positions did not appear to account for new technology developments and also innovations such as domestic precipitators. The Committee noted that Environment Canterbury would have annual reports on plan implementation which would take into account any new technology developments.
- Cr Burke noted the selective reporting in the media of bans/prohibitions and the like and the lack of mention of the incentives, education, advocacy and partnership (with Christchurch City Council) aspects of Environment Canterbury resolution. (He had circulated a copy of these earlier in the debate.)
- Cr Close urged that the policies be presented to the public in a simple form to offset any deficiency in media reporting. Politically words such as prohibit and ban should also be avoided.
- It was noted that Environment Canterbury would consider the Plan for public notification at its 31 May meeting.
- In respect to the Incentive Programme, financial provision had been included in Environment Canterbury's Annual Plan and Budget and also the ten year Long Term Financial Strategy. Community comments on this programme would be heard on 23/24 May 2001.

At this point some Councillors sought to amend the staff recommendation by adding references to pollutants other than PM<sub>10</sub> and sources other than domestic fires, secondly reference to new technology development and thirdly, enforcement of the wet wood standard. Other Committee members felt that these additions were already catered for by implication and that the recommendation was a general statement of co-operation and partnership rather than a detailed all inclusive statement. It was agreed that the staff recommendation be considered and then any additional matters could be entertained. The mover and seconder of the motion did agree that the words "implementing the Air Plan" be substituted by the words "cleaning up Christchurch's air".

***Resolved***

*That the Joint Committee recommend to the Christchurch City Council that it work with Environment Canterbury on cleaning up Christchurch's air, and in particular the development of:*

- *An incentive programme to encourage people to use non-solid fuel for home burning;*
- *A programme to raise public awareness of the need to eliminate solid fuel burning;*
- *An energy plan and energy policies;*
- *Energy conservation measures; and*
- *Alternative energy sources.*

Crighton/Shand

Cr Wells wished to have her vote against the resolution recorded.

Cr Evans moved, seconded by Cr Harrow an additional motion that the plan make specific provision for other air pollutions (apart from PM<sub>10</sub>) and for the introduction of new technology where this was appropriate. The motion was put and carried. The Committee also sought a report on the wet wood regulation for the next meeting.

***Resolved***

*That the Air Plan make specific provision for other air pollutants (apart from PM<sub>10</sub>) and also for the introduction of appropriate new technology.*

Evans/Harrow

**6. MEDICAL WASTE INCINERATION – CONDITIONS AND MONITORING OF THE RESOURCE CONSENT CRC921519**

Dr Freeman introduced the report relating to air quality management including dioxin emissions from the incinerator. The site was owned and operated by Christchurch International Airport Limited and operated under a Resource Management Act consent granted in 1992 and which had an annual review clause. A new incinerator was installed in 1993 by Medical Waste Group who operate under the Christchurch International Airport Limited consent. A table of emissions (particulate, hydrogen chloride, sulphur dioxide and dioxins) along with predicted ground level concentrations undertaken in 1994 was noted. Consents were issued pursuant to the Resource Management Act and International Guidelines. If the environmental effects were acceptable then consent must be granted and maintained within limits of the conditions set.

Cr Buck who had raised the matter at a Christchurch City Council Standing Committee meeting said that constituents reported visual and odour exceedences at the time. She wondered why the consent had been non-notified and why alternatives such as the autoclave proposed for 2004 were not brought forward. The question of the plant being required to meet some more stringent European dioxin emission standards was also raised. In respect to monitoring the frequency and the degree of self monitoring was of concern.

Dr Freeman said ground level concentrations had to meet guidelines and the company had been required to improve its performance at a number of annual reviews. Cr Buck believed that Environment Canterbury's decision made on the consent had merely rubber-stamped company data. Dr Freeman said that was not the way consents were dealt with as this would be an abrogation of responsibility. Some members noted the apparent contrast between such consents and the approach of the Air Plan towards domestic burning. Cr Buck sought to receive copies of all monitoring reports.

***Resolved***

*That the information be received.*

Cr Buck wished to have her vote against the resolution recorded.

**7. AVON HEATHCOTE ESTUARY STRATEGY UPDATE**

Mr McGuigan gave a verbal update on this matter. Staff of both Councils had agreed to pursue development of a Non-Statutory Management Plan involving all interested groups and the community. The Strategy document would form the basis of the management and also the focus of the Community Forum sponsored by the two Councils on Saturday, 9 June 2001. Invitations would be sent out on 30 April. The structure of the forum was outlined.

***Resolved***

*That the information be received.*

Campbell/Crighton

**8. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS**

Nil.

**9. NEXT MEETING**

Scheduled for 16 May 2001 at 4.00 p.m.

**10. CLOSURE**

The Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 6.15 p.m.