

## Minutes of Meeting

### Te Mata Mushroom Co. Ltd

|              |  |      |                   |
|--------------|--|------|-------------------|
| Subject      | Te Mata Mushroom Co. Ltd - Expert Conferencing   | Page | 1                 |
| Venue        | AECOM NZ Limited - Auckland Office - Meeting Room 3.2 Mt Cambria                       | Time | 11 am to 12:30 pm |
| Participants | Terry Brady, Duncan Backshall, Jason Pene, Tracy Freeman, Bryan Holyoake, Peter Stacey |      |                   |
| Apologies    | Andrew Curtis (on leave overseas)  |      |                   |
| File/Ref No. | Rev A  | Date | 09-Oct-2019       |
| Distribution | As above   |      |                   |

| No | Item  |
|----|---|
| 1. | Introductions   |
| 2. | <p>It was agreed that the meeting was to focus on the key areas that Mr Barrett (Council Officer) identified in his email dated 1 October 2019 where there remain some differences of opinion, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>The degree to which the proposed outcome will address the adverse effects from the activity, and identification of any further information/design specifications that are required to allow conclusions to be made in this regard.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Consent conditions and ability to address any lack of design detail, identification of key design criteria and parameters.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Timing of proposed Steps 1 and 2, and the relative importance of the additional Phase 1 bunker.</i></li> <li>4. <i>Impact of increasing compost production prior to completing Step 3.</i></li> </ol> |
| 3. | <p>Discussion Point 1: "<i>The degree to which the proposed outcome will address the adverse effects from the activity, and identification of any further information/design specifications that are required to allow conclusions to be made in this regard.</i>"</p> <p>No further information on the proposed design was provided to the experts by Tracy Freeman or Bryan Holyoake.</p> <p>Terry Brady referred to his written statement and reiterated that he would need to receive more information on the proposed design before he could provide an opinion on its effectiveness at controlling odour. Duncan Backshall, Jason Pene and Peter Stacey also had the same opinion.</p>  |

|    |  |
|----|--|
|    | <p>There is agreement amongst the experts that the proposed concept should, in theory, be effective at controlling odour, however the actual effectiveness would depend on the details of the design that are currently unavailable.</p> <p>Tracy Freeman stated that due to the tight timeframes the applicant has been unable to provide the level of design detail required.</p> <p>Bryan Holyoake had concerns that if the design process was rushed then it would be open to critique.</p> <p>In summary, the experts could not provide an opinion on the degree to which the proposal will control off-site odour given the lack of information on the design.</p>   |
| 4. | <p>Discussion point 2: <i>“Consent conditions and ability to address any lack of design detail, identification of key design criteria and parameters”.</i></p> <p>Bryan Holyoake provided an overview of the proposed concept and discussed the key aspects of the design which would control odour. He then asked what design specification would be required to satisfy the concerns of the experts.</p> <p>Terry Brady was uncomfortable for the caucus group to propose design and performance specifications and then incorporate them into resource consent conditions. He stated that it is the Applicant's task, and that the experts task is to review them and potentially suggest conditions.</p> <p>There is agreement amongst the experts that the biofilter conditions (Conditions 25-27) are generally appropriate.</p> <p>Tracy Freeman requested a copy of the proposed conditions for another mushroom farm (Mercer Mushrooms), that Jason Pene and Terry Brady currently have some involvement with, as a starting point and have Bryan Holyoake review and amend as necessary, with the intention to put these conditions forward at the hearing.</p> <p>In summary, it was agreed that the Applicant should review the Mercer Mushroom's consent conditions and then put forward a set of conditions for comment. This should not be expected to resolve the issues arising from the lack of design information discussed in (3).</p> |
| 5. | <p>Discussion point 3: <i>“Timing of proposed Steps 1 and 2, and the relative importance of the additional Phase 1 bunker”.</i></p> <p>There was agreement amongst all of the experts that the commissioning of Bunker 3 should be undertaken as soon as practicable. Jason Pene, Duncan Backshall and Peter Stacey preferred that it be included as part of Step 1. Terry Brady agreed but he is not confident that it will achieve the aim of odour control from the proposed buildings.</p> <p>Tracy Freeman disagreed with a recommendation to bring the installation of Bunker 3 into Step 1, as notwithstanding her agreement to the sentence above, in her opinion the degree and timing of staging to achieve the final Step 3 design should be a matter of practicality and is for the applicant to justify to the Hearing Panel.</p>   |
| 6. | <p>Discussion point 4: <i>“Impact of increasing compost production prior to completing Step 3”.</i></p> <p>In terms of odour potential, there was agreement that the proposed increase in compost production from 120 T to 160 T will only result in a small increase in the amount of time that bale breaking takes place (worst-case extending further into Thursday afternoon), and consequently the amount of time odour could be generated and experienced offsite. While</p>   |

|    |  |
|----|--|
|    | <p>there is some potential for an increase in odour intensity it was agreed that this is unlikely to be significant.</p> <p>No other activities were identified where the increase in compost production could increase the intensity or frequency of odour discharges.</p> <p>Terry Brady, Duncan Backshall, Peter Stacey and Tracy Freeman were of the view that the relatively small increase in the frequency of odours from bale breaking would not be a significant factor in whether odour from the site could be considered offensive or objectionable, when compared to other existing intensity and offensiveness factors.</p> <p>Jason Pene suggested that he would need to better understand how the frequency of odour discharges might change before he could form an opinion.</p> <p>Tracy Freeman stated that she will be able to provide more information on the increased frequency of bale breaking in time for the reconvened hearing.</p> <p>Agreement amongst the experts that the above statements are predicated on the ventilation and odour treatment system design ensuring that will be no fugitive odour from the enclosed buildings.</p> |
| 7. | Close of Meeting   |