Taranaki Regional Council

Submission on resource consent application

Online reference number:	CA210838408
Completed on:	20 Aug 2021

Submitter's details

Full name or company name of submitter	Kevin John McDonald and Glenis June McDonald
Contact Name	Kevin and Glenis McDonald
Email	[redacted]
Contact phone number	[redacted]
Postal Address:	[redacted]
Street address of property affected (if different to the address above)	NA

The Council will serve all formal documents electronically via the email address provided above.

Application to which submission relates

Name of applicant	Airport Farm Trustee Limited
Proposal (activity type and location)	For an "early renewal" of the consent to discharge emissions into the air from a free range poultry farming operation at 58 Airport Drive, 3 R.D., New Plymouth, 4373.
TRC Consent number/s	5262-3.0
I am a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991	No

The specific parts of the application this submission relates to are:

My submission relates to the whole application	Yes

Submission details

Please provide details of your submission. If your submission is in a document, you can upload the document below.	'document uploaded'

K. and G. McDonald Submission to TRC Final.docx

Outcome sought

I seek the following decision from the Council	To refuse consent
If consent is granted, the conditions I seek are	NA
You can upload a document containing the conditions you seek here	NA

Attendance and wish to be heard at consent hearing

I/we wish to be heard in support of my/our submission	Yes

By answering yes, you will have the option to speak in support of your submission at any consent hearing.

If others make a similar submission, I/we will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.	Yes

Request for independent commisioner/s

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, I request that the Taranaki Regional Council delegates its functions, powers, and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearing commissioners who are not Taranaki Regional Councilors.	NA

Note: Such a request may be made (in writing) up to 5 working days after close of submissions. If you do make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you will be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners.

Provision of submission to applicant

The Resource Management Act 1991 requires you to send a a copy of the submission to the applicant.

Would you like the Applicant to be automatically sent a copy of this submission via email?	Yes
Please enter the applicant's email address here	ed@airportfarm.co.nz

Authorisation

By selecting this checkbox, you are confirming you are the person making submission, or person authorised on behalf of person making submission.	Yes
Date	20/08/2021

Council Use Only

Action	Signature	Date
Database updated by		
Document number		

20 August 2021

RE: Submission on Resource Consent Application 20-0526-3.0

Airport Farm Trustee Limited

Submitter Details

1. This submission is made by Kevin and Glenis McDonald of 62 Airport Drive, New Plymouth 4373.

2. We have been identified as affected persons under Rule 52 of the Regional Air Quality Plan (RAQP). We have been served with a notice by the TRC under their Limited Notification decision for application by Airport Farm Trustee Limited (**AFT**) for early renewal of existing discharge consent 5262-2.

3. We are the immediate neighbours of AFT and share their northern and eastern boundary with our 16 acre life-style block. We have lived at this address since September 1994. We are self employed and operate a business from the property.

4. We have been provided with the following documentation from the TRC that have informed us in the preparation of this submission[1]:

TRC document Identifier	Name of Document
FRODO-#2574889-v2	Application form 20-04692-3-0 20-0526-3-0 Airport Farm Trustee Limited 26 August 2020.PDF (**Application**)
FRODO-#2791520-v2	Application AEE-odour assessment 20-04692-3-0 20-0526-3-0 Airport Farm Trustee Limited 3 June 2021.PDF (**Tonkin and Taylor Report**)
FRODO-#1276405-v1	Image 4692-2 Transferred 25 Oct 2013.PDF (**Consent 4692**)
FRODO-#1314237-v2	Image-5262-2-1 Airport Change 20 Feb 2014.PDF (**Consent 5262**)
FRODO-#2831685-v1	Notification decision-Limited notification 20-05262-3-0 Airport Farm Trustees Limited.PDF (**Notification Decision)**

5. In addition we have also met with the following Taranaki Regional Council (TRC) personnel on 30 July 2021 at the TRC in Stratford to clarify details of the Application:

    a. Gary Bedford – Planning Manager

    b. Colin McLellan – Consents Manager

[1] A number of these were supplied after lodging a request for further information.

6. We note that this process has been personally revealing in terms of how current consents are supposed to operate, what obligations are placed on parties, and the rights of affected parties. If we, and neighbours, had been aware of these much earlier, we believe that the TRC would have been presented with an entirely different perspective on the Application that would have created a different process and a better informed outcome.

Summary of our understanding of the application

7. We understand that AFT are seeking an early renewal of their two discharge consents 4692-2 and 5262-2, both of which are due to expire 1 June 2026.

8. Discharge consent 4692-2 relates to discharge of wash-down water from the cleaning of broiler chicken sheds onto and into land. We understand that the TRC is processing consent 4692 separately to the air discharge consent. TRC's reasons are that consent 4692 is a Controlled Activity (must be granted) and will be processed non-notified, because "*nobody is adversely affected*"[2]. We don't necessarily agree that this assumption is correct, but we are happy to capture our broader concerns under this submission for consent 5262.

9. We understand that AFT haven't specified a period for the renewed consent in the Application, but that they have indicated that they are seeking a renewal term of 10-15 years from date of granting without change to the special conditions under their current air discharge consent 5262-2[3].

10. AFT has provided an odour assessment report from Tonkin and Taylor (T+T) in support of their application.

[2] Email correspondence 4 August 2021 with TRC Consents Manager Colin McLennan clarifying this point.
[3] ibid

Outcome Sought in this submission

11. **The TRC should refuse the consent**

12. **Within the current remaining period of the consent**:

    a. We oppose the Application to extend the free range to outside of the shed until an AEE is made, and control measures associated with the new risk have been identified and implemented.

    b. We seek a review by the TRC on the effectiveness of AFT's existing control measures to ensure improved compliance with current consent conditions that we now understand are being breached on a regular basis.

    c. We seek an improvement in the TRC monitoring program that can better and more regularly capture the ongoing concerns of residents of Airport Drive.

    d. We request that AFT are required to keep all written records of complaints for longer than six months and present these to the TRC at the appropriate review dates. We also request that AFT provide the complainants with a copy of a record of their complaint each time a complaint is made.

    e. We request that we are included in the information loop and kept informed on these actions and their progress.

Summary of objections to the Application

13. AFT has a poor compliance record as experienced by ourselves and other neighbours. TRC officers seem to be unaware of this persistent, ongoing, and the cumulative negative effects on loss of our living amenity value.

14. There is a strong and reasonable expectation that the consent wasn't going to be renewed beyond 2026. A number of parties, including ourselves, have relied on this in our future planning.

15. **We believe that the consent should have been publicly notified under S95 of the RMA.** Our grounds for this are detailed further in this submission, but in summary we believe that the TRC has made a number of material errors in its assumptions and reasoning that have led to their willingness to consider the early renewal of the consent and its notification decision and determination of affected persons.

Evidence in support of our objection

Consent should have been publicly notified

16. S95A of the RMA provides for public notification in special circumstances. We consider the special circumstances requiring public notification to be self-evident:

    a. The Application proposes to extend the consent past 2026, potentially by a further 15-years to 2036. This is well past the reasonably held expectation of affected

parties, including NPDC on behalf of the district, residents of Airport Drive, and parties having bought land with the expectation to subdivide.

b. The consent also proposes to change the operation where the environmental effects haven't been assessed. Residents excluded on the basis of having already provided consent in earlier applications cannot automatically be assumed to provide a blanket approval for changes of operation.

c. AFT have a poor record of environmental performance as experienced by residents that challenges the notion of whether they are fit to continue their operation.

Consent not to be renewed beyond 2026

17. A public meeting with residents and businesses in New Plymouth District Council (NPDC) was held to discuss District Plan zone changes for areas designated as Area Q and Area R in 2014. The newspaper report at the time recorded the discussion. This included an article highlighting AFT's owner, Mr Ed Whiting, distress at not having his consent renewed in 2026. He was resigned to this however and his main concern was that he should be allowed to capitalise on the new urban zoning, rather than have the area rezoned after his operation was closed[4].

18. Others, including ourselves, have since relied on the consent not being renewed past 2026. This also includes parties not being notified in this process (developers, and owners looking to subdivide their land once it is rezoned as residential).

19. Given the background and well signalled intentions by NPDC for the development of the area, it is concerning to us that NPDC have been ruled out of having any say in this application.

Change of Process

20. AFT clearly explain in their Application that they intend to ***convert*** *their existing operation to free range.*

> *"This will include conversion of its four existing poultry sheds from conventional (i.e. non-free range) broiler to a free-range configuration[5]"*

21. While no further explanation is provided on what this entails, other than reduced bird numbers, the Tonkin Taylor Report notes that this also encompasses[6]:
    - *"Provision of **outdoor range** areas alongside each shed corresponding to the shed area (at a minimum).*
    - *Installation of pop holes along the side of the sheds to allow birds to access the range areas in the following circumstances:*

[4] https://www.stuff.co.nz/taranaki-daily-news/news/63623010/chicken-farmer-worried-rezoning-will-leave-him--in-limbo-land
[5] Section 6.1 of the Application
[6] Tonkin Taylor Report 2.4

- Once the birds are old enough to self-regulate body temperature at 21 days; and
- During daylight hours thereafter (except during inclement weather)".

22. Surprisingly, Tonkin and Taylor do not address the significant change to include an outdoor operation that appears to increase the risk of environmental effects beyond the boundary. Instead they focus on how this affects the risks from *within the shed* operation and conclude odour effects will be *less*. They base this on argument of reduced stocking density and an assumption that chickens only excrete where they eat (indoors).

23. Tonkin and Taylor (Section 3) note that odour is odour is exacerbated by water/ moisture and also created by the birds themselves. This is a point that should have been picked up by them in terms of the outdoor operation.

24. In both minimising current emission risk and being silent on the new emission risk, the Tonkin and Taylor report has also avoided commenting on how controls should be enhanced and where existing controls might become less effective under the new operation. In terms of equipment that AFT have to mitigate effects of odour and dust, these are all based on having birds contained within a negative pressure maintained enclosed space.

25. Likewise the TRC in its assessment of the Application appears to make a similar error of omission to conclude that the consent application falls under Rule 52 of the RAQP. Rule 52 covers "*Existing poultry farming processes*" whereas AFT (and Tonkin and Taylor) clearly indicate that the Application covers a *conversion **of an existing operation** **to** free range (*our emphasis added). According to the RAQP this would make the Application subject to Rule 54.

26. While making this Application subject to Rule 54 (discretionary activity) seems to remove any rule based obligation to notify the consent, it should affect the consideration of affected parties and whether the effects are likely to be more than minor (S95E). When considering discretionary activities, **all** adverse effects of the activity can be considered. Activities classified as discretionary are recognised as being capable of generating a wide range of effects and therefore the assessment of effects is not narrowed or limited in any way.

27. In restricting the consent to a limited notification consent it seems to us that the TRC has unnecessarily limited its own powers to properly assess the application in the right context.

Lack of complaints

28. TRC's judgment on how to address the Application seems to have been informed by an unfounded assumption that AFT have good compliance performance with current consent conditions. In our view, the TRC's handling of the Application has relied excessively on its official complaint record to conclude that adverse impacts are no more than minor. It hasn't tested this in either its monitoring process, or tested this assumption with potentially affected parties that would have provided a different conclusion.

29. The Application, the Notification Decision, and the Tonkin and Taylor Report all rely on a mistaken representation of AFT's performance under their current consent. In particular, they all state, or assume that AFT is complying with its existing consent conditions and any effects are no more than minor:

a. AFT claims that it is meeting its existing resource consent conditions standards[7]

b. AFT claims no "record" of dust being a problem on the farm[8]

c. AFT (falsely) states that no complaints have been received in relation to offensive and objectionable odour beyond the boundary of the site[9]

d. AFT (falsely) claims that records and experience has not shown dust emissions moving beyond the site boundary[10]

e. AFT (erroneously) claim odour is a subjective matter and relies on statement that only official complaints to the TRC should matter[11].

f. Tonkin and Taylor note that their report relies solely on the complaint record, and an absence of any complaints since 2015[12].

g. Tonkin and Taylor note in relation to Odour Diaries as an assessment tool in Table 5.1 that[13]:

> *"The complaints record has not indicated that odour is prevalent on neighbouring properties and an odour diary programme was therefore not considered suitable for this assessment".*

The passive approach taken by Tonkin and Taylor in their assessment by simply relying on the word of the Applicant, undermines the relevance of their report.

h. The TRC concludes that there are no *recorded* complaints about odour in assessing any impacts as being less than minor[14].

30. Contrary to the perceptions created above, our experience, and those of our neighbours, suggests that AFT regularly breach special conditions 6 (odour) and 7 (suspended dust) of consent 5262. These breaches are having an adverse effect on our physical and mental wellbeing and our overall enjoyment of our living amenity. Namely because:
A. We do not occupy just the dwelling, we live and work on our 16 acres
B. The odour and dust absolutely **DO** cross over the boundary onto our property, at times needing to wear a mask for respiratory protection
C. There are some days if we are planning to attend our orchard, flower or vegetable gardens, we cannot purely because of emissions permeating all around our environment
D. These emissions not only within the air we breathe, but the plants and fruit we consume

[7] Section 6.1 of the Application
[8] Ibid 7.4
[9] Ibid 7.6 – also notes prevailing wind as from the West whereas the Tonkin and Taylor Report indicates prevailing wind is SSE (Fig 4.1 and p11)
[10] Ibid 7.7 – note that if there is a dust emission from the shed it is hard to explain where else the dust might go, if not beyond the boundary.
[11] Ibid 7.8
[12] Tonkin and Taylor Report – Table 5.1 p12 and Section 5.2 p13
[13] ibid
[14] Notification Decision – p6

from our property and the animals we grow for food

E. The TRC's Notification document point #4 Are the adverse effects likely to be more than minor – we would say the current odour management regime is not implemented effectively and odour emissions from the operation **DO** cause odour that is offensive and objectionable beyond the site boundary and the emissions to air are **MORE THAN MINOR.**

31. Our personal experience is that emissions from AFT site regularly impact our personal physical and mental wellbeing, to the extent that we frequently feel forced to leave our property to escape the discharge intrusion. This became more difficult during the New Zealand COVID-19 March/April lockdown in 2020. This was a source of considerable personal stress at the time, in being unable to leave the property when such excursions were occurring. Not one square centimetre for days on end of our 16 acres was free of odour and/or dust.

32. For years we have had thick masking tape over the windows and doors on the SW side of our dwelling, in which we have our master bedroom and ensuite. Reasons why we do this:
A. Let as little odour and dust seep into our sleeping environment as possible
B. We are exposed for a good length of time (i.e. 8 hours) breathing in **volatile odorous nitrogen, sulphur and ammonia** (the main gases emitted as stated in the T+T report) which at times is extremely **HIGH,** especially if conditions overnight are clear and calm leading to poor odour and dust dispersion
C. Long term exposure to these gases are having a very adverse negative effect on our personal physical and mental health wellbeing
D. Symptoms of such exposure (which coincide with the end of a run) including collection of birds, removal of litter and washing down of the sheds, experienced to a higher degree by Glenis are:
1. Burning, irritated eyes
2. Narrowing of the throat and swelling of the respiratory tract, causing airway obstruction
3. Accumulation of fluid in the lungs with persistent coughing on waking in the morning to clear phlegm
4. Pounding heart as the body pushes the blood through to clear out the system
5. Liver also in overdrive – very obvious in the urine odour
6. Foggy head/headaches and swollen glands as my immune system is hard at work to eliminate the odorous gases I have breathed into my body
E. It has highlighted to me (Glenis) how worried I should be for my future health, and from now on I will be keeping an "Odour Diary Programme" and seeking medical advice.

33. We are constantly on edge when organising entertaining for family and friends, hoping that the events won't be spoiled by odour, dust, and noise emissions. The latest example was on the evening of Tuesday 3rd August, Glenis had a long term school friend stay over visiting from Christchurch. It was on/or around day 35 and 36 of the last run. At the time it was a Southerly breeze and the odour was **extremely offensive and objectionable**, permeating our home. We seldom see each other, and because of the odour, and some symptoms noted above Glenis was suffering from at the time, it was very upsetting and spoilt the very little time we spent together.

34. In regards to the **T+T report 4.2 Topography** re odour dispersion statement *"katabatic drainage flow will likely gently push air and accumulated odour from the sheds downgradient, in this case to the east of the site and down the Mangaoraka Stream (away from the nearest houses)",* we would like to **respectfully disagree** with this statement. Having lived on this property for 27 years, we find the katabatic wind hangs and lingers around our dwelling, particularly on the SW of our dwelling (which includes master bedroom), and drifts over Airport Drive to neighbours in the west, rather than towards the stream on the east side of our property. T+T also state *"There is a strong prevalence of wind from the south to southeast directions (particularly in relation to calm to light winds of less than 3 m/s in which odour dispersion is poorest)."* **T+T also state in 4.3 Meteorological conditions** *"The nearest dwelling is to the north* (66 Airport Drive/**which is incorrect we are 62;** *55 m from the sheds) and while the winds from the south are relatively infrequent, they are typically weak."* As the SE/S air movement/winds are predominately what affects us the most, we note that this statement by T+T has a very adverse negative effect on our wellbeing. If winds are high from the SE/S, you might find typically dispersion of the odour and dust is more effective, however, it seems to swirl around our property within the tall hedges of shelter belts all around our boundary. So there is **NO** getting away from the emissions when the wind is in this direction, unless we leave our own property.

35. We run a business from our property, clientele visit our office for up to an hour consultation. The office is 42 metres from one of the north facing sheds. Once again, it is very odorous at times, and the levels of emissions are very offensive and objectionable. It is embarrassing that we ask clientele to pay for a consult regarding their health, when they are subjected to breathing in these emissions while under a health provided consultation.

36. We would have loved to have started a Bed and Breakfast from our property many years ago. Your home should be a **safe haven of peace and tranquillity** that you can share with others if you choose too. However, because of the odorous conditions at times, and the guests paying for the B&B experience, we feel we cannot subject anyone to breathing in these volatile emissions. If we had stayed in a B&B within the conditions we have to live in at times, we would demand our money back. Therefore, this is another thing we have been **adversely affected** by, not freely being able to do what we want on our own property, and having to forego this stream of income over the past 27 years.

37. As we are in our 60's and heading towards retirement, we are trying to plan for our future. It weighs enough on our mental wellbeing, that if we stay at 62 Airport Drive, we have to endure another approximately 4 years 9 months of living in close proximity to AFT's operation, with all of the above mentioned adverse effects on our environment until the current consent ends on 1st June 2026. To think AFT's operation could go beyond this 2026 date, is so negatively consuming to us, and leaves us in limbo regarding planning for our future retirement years. If we cannot live here any longer due to the adverse affects on our personal physical mental wellbeing, our property's value could be adversely diminished because of AFT's operation. We believe a ~~boiler~~ broiler farm is not compatible with a residential growth area in this environment.

(as per email #2851017 error with word should be broiler not boiler)

38. Not once since this broiler farm was established in 1998, has anyone from the TRC or any owner/manager of the broiler farm at 58 Airport Drive, EVER came and consulted with us on how we feel they are operating under the consent. We find that amazing when in part of the **TRC's Mission Statement reads "Safeguarding Taranaki's people and resources from natural and other hazards**." We would regard volatile gases emitted from AFT's operation into the environment, a hazard to basic human physical mental health and wellbeing.

39. We have addressed our complaints a number of times with AFT whenever odour or dust appears particularly severe and crosses over into our boundary. We have done this via personal approach to the Mr Whiting, rather than through formal complaint channels with the TRC. This has not been recorded or acknowledged by AFT in its application.

40. In addition AFT also are a significant source of complaint for noise performance. This is particularly during the night with shed cleaning, feed deliveries, and other truck movements occurring at all hours of the night and very early morning. We appreciate that the TRC does not concern itself with noise other than providing more general advice on avoiding noise complaints under Appendix V of the RAQP[15], but it helps to paint the picture of cumulative negative effects of AFT's attitude to its neighbours.

41. We have, through this process, discovered that it is recommended good practice (but not a requirement) under RAQP Appendix 5 section t (complaints), that the farm operator is required to keep a written record of complaints noting all of the relevant details of the complaint. These written records need only be retained for *at least* six months.

42. The TRC, Tonkin and Taylor, and AFT claim no records of non-compliance exists. While this may be the case because complaints haven't been officially notified to the TRC, and they haven't been recorded by AFT either, this does not mean that complaints don't exist. In the context of an Application that seeks to present itself as "no adverse impact" it strikes us that AFT in being less than transparent, have misled the TRC. This lack of transparency leads to a false perception that AFT are a model compliant neighbour, which is not how we would characterise their behaviour or their fitness to continue to operate this way.

43. It is noteworthy that AFT has chosen not to engage with its neighbours on this consent. This is evidenced by this section being left blank in the Application, and also noted by Tonkin and Taylor in Table 5.1 under Community Consultation

> *"AFTL has not consulted with neighbours in relation to this application and the complaint record has been relied upon for community feedback in relation to odour."*

Effectiveness of Current Controls

44. The examples of breaches that we have noted above seem to point to the lack of the effectiveness of engineering controls in the operation.

45. On reflecting on this, our personal thoughts and observations on this are:

[15] RAQP- Appendix 5, section S (Noise)

a. The shed side vent discharges are less than 15 m away from our boundary at the closest positions **and point to the ground**. The original shed configuration had these in the roof. I believe that they were changed because emissions at the roof were causing the roof to corrode[16].

b. We assume that the original AEE would have included a description of the engineering controls supported by air discharge dispersion modelling to show sufficient dispersion to meet the consent conditions at the boundary. If the original controls have changed, then presumably the original AEE that the TRC relied on to issue the consent is no longer valid.

c. Special consent condition 4 of the Consent requires the TRC to have reviewed these type of changes.

d. We would submit that having shed air discharged at ground level and pointing towards our boundary may offer one explanation for the air discharge problems we, and our neighbours are experiencing.

e. The fact that this engineering change may have bypassed TRC scrutiny also points to a lack of effective auditing and monitoring by the TRC.

46. Based on this, we would request that; the TRC reviews the effectiveness of AFT's existing control measures; how these may have changed from the original consent; and whether these changes were properly notified and dealt with as per special condition 4. Depending on this investigation we assume that the outcome might need further investigation in the shed operation as a remedy.

47. We also ask that the TRC reassesses the effectiveness of its current monitoring programme. In our view, these seem largely passive and reactive; if it simply relies on official complaints being received, or relies solely on the representations of AFT during any review periods.

IN CONCLUSION

We are opposed to the application and seek that the consent renewal application is declined/refused entirely.

In our view TRC should not be assessing/treating the application as a renewal in any event – as the proposed activity to move to free range farming is a different activity than that originally consented – with a different nature, scale and intensity of effects such that it should be processed as a new application for a new activity (not a renewal); and in the context of that new activity (to move to free range farming), we are of the view that there is insufficient information for us to properly ascertain and consider the actual and potential adverse affects on us and the environment generally (for the many reasons noted earlier in our submission).

Odour and dust (and noise) effects from the existing and proposed activity are having, and will continue to have), significant adverse affects on our personal physical mental health wellbeing, our

[16] Note that it is our recollection that this change may have occurred before Mr Whiting assumed ownership of the operation

amenity values and the quality of the environment in which we live. The odour effects are causing loss of amenity value of air in the surrounding environment in which we live; the odour/dust effects and emissions are offensive and objectionable beyond the applicant's site boundary and are having (and will continue to have) more than minor adverse affects on us and in the receiving environment in which we live.

Odour/dust (and noise) is very noticeable, offensive and objectionable (as already discussed in numerous points in our submission) and the adverse effects are far more than minor in our experience; the activities are incompatible with the receiving environment in which we live and cause (and will continue to cause), unacceptable adverse, cumulative and nuisance affects.

The proposed activities are inconsistent with, and contrary to, the relevant provisions of the Taranaki Regional Policy Statement (RPS), Regional Freshwater Plan for Taranaki, Regional Air Quality Plan for Taranaki (RAQPT) and the purpose and principle of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) under Part 2 RMA – and will not achieve or promote sustainable management under the RMA.

We wish to be heard in support of our submission and if others make a similar submission, we will consider joining the hearing with them.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FROM NEIGHBOURS

While only limited notification parties are entitled to make a submission, in this process we have also engaged with other neighbours excluded from this process, to give voice to our shared concerns on the failure to comply with the existing consent. The neighbours listed below are also adversely affected and give their consent to be named on our submission:

- Brent Dodunski, 32 Airport Drive
- Nigel Williams, 46 Airport Drive
- Don Crow, 65 Airport Drive
- Gavin & Marion Struthers, 82 Airport Drive

Kevin and Glenis McDonald