

# **Organics Processing Plant Community Liaison Group Meeting**

**Date - Monday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

**Venue – Waitai Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Boardroom**

**Address - 180 Smith Street, Woolston, Christchurch 8062**

**Chair** – Carl Pascoe

**Christchurch City Council (CCC) staff** – Mary Richardson, Lynette Ellis, Keygan Clutterbuck, David McArdle.

**CCC elected members** - Yani Johnson, Paul McMahon, Jackie Simons, Reuben Davidson.

**Environment Canterbury (ECan) staff** – Judith Earl-Goulet, Nathan Doherty, Tess Hindle-Daniels,

**ECan elected members** - Greg Byrne

**Living Earth (LE) staff** – David Howie, Jaco Kleinhans

**Community** – Carol Anderson, Geoffrey King, Katinka Visser, Margaret McPheson, Michael Williams, Sheryl Ladkin, Vicki Walker.

**Minutes** - Mary O’Leary

**Apologies** – Andrew Walker, Bruce King.

## **1. Welcome and Introduction**

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - Introduced the meeting and requested a vote of confidence via a show of hands for him to remain as Chair, which was unanimously agreed. He discussed how the dynamics affected things, noting that things seemed to be stuck and progress was slow, commenting;

1. Fundamentally, this is a failed model of engagement between a community with an issue that is affecting them and the institutions that are responsible for enforcing or monitoring the issue.
2. The local authorities have a lack of simple, plain English communications.
3. Nobody in the room has adhered to the Terms of Reference, whether it is a date change of a meeting or the language used.
4. It has become adversarial, so to get us ‘unstuck’, I am changing the order tonight and will invite the residents to start the meeting by sharing the personal impact on each of them during the last quarter.
5. The Terms of Reference state that the Chair can remove anyone if they are in breach of the terms with antisocial or abusive behaviour. They will be asked to stop, if they refuse to stop, the meeting will be adjourned for 10 minutes whilst the offending participant is given the opportunity to calm down. If that doesn’t work, they will be asked to leave.

## 2. Community update on personal impact experience

**Geoffrey King, community** - Gave thanks to the **Chair** for introducing the meeting and offering the residents the opportunity to express themselves.

**Michael Williams, community** - Acknowledged **Yani Johanson** for his work and his transparency and for keeping the flame of democracy alive.

**Jackie Simons, CCC elected member** - Acknowledged the anger and reminded the audience that everyone was suffering from 14 years of trauma and that this should be taken into account.

**Geoffrey King, community** - In November, 24 out of 30 days he suffered from odour and six of them were six out of six, December had 29 out of 31 days and 14 of them were six out of six. January was 31 days with odour, 18 of them were six out of six. February, 15 of 19 days had odour, nine of 15 days were six out of six. On these days, he and his wife had to drive to the Sumner laybys and sleep in their car. He noted that only 19 days had been recorded in February, as tonight's meeting was originally scheduled for February 21<sup>st</sup> and the residents had not been consulted about this change.

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - Acknowledged **Geoffrey King's** frustration and remarked that it was understandable that community residents had a low threshold for trust with CCC and ECan.

**Michael Williams, community** - Agreed with **Geoffrey King's** summary of the odours and reiterated that odour was the major issue along with the midges. It was alarming that reports said that things were different when nothing had changed in the last three months. Creating a log when it was known that the majority of the problem was the smell from grass clippings was disappointing since nothing had been done to address the core problem. It was difficult to take any response from LE or CCC seriously when there were clear lawn mowing peaks that needed to be managed. Said a previous meeting, we were told "just suck it up, it's grass, it smells".

**Margaret McPherson, community** - Despite making multiple Smelt It complaints, nobody followed up so she no longer had faith in ECan or the app. The midges had been really bad this year and whilst there was uncertainty as to whether they came from the organics plant or the sewers, the last three months had been really bad. Nothing had changed.

**Vicki Walker, community** - Noted her husband Andrew has a lung disease and has to put up with the issue at work and at home. It comes through the HRV and is ruining her lungs as well. They can't even plan a BBQ due to the smell issues.

**Sheryl Ladkin, community** - Over the past few years the smell had been worse. She was content that she recently had a visit from ECan within half an hour of complaining in the Smelt It app. She expressed concerns with spreading the compost. At home, she waters compost in, so wanted to know why it was not being watered in around the sewer plant as the dirt and dust was coming from that, in her view.

**Katinka Visser, community** - Despite living in Bromley for 40 plus years, she hadn't had a lot of problems with the compost odours and hadn't complained as she didn't know where the smell was coming from. However, this January it was so bad that she was getting it at her home as well as when out on her mobility scooter. From Bromley Road into Masons Road, 2 and a half houses down the road, the stench is unbearable. She acknowledged that the sewer plant is the worst problem right now and commented that it seemed very convenient to have reclassified the pools as orange, feeling that this allowed a shirking of responsibilities.

**Carol Anderson, community** - The smells had been "up there" in this reporting period. After four years of waiting for the black marks on her terrace to be reviewed by ECan or CCC, she finally got someone to water blast it, and so far it hadn't come back other than in little patches. It was never investigated despite mentioning it regularly. Recently, driving down Cuthberts Road, she almost vomited as she got close to the Waste Water Treatment Plant. On the way home, she returned via Bridge Street where she thinks the odour is definitely coming from the compost. She coughs all the time.

**Greg Burns, ECan elected member** - As he is also a resident, **Geoffrey King** had suggested a few places he should check. He concurred with Geoffrey's six out of six ratings and also with **Carol Anderson's** observations regarding Bridge Street, noting it was difficult to walk around there. Previously, he worked as an apprentice for CCC at the Botanical Gardens, mulching and composting around Hagley Park, noting it never smelt like this. His observation from a horticultural perspective was that there was too much going in too quickly without the adequate capacity to process, concluding he felt there was a logistical issue at play.

**Paul McMahon, CCC elected member** - Lives on Radley Street, works in Wainoni and rides a bicycle through Bromley, smells it and concurred with the previous residents. Believes the plant was never designed properly and in his opinion it has never been fit for purpose. Agreed with **Katinka Visser**, the odour was easily identifiable in certain pockets and it was easy to tell the difference between the sewer plant and rotting organic waste. 14 years resolving this was far too long and not fair. He also gave thanks to **Carl Pascoe**, and said we need to move forward, hoping it is the beginning of the end at the Council meeting tomorrow.

**Yani Johanson, CCC elected member** - Expressed concerns that the resource consent had never been complied with. This was especially disappointing when the lawn clippings were a known problem. A resident of Woolston, he noted the odours reached his home and pointed out notable incidents from the last quarter, such as the Bromley Fair, which consistently suffered from odours ruining their event, the prevalence of the smell at the newly built Linwood pools and the ongoing failure to provide detailed information on timing of ECan site inspections, along with general transparency issues on reporting that highlighted irregularities in the reports. He hoped that ECan would use its powers to serve notice of its intention to review the consent conditions for the purpose of dealing with the adverse effects. He concluded, anyone looking at the report for the last quarter should see that something was not right.

**Geoffrey King, community** - Sent an email to the CEO of ECan asking for a timeline for the prosecution for the reporting period's five non-compliances. The CEO of ECan turned it into an OIA, which allowed them 28 days to respond. On the 28th day, the response arrived, stating that on each occasion, all parties had been advised (CCC, ECan, LE), and that if the response was unsatisfactory, the matter should be taken to the Ombudsman. The response also stated that it was more appropriate that the notices be issued to the City Council as the consent holder and that it was ultimately the CCC's responsibility to ensure compliance with the consent. In short, there was no information provided regarding what the timeline would be.

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - Summarised:

- There was no doubt that the period between November and February had the known issue of grass clippings and there was odour.
- ECan had an issue of inconsistent response rates to their handling of odour complaints ranging from nobody coming out to a quick response.
- ECan processes were not visible and transparent to the community and nobody seemed to understand what the five Notices of Non-Compliance (NONCs) that were issued meant and how they impact changing behaviour.

**Q: Michael Williams, community** - At a recent meeting, collection of data was discussed so that ECan could bring a prosecution case against CCC. The CCC website mentioned the significant amount of data they had collected, yet ECan claimed there was not enough data to effect a prosecution. After 10 to 15 years, what hope have we got of getting justice?

**A: Carl Pascoe, Chair** - There is a clear challenge over a range of issues from the community who seems to have no faith in ECan's ability to effectively monitor and deliver on consents.

**Geoffrey King, community** - Katherine Harbrow (ECan) commented that they did not have enough of the right data in the minutes of the last meeting.

**Yani Johanson, CCC elected member** - One of the actions from the last meeting was that something gets circulated to the community telling us what is the relevant data they need from the community when complaints are made. Katherine Harbrow commented about data in the last minutes and it was agreed that this would happen.

**Q: Michael Williams, community** - Why hasn't an independent auditor, such as the Ombudsman, been consulted to review the existing data to see if it meets the threshold for a prosecution?

### **3. Environment Canterbury Odour and Dust Report November 2022 - January 2023 & questions arising**

**Nathan Doherty, ECan** - Stated that as the Christchurch/West Melton lead, compliance matters came to him in the first instance.

Reflecting on comments made from residents he summarised his understanding of the community's requests as follows;

- Talk in plain English
- Provide actions/outcomes
- Consistency in approach
- Transparency regarding processes
- Data required for prosecution

In the three month period there were 268 Smelt It submissions, 188 reported compost odours along with other characteristics, but only 67 specifically reported compost characteristics. Aggregating those against time and proximity, 65 incidents were calculated. Sometimes odour calls were separated by times, sometimes they were close together and matched into one event. For example, if all complaints come from one street, it was probably one event and aggregated accordingly in this manner.

The graph showed a difference between callers and Smelt It app users with up to five times as many coming from the Smelt It app. Of the 65 incidents, 31 site visits were assessed by ECan staff. More comprehensive data on the website showed the average response time was around 45 minutes. On five occasions where odour was determined to be offensive, Notices of Non Compliance were issued to CCC saying "we don't believe you are complying with resource consent".

**Q:** If they are non-compliant, then what happens?

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** - The Abatement Notice is a formal warning that states you must comply with the conditions of the resource consent, failure to do so will result in more significant penalties. Action has been taken but the law does not allow the information to be shared due to the Privacy Act. There is a time limit and once that is over the information can be shared.

**Q: Greg Burns, ECan elected member** - Is it correct to assume that there is something happening with regard to Abatement Notices?

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** - We have taken some action about it yet there is a legal process that has to be followed in order to be able to enforce it.

**Q: Carl Pascoe, Chair** - What is the timeframe for being able to share this information?

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** - 28 days, then another 28 days from the date of the particular abatement action, in total 56 days.

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - It is effectively 56 days from the date the NONCs were issued.

**Q:** What dates were the notices issued?

**Q: Yani Johanson, CCC elected member-** If the first notice was issued on 19 December, and now we're in March.

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** – It doesn't work from the date the notice was issued by the ECan officer saying "We think there's a problem with your compliance", but at the point when ECan has reviewed the situation and decided to take some enforcement action. We can let you know that exact date, the 56 days apply from that date.

**Q: Geoffrey King, community** - The printout of the ECan report "Compost Type Odour Monitoring" states the odour was verified but compliant. Please explain, as clause 3.9 of the Design Build Act along with the Clean Air Act and the Worksafe Act, clearly state no odour over the boundary. So how can it be compliant?

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** - This is a new report so that we could show new information relative to data collected over the last six months. When our officer goes out, it doesn't matter what they are investigating, if there is some odour of the type that is referred to but it is not offensive, it is verified that there was an odour but it complies to the consent. The consent doesn't say 'no odour', it is about the level of offensiveness.

**Q: Geoffrey King, community** - So who decides whether or not it is offensive?

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** - The Ministry of Environment guidelines have a five factor assessment - FIDOL - which is a standard approach that every regional council adheres to.

F – Frequency

I – Intensity

D – Duration

O – Offensiveness (character of the odour)

L – Location (a surrogate for sensitivity)

There are pleasant and unpleasant smells, something of a longer duration is generally offensive for example. Some places are more sensitive than others, e.g. places of transit such as highways vs a school.

**Q: Geoffrey King, community** - For you to go out and monitor it, someone must have complained, so it must have been offensive in order for them to complain, so how do you justify this?

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** - Everyone experiences odour differently, the task for ECan is to make a reasonable assessment. We assess our officers to try and find ordinary people who are somewhere in the middle of sensitivity extremes that range between super sensitivity to low sensitivity. Also when we go out we use a range of factors, for example, if

you are exposed to this for a long time at a moderate or low intensity, how it might affect you.

**Q: Vicki Walker, community** - If you're at work and then at home, exposed in two locations, how do you rate that with the FIDOL system?

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - There are four or five challenges before ECan in order for them to begin building trust, therefore, I would ask ECan to give a clear and plain English response to the issues raised by the community.

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** - Regarding the issue of the data we need you to supply, currently it isn't easy via the app, but we are working on updating the app to record more info. We need to know who you are so that we can give you a call back. Meanwhile, you can provide that information with a phone number or email address and give us your personal details along with a few more details such as what sort of odour it is, the intensity presently and at the time you experienced it.

**Michael Williams, community** - I find this derogatory and I'm personally offended. You're talking about ordinary people assessing this. We are ordinary people. ECan should be our warriors making sure we are looked after. All you do is look at data. CCC boasts about collecting data, we want you to go out there and act on our behalf.

**Q: Kitinka Visser, community** - There's a big turnover at ECan, we talk to people and build a rapport with them, then they are gone. I think you said you took notice of 31 complaints, what happens to the rest? The last few days, the sewer odour is overpowering the compost, it smells like rotting meat. I'm on a mobility scooter, so I can't assess it and I'm concerned that you're only taking action on a few because they're compost, however there are a lot of other things.

**Q: Paul McMahon, CCC elected member** - There are a bunch of action points in these minutes e.g. ECan to increase value monitoring activity, ECan to investigate odour at Bridge Street, Anzac Road. What is happening with these?

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** - Monthly reporting on our website has been updated to include information such as how long it takes to get there, how long we spend there, our colleague Marty has looked at the compost spreading in Bridge Street in great detail, it's not an activity that currently requires resource consent as it is not composting, which is when a resource consent is required.

**Q: Paul McMahon, CCC elected member** - Who decides whether it is composting?

**A: Nathan Doherty, ECan staff** - We had to look at the scientific report CCC provided about the materials that were being spread. We independently compared this info to the NZ standard for what compost is. The material being spread chemically is the same as the compost. Admittedly there is an odour from the very fresh material. When you spread it thinly, you take away the potential for the biological processes that occur in normal composting. Yes there is an odour but it dissipates relatively quickly over a number of days.

**Yani Johanson, CCC elected member** - - It would be ideal if we had it in the report, we get all these answers at these meetings but don't get them in the report.

**Q: Carol Anderson, community** - Where are the monitors now for the compost?

**A: Lynette Ellis, CCC staff** - There aren't static monitors for the compost, they are for the Waste Water Treatment Plant. They are still monitoring the ponds and there are more around the edge of the estuary as the hydrogen sulphide egg smell is also caused by the sea lettuce.

#### **4. Living Earth's Organic Processing Plant Community Liaison Group Report, 13 March 2023 & questions arising**

**Jaco Kleinhans, LE staff** - Spoke to the two main dust collectors around Dyers Road as the ones that monitored specifically for the report. During the period there was a slight increase, still below the four gram consent limit and subsequent to this report levels dropped further, showing what had been done to date had made a significant difference, noting it was different to the previous period when a lot of clearing had created a lot of dust.

Boundary plantings were ongoing.

There were ongoing odour assessments and there had been some learnings identified. In 2021/22 an enormous amount of material was cleared from the site. It was very different this year due to all the changes that had been made. Spring and Summer 2022/2023 commenced with minimal material on site, then the lawn mowing season began so equipment was on standby, however there were some operational challenges. Areas to work on had been identified with a view to reporting on a weekly basis.

**Q: Michael Williams, community** - Do you not think that we have had the same in the past? How many times do we have to go through the cycle to learn from it?

**A: Jaco Kleinhans, LE staff** - This is totally different, previously we would take material out of the tunnel and we would windrow it, I don't have the pressure to screen it the same night or the next morning.

**Q: Michael Williams, community** - If you guys can't manage the peaks, why can't you send them out to Kate Valley? Just pay them the money and give us our lives back.

**Geoffrey King, community** - That's not the problem, the problem is the biofilter and you know that. There is no biofilter, the wind pumps the methane up into the atmosphere and the wind blows it our way.

**Q: Yani Johanson, CCC elected member** - - Can the community see the odour assessments done by Pattle Delamore Partners (PDP) reports or can you give us an understanding of what they show, do they match the records that ECan have around the non-compliance?

**A: Jaco Kleinhans, LE staff** - That's a question for the CCC, I believe their report is in draft and has been finalised.

**A: Lynette Ellis, CCC staff** - LE do their own assessments, they have their own calibrated noses to come onsite to do assessments. PDP have been doing regular reporting multiple times a week, we are working on getting that through to you in a plain English manner as quickly as we can. We've heard what you've said tonight about transparency and we are going to try and be better.

**Q: Yani Johanson, CCC elected member** - Can I please confirm there are no issues with the biofilter? I know this is LE's report, but since they have referenced CCC, can I clarify Condition 27 saying there is compliance, with no offensive or objectionable odour?

**A: Lynette Ellis, CCC staff** - When a notice is issued, assessment staff come on site to assess where the odour is from and how much smell there is. The odour at the bio filter is different to other odours on the site such as the smell from materials, we have had it confirmed from PDP and ECan that it is not the bio filter.

**Geoffrey King, community** - There was an article in the Christchurch Press stating that independent environment expert PDP have failed to find any offensive or objectionable compost in the Bromley area since they started monitoring in January 2022. I have a pile of complaints and went and saw the technical director of PDP, Dr Steve Pearce and he confirmed they had found nothing.

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - I understand the CCC have done a lot of assessment work on the odours and there is a report coming next week.

**Q: Geoffrey King, community** - Is that going to contradict the Christchurch Press article printed on January 16th?

**A: Carl Pascoe, Chair** - It may do, but at least there is a report coming so you will be able to make up your own mind.

**Lynette Ellis, CCC staff** - Can I clarify that all the reports done last year are all up on the website now, and we are looking to get the report from the beginning of this year as soon as we can, we are aiming to get it out next week.

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - Tomorrow CCC meeting is going to look at the next phase.

## 5. Christchurch City Council Community Liaison Group Update including Otautahi Christchurch Organics Processing Solution procurement update

**David McArdle, CCC staff** - Spoke to the update, beginning with defending **Marty Mortiaux (ECan)** in his absence. Two days after the last CLG, Marty met with CCC and other ECan staff on site at the paddocks where they assessed the compost being spread there. Following that, LE provided lab test results which were independently tested by a third party, Hills Laboratories.

In April 2022, CCC agreed to relocate the processing of organics to an alternative location. In August 2022 the process started with an Expression of Interest phase and received responses. Of the 15, six options were shortlisted, none of which were located in land owned by CCC, including the existing site. The details are commercially sensitive due to the process, the reasoning is to allow for a fair and objective procurement process without compromise. If commercially sensitive information was released prematurely, this could result in a bias prior to the completion of the process.

The first stage of the process is complete and the Mayor and elected council members will consider a report seeking approval for council staff to go to market to move to the second and final procurement process to find an alternative location. The final stage will involve the shortlisted six options submitting a competitive bid for a closed proposal process.

The key elements to be considered will include;

1. A suitable site and location, including access to utilities and consenting for a period of no less than 15 years.
2. A selection of the most appropriate technology, including full odour containment and treatment.
3. A secure and market for finished product
4. A selection of a suitably experienced and qualified operator.

Following the final stage of the procurement process, the six options will be ranked and listed and presented to the CCC elected members early next year for their consideration, or earlier if possible. Once approved, a contract was expected to be awarded by February 2024 at the latest.

**Lynette Ellis, CCC staff** - I understand the frustration, but these things can take a long time. We've learned from other cities that the likes of legal challenges can stall the process hence we are being circumspect. The positives are that we've had good interest, we have six options and none of them are on council land, including the current site. They need to be able to be consented and provide a solution that has full odour containment. How we manage the transition is another conversation that we will keep having with our Councillors as well.

**Q: Michael Williams, community** - We understand there are rules around procurement and we do believe this site will be built, but what do we do in the meantime? There are mitigations that we need to work on, because you're talking another five years and if it

means loading it onto trucks and sending it off to Kate Valley, then let's do it, because that is a fair thing to do for us.

**Carol Anderson, community** - Proposed that since the source of the smells was a known factor, CCC should be one step ahead and asked that the waste be transferred to Kate Valley.

**A: Lynette Ellis, CCC staff** - We are working through this with the Councillors at the moment, we had a report done in May last year, but we can't just put it on a truck and send it out to Kate Valley, as it's not consented to do that either.

**Carol Anderson, community** - You're not consented to put the crap into the air either, we pay our rates which are going up yet are going to have this in our lives for another five years.

**Q: Michael Williams, community** - We hear words such as "in principle", why don't we hear "we are absolutely committed"?

**A: David McArdle, CCC staff** - That was the wording that was used for the decision in April last year, and now we've reached the point where we have six options.

**Carol Anderson, community** - We want you to write a report that tells us what is going to happen, we need to know we can still live in our homes here.

**Q:** Tomorrow you have your meeting at the Council and none of us can make any submissions because you haven't given us any time?

**A: Lynette Ellis, CCC staff** - We will feedback what we have heard tonight in good faith.

**A: Greg Byrne, ECan elected member** - Jackie and I are making a deputation to the CCC tomorrow.

**Q: Yani Johanson, CCC elected member** - - Is there a report that shows what will happen in the meantime between when the new plant gets built and all the non-compliances have been done for this quarter? The whole purpose of this meeting is to identify and address any adverse effects including remedial action, and yet, despite having five NONCs for the quarter, we haven't heard anything that says what the mitigation is going to be. Is anyone going to say what is going to happen as a result?

**A: Mary Richardson, CCC staff** - There will be advice on mitigation.

**Q: Geoffrey King, community** - We have had 14 years of discussion after discussion yet you still want more?

**A: Mary Richardson, CCC staff** - If you don't want us to discuss it with you, we can carry on without you if you want.

**Q: Michael Williams, community** - So is ECan going to review the consent conditions by the end of March? When it is reviewed, will there be input from residents who can articulate on the cloud of odour we are living under? Or will decisions around our quality of life be made by people in ivory towers?

**Q: Carl Pascoe, Chair** - We are at the point where there is a question about the resource consent review, will you be able to tell us what input the community can have?

**A: Mary Richardson, CCC staff** - We need to make a determination on what action we can take. We are very concerned about the transition plan if the site is moved to ensure that we are not issuing any more NONCs, we want to see improvement for this community. I will have to come back to you as we are concerned about the legacy effect because of the time this is taking.

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - I'd like the next meeting to have a stronger focus on how you mitigate the effect on the residents while this plant is still sitting there.

**Yani Johanson, CCC elected member** - The problem with that is that it has to be done by the end of March each year, so if we don't do it within the next two weeks, we lose a whole year. At the next meeting we can discuss it, but then we've lost the opportunity to get some remedial action for the period where the non-compliance exists.

**A: Mary Richardson, CCC staff** - I'd also like to point out there is a very narrow legal timeframe. I'm happy to take a look at it, but it is quite limited and restrictive.

**Greg Byrne, ECan elected member** - I have an ECan Councillors meeting on Thursday morning and I will try to get something through to you.

**Margaret McPherson, community** - The east side has the Red Zone area, nobody cares about it because it's the east. We have the containers on the other side of the river, dead fish in the Heathcote River. I feel that we are from low socio economic circumstances, we can't fight against it because we don't have the money. We're surrounded by industrial areas, dust, noise, sewerage. We've had the fire.

**Keygan Clutterbuck, CCC staff** - We've fundamentally changed the operation to deal with this. I know your opinion of CCC is low right now and I hope I can prove you wrong.

**Michael Williams, community** - I hope so too, as actions speak louder than words so I hope you can come back to us with solutions.

## 6. Concluding Remarks

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - Terms of Reference are to be reviewed at the first meeting of every year, that has not been possible tonight, so I propose to draw up something that will better reflect where we are going. It might be better to think about setting the date of the next meeting along with a clear agenda regarding a particular issue at the previous meeting so that there is more flexibility. At the next meeting you'll have the PDP report, but we need to take stock to see if we can come up with mitigating activities that will make life better for residents. Last year you succeeded in getting rid of all the tailings, which was a source of irritation. Your advocacy resulted in the council agreeing to build a plant elsewhere, but there are day to day mitigating things that need to be put on the table such as water blasting your patio, and not at your expense.

**Michael Williams, community** - All we want is the right to breathe clean air.

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - We will look at some mitigating things at the next meeting which will be under the current Terms of Reference on the third Tuesday in May.

**Q: Geoffrey King, community** - Before you finish, I'd like to ask who changed the date of this meeting and why were we not consulted?

**A: David McArdle, CCC staff** - It was a decision between CCC and ECan.

**A: Carl Pascoe, Chair** - I take responsibility for that and I challenged it as it's not OK.

**Michael Williams, community** - We need to have a specified person to deal with a specific task and minimise the number of issues we are dealing with, perhaps five key points.

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - That was my intention regarding revising the Terms of Reference, so I will be developing an agenda with fewer points and focusing on one key issue each meeting.

**Michael Williams, community** – Whoever is reporting back has to be named in the minutes, held accountable with answers to the questions and the outcome delivered.

**Carl Pascoe, Chair** - I agree with outcome focused meetings that change things for everyone. I will make sure that the agenda is done in plenty of time and there will be hard copies available at the meeting and available to be printed on demand at the Bromley Community Centre.