

8. CONSULTATION

Coal Stockyard at Lyttelton Port

- 8.1 LPC informed Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke in August 2020 of the need to renew the discharge to air permit for the coal stockyard and sought advice on how best to engage. After a site visit at the beginning of October 2020, Ngāti Wheke determined a cultural impact assessment report ('CIA') was not required. Rather, it was proposed (and agreed to by LPC) to trial a process whereby the Manawhenua Advisory Group ('MAG')¹ contributed directly to the scope and nature the assessment of effects process early in the planning stages. The process was assisted by an appointed MAG coordinator. Details of the engagement process and the work this entailed is set out in an 'Engagement Report' prepared by the MAG coordinator and is attached in **Appendix 10**. The outcome of this engagement resulted in the following agreement:
- a. LPC would seek a 20 year consent duration for this application;
 - b. LPC to volunteer a consent condition to enable the collective consideration of monitoring results via the MAG at least annually (refer to proposed conditions 41-43 attached in the application); and
 - c. With these provisions, Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke sees no reason to submit on the consent application.
- 8.2 As noted in the report, both parties recognised that the consent duration was not the preferred option, but appreciated the willingness of the other to reach a compromise of 20 years.
- 8.3 Engagement with the local community commenced in early October 2020. LPC door knocked 78 houses, centering on Gilmour, Reserve and Randolph Terraces and Sumner Road. These properties were identified as either having previously been affected by coal dust, or could be potentially affected by coal dust.
- 8.4 An information sheet was left with owners or in the letterbox when nobody was at home. The information sheet briefly explained:

¹ LPC and Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke have a formalised relationship expressed in a Joint statement 2014 and operationalised through a Manawhenua Advisory Group.

- a. Why the replacement consent was required;
 - b. What type of coal is exported;
 - c. What impacts coal dust might have;
 - d. Current mitigation measures;
 - e. Focus of assessment work; and
 - f. The consent process going forward.
- 8.5 The sheet also asked for feedback, including any questions residents might have.
- 8.6 LPC also set up a public web-page with project-related information.² The web-page included a link to the information sheet, a list of questions and answers, and a link to various dust deposition gauges with results of dust deposition rates over the last summer.
- 8.7 LPC also provided project updates with LPC's 'Quarterly Updates' which is distributed with the Bay Harbour News.
- 8.8 A drop-in session was held on the 13th of April 2021 to enable the community to discuss the results of monitoring and to discuss the proposed resource consent application. The drop-in session was advertised in the Bay Harbour News and the residents' earlier door knocked were delivered a letter advising of the drop-in session. In addition, emails of the letter were sent to other potentially interested parties. Three people attended the drop-in session.
- 8.9 The application has also been discussed with City Council's Reserves Committee, and City Council elected members including the Community Board.
- 8.10 There has been limited feedback over the last summer. Three home owners sought that samples be taken to determine the levels of coal dust on their houses. One resident lived on the west side of Lyttelton and the dust swabbed did not appear to be from the coal stockyard. Another resident on the eastern-side of Lyttelton had two swabs taken from pooled water which revealed 15% percent coal dust in one sample and 30% in the other. No sample was taken at the third place because subsequent rain meant it was

² <https://www.lpc.co.nz/community/coal-dust-resource-consent-renewal/>

too late to swab and get any meaningful results.

- 8.11 One resident that has been affected over the years commented that the current situation is satisfactory but wanted to be sure that measures were put in place so the existing situation did not deteriorate. This was echoed by some other residents that noted coal dust deposition was previously far worse when there was insufficient mitigation being carried out or the mitigation was insufficient for the throughput of coal.