

(1) I am presenting this submission as a neighbour of a Broiler Poultry Farm who went through the process and opposed an increase in production from 39,000 chickens to 79,000 chickens.

I have given the hearing panel the Auckland Councils decision following the hearing of an application for a resource consent by Craddock Farms Ltd to establish and operate a chicken egg layer farm in November 2014, and a resource application number to look up on file at Environment Canterbury, No CRC070934 by G E Hubbard in March 2007, now operated by G Lange @78 Weedons Ross Road.

(2) Being at the coalface of having to live through a before and after expansion of a poultry farm, and what really happens after hearing all the same expert evidence. In our case the hearing panel allowed expansion. We now have an offensive odour problem on our property under certain climatic conditions especially when the chickens reach the final two weeks of maturity. They have nearly doubled their production using latest tunnel design. We were told how much better they were, and odour models showing no more than minor increase in odour were presented. It has proved not to be the case. We complain to Environment Canterbury but they have no real teeth to fix the odour problem. Point 142 in the Craddock hearing should be applied with respect to any proposed consent conditions. We should have conditions put on all intensive poultry farms that contained not only standards, but also consequences or actions to be undertaken for not meeting those standards set, eg shorter cycles, decreasing bird numbers on original consent given.

(3) In the decision on the Craddock case in Auckland the hearing panel stood up and did not rubberstamp the hearings agenda, coming with a recommendation to approve the application. They still declined it.

- (a) They were not able to place reliance on the odour modelling.
- (b) The (revised) management plan that we were presented with was not sufficiently robust in order to overcome our concerns in relation of potential significant odour effects
- (c) This was further exacerbated by the lack of any realistic remedies to address any adverse effects from odour if these did occur.

On point 74 in the report Harrison Griesen original air discharge assessment put forward had critical flaws, these being non representative metrological data and erroneous emission calculations. These errors were accepted by all parties and the original assessment was omitted from their decision making process.

Not all neighbours to poultry farm expansions have the funds to have experts challenge these findings in odour modelling reports as in the Craddock case.

Craddock Farms has appealed Auckland council decision to decline their resource consent because of possible odour issue. Suggesting Auckland Council was not taking account for the major differences between shed design and management systems employed in a modern operation. The commissioner's decision appears to misunderstand predictive modelling etc. The same arguments were given at the G Hubbard hearing (now operated by G Lange) for the poultry expansion neighbouring us at Weedons Ross Road and the result is an odour problem.

It is for the above reasons mitigation of odour problems by new technology, new shed design, odour model to show no more than minor increase in odour is a myth.

A step change has to be made by Environment Canterbury regarding the poultry industry using their neighbours land for their own ends. Poultry farms are only going to get larger in scale. It is time Environment Canterbury has policies and rules that direct to buy their own land which is large enough to contain their odours to within their own boundaries.

In the Craddock hearing the many experts quoted Australian states having 250 to 350+metre buffers to neighbours boundaries. One expert told of New Zealand Poultry Association they themselves recommend 250 metre buffer zone. Yet they are quite happy to expand existing ones under the guise of odour modelling. New shed design, even councils allow them only 20 metre building setbacks to neighbours boundaries, knowing full well a 300 metres reverse sensitivity zone gets placed over his whole property. This law placed on neighbours to poultry farms is unacceptable.

Therefore in summation, as I recommended in my original submission a strict 300 metre buffer zone to neighbours boundary for new chicken sheds should be adopted.

Intensive poultry farming, pigs, and mushroom farming should be a prohibited activity at any point within 300 metres of a neighbouring boundary.

Submitter number
63150

L.J. Manion.



Huge chicken farm odour ruling appealed

Warwick Blackler

The company behind a proposal for potentially New Zealand's largest layer-caged chicken farm has appealed Auckland Council's decision to decline resource consent because of possible odour issues.

The Environment Court appeal has devastated Patumahoe residents who spent much of last year battling the proposal.

Craddock Farms planned to house 310,000 chickens in 10 sheds on a former horse stable and training track on Patumahoe Rd.

The bid was heavily contested by three neighbouring residents – the only people allowed to enter submissions at the limited notification hearing in November – and by animal rights activists.

The resource consent application was declined on January 13.

Despite the hearing's agenda coming with a recommendation to approve the application, the four-commissioner panel, chaired by Dave Sergeant, ruled there was a "potential for significant adverse odour effects beyond the boundary".

The commissioners found the impacts on the rural character and visual amenity, soils, noise, traffic, earthworks and stormwater to be at acceptable levels.

Craddock Farms waited until the final day before submitting the appeal yesterday.

Managing director Stefan Craddock believed they could resolve the concerns regarding the potential odour of the farm.

"We are confident we will be able to address and allay all the concerns about potential odour and the appeal process will give us the opportunity to explain in more detail the system and technology we will use to take away any effects," he said.

Ad Feedback



In the appeal it said that all neighbours of its existing Pukekohe East egg farm, "have signed statements confirming that they have never detected odour from the existing facility".

It said Craddock Farms believed the commissioners' decision, "appears to misunderstand predictive modelling and the comparative approach advanced in the appellant's evidence" and that they, "do not account for the major differences between shed design and management systems employed in a modern operation such as proposed".

The appeal comes as a big blow for neighbouring residents.

Peta Berry said she would continue to battle the farm.

"We have had a win, it has clued us up on what to expect and we already have contacts like expert witnesses," she said.

"I would like to think that because we have had an almost unprecedented win, that the community will be buoyed by that and will be more vigorous in defending it."

- Franklin County News

more from stuff

ABs and WAGs take in London

ABs sweat on injuries

Good omen for All Blacks

Bulletproof tyres up for auction

Recommended by

promoted stories

Submitter number
63150

L. J. Manion v. G.S.

Before the Commissioner / Hearing Panel appointed
by Canterbury Regional Council

IN THE MATTER OF The Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Application **CRC070934** by **Mr G
E Hubbard** for a discharge
permit to discharge contaminants
to air.

Section 42A Officer's Report

Date of Hearing: 19 March 2007

Report of Ivan Holland

1. My name is Ivan Holland and I am employed as a Team Leader Consents Investigations at the Canterbury Regional Council. I have been working at Canterbury Regional Council since August 2004. I hold a combined Bachelor of Applied Science and Bachelor of Laws Degree (Queensland University of Technology, 1999). I have over eight years experience in: environmental impact assessment, environmental monitoring and management of air quality and coastal environments; and environmental regulation.
2. This report is prepared under the provisions of Section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). This section allows a Council officer to provide a report to the decision-maker on a resource consent made to the Council, and allows the decision-maker to consider the report at the hearing. Section 41(4) of the RMA allows the decision-maker to request and receive from any person who makes a report under Section 42A "*any information or advice that is relevant and reasonably necessary to determine the application*". This report will provide the decision-maker with information and advice related to:
 - The background to the application;
 - Details of the notification of the application and any submissions received;
 - An outline of the relevant legal and planning provisions;
 - Comments on the assessment of environmental effects provided;
 - Details of Council policy relevant to the application;
 - Comments in relation to the matters specified in Part II of the RMA; and
 - Comments on the decision to be made by the decision-maker including comments on whether the application can be granted or should be declined; if the application is to be granted what measures are required to avoid, remedy or mitigate any