

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, 6 DECEMBER
2000 IN COMMITTEE ROOM 3 OF THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL, TUAM
STREET, CHRISTCHURCH FROM 4.00 P.M.

CONTENTS

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 18 OCTOBER 2000
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS
5. BUS SHELTERS
6. CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL HOUSING (CONVERSION TO CLEANER HEATING)
7. OWAKA PIT
8. REVIEW OF ANNUAL AIR QUALITY MONITORING
9. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
10. NEXT MEETING – 14 FEBRUARY 2001
11. CLOSURE

PRESENT

Christchurch City Councillors

Crs A Crighton, D Close (from 4.30 p.m.), C Evans, P Harrow, C Manning (from 4.30 p.m.), D O'Rourke (from 4.30 to 4.50 p.m.) and R Wright from 4.40 p.m.

Environment Canterbury

Crs V Campbell (Chairperson), K Burke, H Hay, D Shand, P Yeoman and R Johnson.

IN ATTENDANCE

Cr R Little (Environment Canterbury), M Mora, A Wilkie (Riccarton Wigram Community Board for item 4).

STAFF PRESENT

Christchurch City Council

J Fletcher, G Hadley, J Ridgen, B Pollett, R Dalley and W Brixton.

Environment Canterbury

J Talbot, E Brussovs, P Gurnsey, and for part meeting E Wilton.

1. APOLOGIES

An apology was received and sustained for Cr J Waters (Environment Canterbury).

2. MINUTES OF 18 OCTOBER 2000

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 18 October 2000, as circulated, were taken as read and confirmed as a true and accurate record.

Shand/Harrow

The notes of the Seminar/Workshop held on 15 November were circulated and received.

3. MATTERS ARISING

Cr Hay asked about the apparent contrast in the minute reference to the "Helping Hands" programme and the statement in the latest "City Scene". Staff advised that the current financial provision would be used by the end of February 2001. In terms of audit advice, a further financial commitment could not be made until a proposed Air Plan was in place (March 2001 indicated). Staff of the two councils were meeting to discuss a new incentive grant scheme.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

While no deputations or petitions had been advised, Mike Mora of the Riccarton Wigram Community Board requested the Committee's leave to present a report on the Owaka Pit item, which was on the agenda for consideration (Item 7 refers).

Cr Crighton moved, seconded by Cr Johnson that the deputation by the Chairman of the Riccarton Wigram Community Board be heard. The motion was put and carried. A copy of Mr Mora's statement was circulated and read. In summary the main points were:

- The Owaka Landfill had been unsatisfactorily managed for many years and was an environmental disaster.
- He noted that the site had never been in compliance with its resource consent conditions and that the number of monitoring visits was to reduce.
- He regretted the lack of action by Environment Canterbury and in hindsight may have chosen other avenues to get action.
- Particular compliance deficiencies were instanced such as lack of supervisor presence and also access to the dumpsite virtually around the clock.

- That Envirowaste should be required to immediately comply with resource consent conditions and that action be reported to the next Joint Committee meeting.

The following questions of clarification were made:

- In response to a question about action following monitoring visits, Mr Mora said the site had never complied and needed to be shut down until it did. The water quality results were not available from the last visit.
- Mr Mora revealed that he had viewed the site from adjacent land about five times in the last six months. He believed that 70% of the waste was not hard fill and had noted gibboard, timber, plastic and glass.
- His Board was proposing a wildlife refuge on adjacent land and was concerned about water quality effect on wildlife and plants.

The Committee then agreed to consider the Joint Christchurch City Council/Environment Canterbury staff report.

7. OWAKA PIT

Jenny Ridgen spoke to her report and circulated some photographs of the site. She agreed the site looked messy and the fact that the consent allowed for inert fill was a given. Attention was drawn to the history of compliance with conditions from 1997 to October 2000 as well as the fact that not all conditions could be monitored on every visit. The trend toward improved compliance and co-operation was noted with the proposal to continue monitoring at present levels until a consistent compliance record is achieved.

The conflict between conditions 4 and 6 regarding supervision and securing the site was noted. It was also revealed that Envirowaste had provided keys for out of hours access, which was clearly a condition breach.

In response to a question if it was usual for a resource consent to be non-complying for three years, John Talbot advised of the continuum of action following the detection of non-compliance. The seriousness of non-compliance and above all the evidence of adverse effects on the environment were necessary to proceed through all the enforcement steps. No amount of monitoring would pick up all breaches. This was why the community's eyes and ears role was valuable.

A question about why the water quality tests had not been done in conjunction with the last visit revealed that test samples had been taken and were currently being analysed. It was noted that previous test results had been well within guidelines.

Reference was made to the undesirability of allowing these pits to be quarried in the first place, which lead to subsequent opportunity for such activity.

In response to a question about ownership of the pit, it was revealed that the owner was Envirowaste which was involved in the Regional Landfill project.

Cr Crighton moved, seconded by Cr Evans a motion:

That a further report be provided at the February 2001 meeting of the Committee which outlines the options for improving compliance with consent conditions and also responds to questions raised, i.e. provision of keys, unsupervised dumping and the process for abatement of environmental effects.

The motion was put and carried.

Resolved

That a further report be provided at the February 2001 meeting of the Committee which outlines the options for improving compliance with consent conditions and also responds to questions raised, i.e. provision of keys, unsupervised dumping and the process for abatement of environmental effects.

Crighton/Evans

5. BUS SHELTERS

Mr Hadley presented his report, which covered the background and future provision of bus shelters by the City Council. The Bus Shelter Subcommittee had resolved to provide 500 additional shelters over a five-year period with Adshel providing 230 of these in the next three years. Existing serviceable shelters on sites sought by Adshel will be relocated. The following points were made in discussion:

- That opening of the Bus Exchange and ancillary facilities had raised bus patron expectations and it was appropriate for shelter development to be in sync.
- It was noted that the cost of the City Council shelters was of the order of \$2 million and the Bus Shelter Subcommittee proposals had not yet been approved by the city Council.
- City Councillors were urged to divert complaints on bus services to Environment Canterbury.

Resolved

That the information be received.

Hay/Evans

6. CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL HOUSING (CONVERSION TO CLEANER HEATING)

Mr Pollet spoke to his report, which showed that all but eight of the 2200 housing units had converted, the remainder would be completed by the end of 2001. In addition energy efficiency projects funded by Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority had provided solar water heating, ceiling and under-floor insulation, cylinder wraps, thermostats, draught stopping, compact fluorescent bulbs and double glazing. These improvements provided not only air quality and energy efficiency and savings but also better comfort and quality of life outcomes.

Resolved

That the information be received.

Johnson/Harrow

8. REVIEW OF ANNUAL AIR QUALITY MONITORING

Ms Wilton provided a presentation noting that the notion that global warming would solve the air pollution problem was incorrect. There had been 22 exceedences of the 50 µg/m³ guideline during the last winter compared to the usual 30. Last winter had been warmer with no exceedences in July. A comparison between Christchurch and Timaru was shown.

The exceedence reporting period was noted as 24 hour averages with examples shown of nights with high pollution, which had been mitigated by overnight wind changes. There was no advantage in providing an accumulated wintertime average.

An overhead showing emissions (in addition to PM₁₀) of carbon dioxide, sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxide were shown.

In response to a question about comparisons with exceedences in the 1950s, 60s and 70s it was noted that different measurements and guidelines applied which made comparison extremely difficult.

Resolved

That the information be received.

Johnson/Hay

9. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS

Nil.

10. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was proposed for 14 February 2001.

Cr Campbell thanked members for their participation during the year and wished everyone season's greetings. Cr Crighton echoed these sentiments and said the Committee had had lively debates and not always agreed but had been positive. She hoped that a history of the Committee's achievements would be prepared next year.

The Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 5.50 p.m.