

# FORM521: SUBMISSION ON AN APPLICATION FOR A RESOURCE CONSENT BY A PERSON ON WHOM NOTICE OF THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN SERVED

SECTION 96 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

TO: Consents Hearings  
Environment Canterbury  
PO Box 345  
Christchurch 8140

Email: [hearings@ecan.govt.nz](mailto:hearings@ecan.govt.nz)

Ph: (03) 353 9007 Fax: (03) 365 3194

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

File: CRC193743 CRC193745 CRC193748

Closing Date: 5pm Friday 17 January 2020

I/We have been limited notified for the consent applications listed below

Property Owned/Occupied:

Golden Market Garden Limited

Full Name of submitter:

Rutian Mao or Xinyin Mao

Address For Service:

Contact Phone No(s):

Fax/Email Address:

☐: - Please tick this box if you do not want to receive communications on the process, and hearing via email

Contact Person:

Irene Mao

Name of applicant:

Waste Management NZ Limited

Consent Application:

CRC194083

1. ☐ I/We support the application ☒ I/We oppose the application☐ I/We are neutral to the application (neither support or oppose)

2. The reasons for making my submission are: (state in summary the nature of your submission, giving reasons)

Please find attached submission

3. I wish the consent authority to make the following decision:

(give details, including the general nature of any conditions sought. Please attach additional pages if required)

as per attached

4. ☒ I/we do wish to be heard in support of my/our submission\*

(Note: this means you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing)

\*If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing ☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ I/we do not wish to be heard in support of my/our submission

(Note: this means you cannot speak at the hearing, however you will retain your right to appeal any decision to the Environment Court on any decision made by the Council.)

5. ☐ I/we am a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.

I/we am/am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that a) adversely affects the environment; and b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.



Signature of submitter or duly authorised agent on behalf of submitter

16/01/2020

Date

Notes to the submitter:

1. The person making this submission must send a copy to the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable after serving Environment Canterbury
2. A list of all submissions received will be provided to the applicant
3. Privacy: Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission (excluding your contact details) will be included in papers that are available to the media and public which may include publication on the Council website. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the notified resource consent process.



**Waste Management Proposed  
Hazardous & Toxic Waste Processing  
305 Marshs Road,  
Prebbleton.**



To whom it may concern:

I/our family oppose the application at 305 Marshs road just opposite of our house.

For us is huge effected by that noise and pollution in the close proximity of so many people. And particulate toxic that may as risk to our vegetables farm, we supply to the many supermarket and resturants daily.

We as family Business Golden Market Garden Limited, trading as Mao Produce we had run 19 years in Christchurch and we are NZ GAP Approve, nzgap number is 4430, we need to do soil and water testing yearly. Therefore, I am likely to be effected by these many and yet undetermined toxic pollutants daily due to my home/work proximity. As such, we are absolutely opposed to this resource consent ever being granted to the applicant.

Our plan for our farm business Mao Produce will extend land growing in Prebbleton area, that mean more and more people will eat our products of vegetables daily to daily. We must make sure our products are healthy for people to eat. As such, we are absolutely opposed to this resource consent ever being granted to the applicant.

I believe the location of the proposed facility so close to a residential area is a totally unacceptable site. It is far too close to many 'sensitive receptors' on all four boundaries.

Firstly, on the southern boundary, there are numerous residential properties, commercial vegetable growers, personal vegetable gardens and orchards, a cut flower grower, cut foliage grower, various stock and numerous wildlife.

Secondly, bordering right on the eastern boundary is the new extension of the Little River Rail Trail, high-end residential properties such as Park Provence, Texture Plants Nursery, Lush Lawns Turf Farm and retail sites, Healthy Harvest fruit and vegetable store, Egmont Commercial and their staff and Springs Road which sustains in excess of 16 000 vehicle movements/day.

Thirdly, hard on the northern boundary, there is the new Southern Motorway that will have thousands of users per day and an Industrial Business Park where hundreds of workers are employed right through to Halswell Junction Road.

And lastly, the western boundary also has an Industrial Park which has hundreds of workers, Tothills Maze attraction, Watties and many more residential properties.

The issues that we are deeply concerned about with the proposed facility are as follows:

The unknown health effects, numerous odour emissions from various waste handling and processing activities, toxic dust particulates and noise emissions from waste processing and tyre shredding, chemical emissions from pesticides, fungicides and herbicides, the effects on livelihoods, contaminated air and water, the use of out-dated wind data, odour complaints and the lack of ongoing monitoring and very importantly, the lack of public consultation.

How can it ever be considered that a new hazardous toxic waste processing and stabilisation facility is appropriately located on this site?

I am appalled that this application is being considered with such a lack of scientific data when we are dealing with some very serious air and particulate toxins and noise pollution in the close proximity of so many people. There must be a more suitable location for this hazardous and toxic waste processing and stabilisation facility!

This facility should not be allowed to operate anywhere within a 1km. radius of any persons except the workers who operate under the protection of our NZ Health and safety standards and have the correct protective clothing to ensure their health and wellbeing.

With this in mind, the question must be asked - why is the notification zone only 500m radius from a hazardous and toxic waste processing and stabilisation facility when the substances released have an unknown effect immediately beyond the boundary?

This highly restrictive notification zone appears to have been manipulated to be set at a 500m radius so as to reduce the negative publicity from local Prebbleton residents, including the local Prebbleton Primary School and Kindergarten and all the surrounding industrial businesses. Therefore, I consider the 500metre notification zone totally inadequate for this application.

Ironically, there is an 800m evacuation zone (at the East Tamaki Hazardous Waste Facility) if there was an 'incident' yet our notification radius is only 500m?

It must also be noted that the Canterbury Health Board has requested that the Prebbleton residents be notified of this application. As this hazardous and toxic waste processing and stabilisation facility has not been publicly notified then clearly this recommendation has not been followed.

Ironically the neighbouring properties are zoned 'green fields' of which Selwyn District Council has deemed essential for Christchurch market garden production.

Any air contamination, pollution, smells, particulates in the air pose a serious threat to our environment and people on this proposed site and would have a substantial



negative effect on our properties and businesses. Who pays for our loss of amenity values and loss of land values associated with being in such close proximity to this proposed facility?

A related issue, is how do waste management plan to monitor their hazardous and toxic contaminants discharge? Who is responsible for this? What is the frequency and by whom? Is it an independent assessment? Can this data be accessed by local businesses, residents, E-Can, Canterbury Health Board and other appropriate agencies for monitoring?

It is the NZ Air recommendation that 'given the proximity of these receptors and the potential chemical species that may be emitted...a high level of assessment is required'. There has been no information given on the assessment against 'worst case' operating scenarios such as accidents, spillages or breakdowns, evacuation zones and procedures for residents and local workers to follow.

There is a severe lack of controls and measures in place for this sort of toxic facility to be so close to a built up population. I can only assume that these volumes will increase over time so what measures are in place to ensure they don't outgrow this facility's capacity? Bearing in mind that overcapacity brings even greater potential risks...

The NZ Air report has further concerns. 'There are no proposed limits for the processing of any of the proposed waste streams and therefore the scale or magnitude of the discharge has not been defined and as such, the potential for off-site is also unclear'.

I honestly feel that I am fighting for our health, our wellbeing and our community for years to come. There are multiple short-comings in this application including missing information and manipulation of the facts. Please consider the concerns of NZ Air and the Canterbury District Health Board in your findings. I also quote Environment Canterbury's website home page that claims – 'WE STRIVE for healthier air quality'.