



SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Draft Long Term Plan

2018 - 2028

SUBMISSION BOOKLET ONE
Submissions 100001 - 100101



[100001] -Creative Intentions Ltd Mr Geraint Howells

Address: 104 Salisbury Street Christchurch Christchurch

Postal Address: 104 Salisbury Street

Phone (day): 03 324 3063

Phone (mobile): 022 025 9929

Email: geg@creative-intentions.co.nz

Submission

Topic: Economic Development - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	The Submitter proposes the establishment of a Selwyn Development Agency. Council is currently preparing an economic development strategic plan that will prioritise areas of economic development focus for Council in the short - medium term. There may be an opportunity to revisit the entity proposed in the next Long Term Plan consultation depending on the development in this area.

[100002] -Regimental History Centre, Templeton RSA, Progress Masonic Lodge Bruce Russell, David Clarkson, John Rae and Gordon Wadie

Address: Rolleston Rolleston

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: bruce.russell66@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

The following information has been posted by Council staff: This submission arises out of a public forum session held on at the 14 March 2018 Council meeting. The below is an excerpt from the minutes of that meeting:

A discussion was held regarding the public forum presentation, the following resolution suggested by Councillor McEvedy:

Moved – Councillor McEvedy / Seconded – Councillor Bland

‘That Council receive the presentation and documentation provided at the 14 March 2018 Council meeting public forum from: Mr Bruce Russell; Mr David Clarkson, President of the Regimental History Centre; Mr John Rae, President of the Templeton RSA; and Mr Gordon Wadie, Master of Progress Masonic Lodge, and treat this as their submission to the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028, but request further financial detail.’ (CARRIED)

Councillor Alexander stated that he would like the Group to come back as he did not have the opportunity to ask the questions he would have in the submission process. He suggested that the project could be in the vicinity of \$10-15m in be sited in the centre of Rolleston. He stated that would not be a trivial submission to the Long Term Plan and may set a precedent. He further stated that it is beholden upon the Submitters to work through finances, not Council staff.

Councillor Morten noted his support of Councillor McEvedy’s recommendation, stating that if the Group wishes to come back to submit on the Long Term Plan, he is sure that they will. He further commented that this is the start of a journey for them, and they are looking for help and guidance.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No further financial information has been provided on this project despite the request during the presentation to the March council meeting by this group. At this time staff would not propose any further discussion with the group.

[100003] - Ms Meredith Evans

Address: 112 Irvines Road Rd2 Leeston Leeston 7682

Postal Address: 112 Irvines Road, Dunsandel

Phone (day): 0211800384

Phone (mobile): 0211800384

Email: nzmevans@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Yes. I believe we should have a new dog park in Selwyn, preferably in Rolleston. I am a member of the Selwyn dog training club, which is based at the dog park in Rolleston. We use the park 3 nights a week for training and have constant issues with members of the public and their dogs who come into our training space and let their dogs disrupt our training. Often these dogs are aggressive as are the owners, who are not happy about us using the park. We are trying to run a community service and all our members are volunteers but it is too hard with the problems we have from the public. Another dog park in Rolleston would address this issue. I absolutely LOVE the fact that dogs can be exercised off leash at most Selwyn parks and that suits me and my dogs well because they are well trained. However, most of the dogs who come to the dog park do not have a recall and their owners don't want to let them off leash in an unfenced park. So it's not an option for them to exercise their dogs somewhere else. thanks Meredith

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The extension to the dog park is scheduled for 2019/2020. One of the key points to consider will be how the extension can best cater for the clubs requirements compared to the general public requirements. Also to be considered will be issues around specific areas for small and larger dog varieties.

The reserves bylaw is under review in 2018 and issues around the activities of the dog park need to be considered as well as the linkage to the animal control bylaw.

[100004] - Mrs Helena Anderson

Address: 34 Durrell Way Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 34 Durrell Way Rolleston

Phone (day): 0212948862

Phone (mobile): 0212948862

Email: helenagnys@hotmail.com

Submission

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

I agree that we need a more extensive footpath network in Rolleston, especially with such a large population of children in the area. One particular area of concern is Tennyson Street. With the additional retail etc going into Tennyson Street this road is just getting busier. The corner of Tennyson and Bronte Way is very dangerous to cross and there is no option to walk on one side as due to the water race there is no footpath. In addition to a footpath here, I feel a pedestrian crossing also needs to be looked at for this corner, or at the very least a halfway stopping point in the road to assist crossing.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	A footpath on the east side of Tennyson St is part of the 2023/24 Tennyson St Upgrade Stage 3 Project in the draft 2018 LTP. Crossing points will be considered at that time.

[100005] - Mrs Caroline Burnett

Address: 24 Blue Jean Ave Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 02102916050

Phone (mobile): 02102916050

Email: gc.burnett@hotmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I disagree with the above proposal. I also think that the council should only support a small core group of halls, reserves and community centres as rates are already very expensive and seem to be constantly increasing. The council needs to be mindful re the nice to have and the need to have.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Again a nice to have. I am not sure why there seems to be such a rush for the above proposal in terms of construction times. Perhaps if the council just saved a bit each year for such projects until they had enough it may be less of an impact on our rates.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

I disagree with this proposal. Perhaps a private/public funding model may lessen the impact on rates and ongoing maintenance costs.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I agree to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

Totally disagree.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I agree.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

I disagree. People make decisions where they will live and know what facilities are available when making these decisions.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

I disagree.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29) I agree.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

The ratepayer cannot keep paying for ongoing rises year on year.

As a general comment in regards to essential infrastructure. I support a light rail commuter service between Rolleston and ChCh. The existing bus service is like going on a con tiki tour ie stops at many points and takes too long to reach central ChCh. The volume of road traffic makes the timing of the service not that reliable.

In regards to the bus express service: it is quite slow and does not offer a great service on the return journey back to Rolleston in terms of timing and bus scheduling. It takes easily over 75mins for the journey with current traffic volumes and the number of stops to pick people up. The bus time tabling for the return journey offers the latest available express service at 4.55pm leaving the central bus interchange. This is a ludicrous time as many office workers don't finish work until after this time. The next available bus from the central city - a non express service - to Rolleston after the above 4.55pm service is offered at 5.30pm and interestingly takes a similar time for the journey back to Rolleston. This indicates to me the express bus service is not that express!

To encourage a more cohesive transport policy would seem a vital aspect of district planning and an essential part of the Selwyn District Council infrastructure programme. As such I think light rail would help achieve a more integrated transport approach.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments If we did not proceed with the aquatic development there would be increasing levels of unmet demand for the aquatic services. The demand already outstrips supply . In addition delays to the building would not necessarily reduce building costs but rather increase.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter's disagreement with this proposal is acknowledged. Council has conducted a thorough needs analysis around this facility which has shown a demand in the community for such a facility.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for chlorination on a risk based approach. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all

supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-

products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for

livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	If we did not proceed with the Aquatic redevelopment there would be increasing levels of unmet demand for this service going forward . In addition the building costs are unlikely to reduce with delays.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter's opposition to the proposal to develop new community facilities in Leeston, Hororata and Prebbleton is noted.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

The submitter is in support

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate**Staff Recommended Action**

That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

No comments made.

Topic: Public transport incl Light Rail - Assets**Staff Recommended Action**

That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

The Rolleston 85 Express Service was introduced at the beginning of 2018. Its configuration is being honed by Environment Canterbury based on customer feedback. The Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee that includes Selwyn, is developing a 30 Year Public Transport Business Case for the area. It is unlikely a Light Rail System will be justifiable based on projected demand in the short to medium term compared to bus based services.

[100006] - Rosalie Snoyink

Address: Glentunnel Not provided Glentunnel

Postal Address: Not provided

Phone (day): Not provided

Phone (mobile):

Email: rsnoyink@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

Redirected from Water Supply Bylaw Review -

I returned from holiday this week to find a letter from you informing me that the Malvern Hartleys Rd water supply is to be chlorinated.

I am vehemently opposed to chlorine treatment and request the Council cease this `upgrade` and continue with the UV system.

Your letter states there has been no contamination transgressions therefore our family sees no need to chlorinate.

It is wrong that those of us who have been concerned about water pollution, especially over the last 20yrs as a result of unmanaged dairy farming and intensive agriculture, now face the cost of cleaning up water. We mourn the fact that it is now not safe to swim in most of the rivers, streams and lakes in Selwyn, a shocking heritage for Council decision makers. Please don't add to the list of transgressions by chlorinating our water.

Rosalie Snoyink Glentunnel

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100007] - Matt & Findabair Joynes

Address: Not provided Not provided Not Provided

Postal Address: Not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: matt.joynes@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

Redirected from the Water Supply Bylaw Review:

We would like to object to the proposed chlorination and/or fluoridation of the Whitecliffs water supply for the following reasons:

- 1) We are subjected to more and more chemicals in our daily lives and as a family, we make an effort to reduce the amount of exposure as a lifestyle choice. By adding these chemicals to the supply restricts our choices and freedoms further and potentially increases our living costs should we need to seek other sources of fresh water.
- 2) A number of studies link chlorine to various cancers, such as bladder, rectal, and breast cancers. With the addition of fluoride, there is the worry of dental and skeletal fluorosis reported in some studies. While the proposed amounts added to the water may be within currently recognized safe levels, I'm concerned about long-term exposure to my family - especially with all the other chemical sources we are subjected to on a daily basis.
- 3) The change in taste is obvious and we have always been fortunate to have great tasting water in our township. With the recent chlorination of our water supply, the taste has become noticeably unpleasant. -----

Many thanks for your time, Matt & Findabair Joynes

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Fluoridation is not proposed at this time. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a

refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier

approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100008] - Annette Collins

Address: Glentunnel Glentunnel Not provided

Postal Address: Glentunnel

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: collinspaul270@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

Redirected from the Water Supply Bylaw Review:

Dear Sir

I am writing in response to the councils decision to permanently chlorinate our perfectly good water supply!! I am 66yrs old and have lived in Glentunnel all my life and have had no health problems from our water. I was brought up on water race water as a child and have been using the water scheme since it was introduced. I would rather boil water occasionally or have it shock treated when needed than have permanent chlorination. Chlorinated water dries out my skin and I develop a very itchy rash!!

I am asking the Council to defer its decision for a year and then consult with the community by public meeting before making any decision on permanent chlorination if they think it is still necessary.

Thanking you in anticipation

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100009] - Mr Greg Bluck

Address: Not provided Not provided Not provided

Postal Address: Not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: greg.bluck@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

Redirected from the Water Supply Bylaw Review:

We want you to stop the chlorination and fluoridisation in our water. Here are our reasons why we do not need fluoridisation: A report from the world's oldest and most prestigious medical journal, the Lancet, has officially classified fluoride as a neurotoxin; "known to cause developmental neurotoxicity in Human Beings" in the same category as arsenic, lead, mercury, toluene, DDT and PCBs. [1]

In the Lancet Report "untested chemicals should not be presumed to be safe to brain development, and chemicals in existing use and all new chemicals must therefore be tested for developmental neurotoxicity."

We would prefer to be notified as to and when needed to boil our water. Chlorination and fluoridation of our water is not good for our microfauna (septic tanks) and flora, it is bad for the animals who drink our water, we are sick of smelling 'swimming pool' water in our kitchen water, shower water, and toilet water, and the taste of the water when drinking is just foul and makes me heave.

As a council, it is your responsibility to listen to your citizens' voices.

Kind regards, Greg, Anne, George, William, Henry, Thomas, Harriet Bluck. [1] Neurobehavioural effects of developmental toxicity. Lancet (2014), [https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lanneur/PIIS1474-4422\(13\)70278-3.pdf](https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lanneur/PIIS1474-4422(13)70278-3.pdf)

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100010] - Mr Jared Gallagher

Address: Whitecliffs Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: jazmology@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

Redirected from the Water Supply Bylaw Review:

I'm writing to submit my concerns over the recent chlorination of our water supply.

Firstly I'm dismayed at the lack on communication and consultation around this significant change in our community. To my mind our representatives on the council have let us down in allowing this to be implemented without warning. We discovered that our water had been chlorinated through noticing that it smelled funny and tasted horrible. After a number of my neighbours has phoned the council we have seen a letter that was posted to some households in our township, but not all - this raises further concerns of the manner in which decisions are being made in our local council - did council attempt to sneak this change in hoping nobody would notice? or is our council just incompetent at communicating to the wider community?

My first concern for having our water supply chlorinated is really in relation to the need - is there a need for this really? if so lets see the evidence clearly communicated please! If the water supply is adequately treated using the UV treatment system installed then why the need to also Chlorinate? Chlorination tastes crap, and smells bad! If our water needs chlorination, firstly tell us why, then I could potentially accept that treating it with both UV and Chlorine may be necessary. As it stands it seems to me that the council is really just covering their own backs rather than providing for their community here.

I am further concerned to hear that our water supply could be Fluoridated. My Children have brushed their teeth from infancy using fluoridated toothpaste on advice from our health practitioners and have really healthy teeth - we are really not supportive of the fluoridation of our water supply and would prefer council not to meddle where is un requested and unwanted.

If the water supply is at risk due to contaminants then please deal with the cause first! If a small number of individuals are not fencing their stock from the river upstream of our water supply, or if there are other reasons for the water supply contamination the council should be dealing with these causes first, before directly affecting the quality of the drinking water for a large number of other members of our communities.

Finally I am concerned over the potential extra costs this may cause for us living in this district. My family and I moved here and installed a wastewater treatment system that is quite sensitive to chemicals - this was a major cost to us (over \$20000 in including installation), we know of many other people with similar systems. We are not aware of whether chlorine will impact this system or not - but would hope our council consider finding out whether this change in our water supply might impact these systems. On top of this we are concerned that we'll need to purchase water filtration systems for our property which has an initial cost and ongoing costs that were not present while our water was fresh tasting. If council perseveres with chlorination then I'd like them to consider providing grants for water filtration systems and wastewater treatment systems that are adversely affected by the introduction of chlorine into the water supply.

Thank you for taking the time to hear this submission,

Regards,

Jared Gallagher

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Fluoridation is not currently proposed. Septic tanks are unlikely to be impacted by the proposed low dose of chlorine. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudey has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour

problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the

following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100011] - Ms Jodie Thompson

Address: Whitecliffs Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: jodiethompson2002@yahoo.co.nz

Submission

Submission

Redirected from the Water Supply Bylaw Review

Dear Sir/Madam,

I strongly appose the decision the Selwyn District Council has made to Chlorinate the Whitecliffs township water supply. With the understanding the current UV filter systems are more than adequate.

Selwyn Gets Ready has proven to be a very efficient way to communicate with residents should there be a problem with the water and I personally are happy to boil water for as long as it takes to fix the problem.

Whitecliffs is a growing community with a lot of young families and babies a lot of locals have expressed their concern around how the chlorine will effect their families/pets health ?

We also have a byolitics sewage treatment system in which no chemicals can enter. Is chorine okay? As a single income family we cannot afford to buy a filter and have long term plans to grow organic vegetables for market with concerns about how the chlorine will effect this the quality of our produce ?

With a number of live stock having access to the river up stream from the intake, is enough being done to ensure farms are adequately fenced? The lack of consultation around the councils decision to chlorinate the water is disappointing, there are a lot of unanswered questions..

Yours Faithfully Jodie Thompson

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Septic tanks are unlikely to be impacted by the proposed low dose of chlorine. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a

refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier

approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100012] - Mr Liz Weir

Address: Coalgate Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: liz_weir@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

Redirected from the Water Supply Bylaw Review

I recently spoke to staff by phone about the water treatment upgrade of The Malvern Hills Hartley Road Water supply. I raised concerns about chlorine in the drinking water and expressed my opposition to permanent chlorination.

I also expressed my disappointment that there had been no consultation around this issue - an issue about which residents feel very strongly. You assured me that I could have my say by submitting on the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan by March 21st 2018, yet I find that letters have been delivered, basically saying chlorination is a fait accompli. By the way, I am writing this letter to you on Tuesday March 20 and no letter has been delivered to my house in Whitecliffs.

Delivering letters 2 days before submissions on the Long Term Plan are due, gives people no time to express their views.

Since I spoke with you, more Whitecliffs/Glentunnel residents have expressed their concern about this proposal. There is a great deal of anger because there has been NO consultation whatsoever. It seems that the council has made this decision unilaterally and has only sent out an information letter, because there have been complaints. The information letter gives no information about 'having your say' and it seems that the views of the residents affected are deemed irrelevant.

I understand that chlorination of drinking water is crucial in third world countries and areas of high water contamination but the water in the Whitecliffs Hills is not in that category. If there is e.coli in the water from agricultural run-off, get the polluters of the water to curtail their practises, don't penalise an entire community for something they did not contribute to.

You suggested to me that if the taste of the water is unpalatable, than residents could buy filters. Was it pure coincidence that a week before the Malvern Hills Hartleys Road - Treatment Upgrade was announced, that a full page ad appeared for a commercial enterprise, promoting water filters that could eliminate chlorine? Is it a coincidence that Malvern residents are now receiving phone calls from companies promoting chlorine treatment filters?

Why did Oakleys Plumbing business know about the chlorination plan before affected residents? Water filters are expensive and place a further financial burden on rate-payers that is unnecessary.

Once again : Residents of Coalgate/Glentunnel and Whitecliffs do not want their drinking water supply chlorinated. In your letter you state that the upgraded UV treatment system has been successful with no transgressions being detected.

On behalf of Whitecliffs residents, I am asking the council to defer chlorination and monitor the new UV treatment system to see if it is sufficient to provide potable drinking water. Every resident that I have spoken with, reiterated that they would prefer to receive the (infrequent) boil water notices, rather than have the drinking water permanently chlorinated.

It would be wise for the council to undertake an open, proper consultation process with affected communities before any further action is taken. We have a large hall in Glentunnel where people would welcome the opportunity to discuss this upgrade with you and your team.

Sincerely, Liz Weir

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Thank you for your submission. There has been some confusion around Bylaw consultation and the LTP consultation which closed at a later time frame. The bylaw submission has been redirected to the LTP process. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudey has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but

consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The

Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100013] - Lynette and Kevin Gallagher

Address: Coalgate Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

Redirected from the Water Supply Bylaw Review:

Malvern Hill Hartley Road Treatment Upgrade

We would like to make a submission to the Selwyn District Council regarding the proposed 'Amended Water Supply Bylaw' for the Malvern Hills Hartley Road treatment upgrade.

While we applaud the use of the UV treatment filtration upgrade, we wish to express our opposition to chlorination of the water supply.

We propose that firstly instead of considering chlorination treatment, that Water Services identify sources of contamination rather, and 'fix' the source of the problem rather than use chlorination as a treatment. Clean undistincted drinking water has long been a cherished right for Cantabarians.

And secondly that the UV treatment be trialed for a longer period of time to assess its effectiveness, then be reviewed.

If avenues to trace any source of contamination are not successful, then an informed open public consultation process should be followed through. For many New Zealanders this is of significant concern and not to be taken without robust transparent public consultation (which we saw admirably recently with the Christchurch City Council's temporary decision to chlorinate). We have not seen any sign in the media of Selwyn councils decision making process.

While other communities in NZ have decided to use chlorination there is a growing body of evidence that documents side effects and risks to public health. Are Counsellors informed of recent scholarly articles that point out newly recognised dangers of chlorinated water? These are from reputable sources such as: The World Health organization, Scientific America, The Journal of National Cancer institute, Oxford.

We find it ironical that in this weeks Selwyn News, there is a large full page advert for chlorine water filters for 'clean, safe water', that 'effectively removes chlorine from your water'!

We understand the Selwyn council is also considering adding fluoride to the water supply in the future. Again credible research indicates this is also a health risk, we propose that the council consider other available options rather than subject the whole population to this

Yours faithfully

Lynette and Kevin Gallagher

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Fluoridation is not currently proposed. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudey has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a

refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier

approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100014] - Mr Colin Morris

Address: Coalgate Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: colinmorris146@gmail.com

Submission

Redirected from the Water Supply Bylaw Review

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100015] - Mrs Sue During

Address: 366 Hawkins Road Hororata 7544

Postal Address: PO Box 27, Hororata, Canterbury

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: sundown@xtra.co.nz

Submission

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

I would like to see my street (and township) no longer flood please. To my knowledge, SDC have been sued now twice (and lost) due to the lack of infrastructure (and/or very badly planned strategies) and this urgently needs to be addressed as it has occurred way to often and way too long.

The flood last July has damaged my already earthquake damaged home. I live with dampness, condensation and smell, I lost all my floor coverings and every time it rains we are anxious.

I have video taken over a period of a few years, demonstrating that the water comes into my road (Hawkins Road) via another creek and the current strategy of re directing the water uphill into an often already overflowing river is quite hole in head!

I am happy to provide the videos to show.

I would also like to submit that I am fed up paying my rates for projects and entities that are not using them for their purpose. E-Can for example are running taxi companies for the disabled while I buy my drinking water, and I cannot swim or even let my dogs go into the rivers!

E-Can = Environmental Canterbury! Yet Canterbury's environment has taken a very huge loss over the past twelve years I have lived in Hororata.

Unless the money allocated to E-Can goes to the environment, then it is nothing short of fraud for the ratepayers. I am not prepared to fund outside businesses like taxis or bottling plants and am very frustrated that it is acceptable that I do and I have no say.

Personally, I have struggled financially paying my rates due to the earthquake, as I lost my career, my husband is injured and my home is no longer of the value it was and what my rates are set on. Actually, my home is worthless thanks to the flood being the last nail. I currently sit in an uninsured home, near a fault line and in a township prone to flooding. It's distressing.

I am paying \$50 per week to catch up, but SDC still continue to raise them - and for other townships to flourish.

To also have this money proportioned out to projects like cycle ways and aquatic centers while my residential street is susceptible to flooding due to the infrastructure we are in turn charged for is insulting and very unfair.

Topic: Flooding issues - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Council has provided budget over the next ten years to address flooding issues across the district. Funding will be prioritised based on project merit. Staff would be keen to see any video footage you may have and discuss flooding concerns with you.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter's situation has been referred to our rates team.

[100016] -Institute of Applied Human Servi Dr. OLIVE WEBB

Address: 91 CORDYS RD HORORATA 7544

Postal Address: PO BOX 69 Hororata

Phone (day): 033180880

Phone (mobile): 0212256633

Email: owebbnz@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Yes. I would like the Hororata Project brought forward. The community is ready, willing and organised for fundraising and consultation. We wish to proceed as soon as possible

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	Hororata Community Facility: The submitter wishes to bring forward the Hororata community Facility development. Currently this project has been timed for commencement in 2022/23 and completion in 2023/24 as it is reliant on significant funding from the community that is yet to be fully raised. The proposed funding plan also has Council contributions in terms of reserves development contributions and a grant. Therefore bringing the project forward would impact on cash flows in accounts and the general rate. There is loan component that may need to be increased if the community funding does not eventuate and this would effect both the magnitude and timing for the rate to cover this (whether it is a local or district rate).

[100017] -Lake Coleridge Tourism Group Lyn Nell

Address: c/- Middle Rock 1160 Coleridge Road 7572

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: nell@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Camping: Conducts a review of the camping regulations to make it easier for potential host sites to accommodate those with self-contained vehicles. At present only 1 vehicle per site allowed, any more and onerous regulations kick in. Too restrictive for conscientious visitors with onboard showering and toileting facilities. Would enhance the visitor experience in our area if we could legally accommodate more of these visitors.

Recycling: Consider extending or supporting existing recycling efforts on this area. A limited private scheme operates on a subscription basis, but it is expensive.

Community efforts: Support community efforts to campaign for extended cellphone coverage throughout the Coleridge basin. At present, only patchy in a growing recreational area.

Economic Development: Reinstate the small business oriented workshops held in the past. Growing need for more IT related courses. Without subsidies, these industry related courses are expensive for course participants.

Tourism: Extend the hours of employment for Selwyn's Tourism support staff. Currently only Elizabeth Pitcorn for two days per week. Tourism is of growing economic importance within Selwyn and the Council's tourism presence needs to increase accordingly.

Warden position: Consider appointing a warden's position for the Coleridge Basin over summer. Ongoing problems with freedom camping, rubbish and general compliance constantly frustrates locals taking up considerable Council time to resolve.

Road maintenance: Take a more routine approach to road maintenance in this area. The latest floods exposed blocked culverts and poorly aligned water tables along Coleridge Road in particular.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

We would like to support the building of a community centre on the Hororata Domain. A new community venue would support existing and new community events and the growing visitor presence in the area.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

We would like to support submissions for a complete rebuild of Leaches Rd between Hororata and Windwhistle. This is widely used road for local traffic, farm service vehicles and ski and general tourism traffic. It is in a bad state of repair and increasingly dangerous for overtaking vehicles.

We would like to submit for recycling services to be made available to the Windwhistle community.

We would like to support the renewal of the toilet block at Lake Coleridge Village.

With a growing tourism presence in the Coleridge region we would like to submit for more campervan dump stations.

Camping regulations: With increasing pressure for camping facilities in the Coleridge area we would like to submit that local body rules be reviewed to allow for less restrictive regulations for self contained vehicles parking on private property.

Cell Phone access. We would like to submit that the SDC support initiatives to improve cell phone coverage in the Coleridge area.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide a new community facility in Hororata is acknowledged.

Topic: Camping Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments The submitter's request to address regulations pertaining to camping activities on private land will not be addressed within the scope of the Responsible Camping Strategy that is being developed this year. It is recommended that the submitter be referred to the District Plan review process, preceded by a discussion to further develop and refine the request. It is also recommended that as the submitter has an interest in the management of public space within the Lake Coleridge area that they be invited to participate in the camping strategy consultation process .

Topic: Economic Development - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments The Selwyn District Council Economic Development Strategic Plan (currently under development) , is the business plan that can potentially accommodate Submission suggestions that include: 1) support community efforts for extended cellphone coverage throughout the district, 2) small business oriented workshops (including website/ IT), increased role of Council in visitor promotion activities.

Topic: Recycling facilities - Assets

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments Regarding recycling: A review of the current recycling method at Lake Coleridge is planned for 2018/19.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Sections of Leaches Rd justifiable for pavement reconstruction and/or resealing have been completed with others pending. A \$3.4 million project to fully widen

Leaches Rd in 2032/33 is currently in Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast.

Topic: Tourism Services - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	The Selwyn District Council Economic Development Strategic Plan (currently under development) , is the business plan that can potentially accommodate Submission suggestions that include: 1) support community efforts for extended cellphone coverage throughout the district, 2) small business oriented workshops (including website/ IT), increased role of Council in visitor promotion activities.

[100018] - Mr Harvey Polglase

Address: 119 Horndon Street Darfield 7510

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: harveypolglase@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

Darfield and Kirwee Wastewater: Given that the Darfield population is only projected to grow by 750 persons and that extensive discussion to date has concluded there is no need for a scheme, this item should be dropped. The annual \$73 sewerage investigation rate should be deleted.

Topic: Darfield & Kirwee Wastewater - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Council will provide an opportunity over the coming year for targeted feedback on the development of a reticulated wastewater network for Darfield and Kirwee. The current rate covers the cost of environmental monitoring and preliminary investigations.

[100019] -Selwyn Parenting Network Karla Gunby

Address: 646 Springston Rolleston Road Rolleston 7675

Postal Address: 646 Springston Rolleston Road

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0272292001

Email: enquiries@spn.org.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

SPN is supportive of a district wide rate to provide some equity between communities. We see the local community centre/hall as one of the corner-stones of the growing communities. It is essential they are maintained and we have a diverse range of facilities to use.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

The Selwyn pool has proved very popular with families throughout the year and SPN welcomes the extension.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

While this would be a fantastic facility to have, it comes as a nice to have and we would be conscious of the rate rise for Rolleston families. Spreading the rates across the district is our preferred option.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

SPN sees this as extremely important and an investment in our local communities. Small organisations have been growing post earthquake and have been reliant on funding outside of the district to get them up and running e.g. Rata, Lotteries. This is in contrast to Christchurch City Council that is able to invest significantly in local community groups. Investment in this fund will be beneficial to local communities and we support this initiative.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

SPN sees the investment in walking and cycling tracks as beneficial to the local communities. We would support this initiative.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

SPN would like to advocate for a social procurement policy so that the councils social outcomes can be met through its spend. This means engaging more with local groups to do work that can provide a means of income, providing more apprenticeships and opportunities for young people in our district.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter's support for this project being conditional on the application of a district wide rate for the facility is acknowledged. The facility needs analysis demonstrated a community demand and need for the facility from a geographical area beyond Rolleston.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support.

Topic: Social initiatives / issues - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments Submitter advocates for greater "social procurement" by Council (sometimes referred to as social purchasing). This suggests Council should give further consideration for buying goods and services from social enterprises, with the intention of making a positive social impact, be it job creation for a historically

disadvantaged community, or reducing carbon emissions etc. Some consideration related to this submission sits with Finance Team as well as consideration within economic development priorities.

[100020] - Mrs Carole Logan

Address: 644 Weedons Road R.D. 8 7678

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 3473042

Phone (mobile): 027 606 2035

Email: Clogan_nz@yahoo.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? I would like to comment on the foster Dog Park. This park is far too small for the amount of dogs now living in and around Rolleston. It is regularly over crowded and dogs are in dangerous situations, which puts people in dangerous situations due to the smallness of it in relation to the amount of dogs often there. The Selwyn Dog Club are also often using the park, and it is difficult to keep dogs away from their training area and sometimes dogs can't be exercised there as it is shut due to them using it. I think it is well overdue for another, larger dog park to be set up for general use. That way people could go there when the dog club are using the park too. Please consider this in your plans as soon as possible. Dogs are often uncontrolled and unruly and fights occur which put people as well as dogs at risk. A larger area would take some pressure off this situation.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The extension to the dog park is scheduled for 2019/2020. One of the key points to consider will be how the extension can best cater for the clubs requirements compared to the general public requirements. Also to be considered will be issues around specific areas for small and larger dog varieties.

 The reserves bylaw is under review in 2018 and issues around the activities of the dog park need to be considered as well as the linkage to the animal control bylaw.

[100021] - Mr Campbell Tuer

Address: 75 Scotts Rd Hororata 7544

Postal Address: Box 44 Hororata

Phone (day): 0272483462

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) It is fine if it helps keep rates down.
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) I think entry to the pool is too cheap and more should be raised this way than through rates.
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer? (see pages 16–17) I think it is unsustainable to keep raising rates above the rate of inflation.
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) I think our drinking water is of a very good standard.
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21) I oppose the water races continuing. There is only a small number of people who require them and already a lot of people who don't require them are forced to pay. It is only a viable source of water for those that use them because they are already heavily subsidized by others. The water races should be shut and the water retained in the rivers.
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) I think there are good facilities already in a short drive from most places we need to look at ways to not increase pressure on rates.
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) Maybe some of the office that were shut could be used again.
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) These projects should not be done until road maintenance is improved.
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments This submitter proposes an increase in admission charges. Council will note that the fees and charges are annually reviewed and benchmarked against other similar populations / facilities in these reviews.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter's disagreement with the proposed indoor court proposal is acknowledged. This submission is not clear on whether or not the facility is desirable or needed but makes clear a concern re the level of rate rise proposed.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Thank you for your acknowledgement of our high water quality. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This

approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. "During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ." This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] "Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are

present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community.

These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter comments that there are already adequate facilities in close proximity to these locations and Council should look to save rates. There is sound rationale and needs assessment work that supports the development of facilities to service these communities. The Hororata Hall was damaged in the earthquake and is not fit for purpose. The proposal involves the provision of a new multi-purpose facility to serve both community and recreation needs being located on the Domain. The proposal is supported by a feasibility study and is contingent on a significant contribution of community raised funds which will reduce the rate impact. There is currently no facility servicing Leeston which is a growing town that has a deficit in community space. A needs assessment identified the need and demand for a facility for Leeston. The Hall at Prebbleton is aging and does not provide for the range of community and recreation uses that would be expected in a community of this size. A new facility is planned to address this situation.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Darfield and Leeston Library spaces were previously used for staff accommodation but have been re-purposed and are no longer available.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

The submitter would prefer priority to road maintenance.

[100022] - Miss Sally Mckay

Address: 35 Chert Street Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 35 Chert Street Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: 8osallyannemckay@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Absolutely against introducing any chemical into our wonderful water supply. If the wells need to be secured then do this but do not permanently introduce chlorine into our water. Instead work harder to protect our drinking water and all other waterways

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Rate increases need to be set to inflation levels - 40% increase over 10 years is ridiculous and getting beyond many people. Council your residents demand for you to be more responsible with our money.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	No comments made.

[100023] - Mr Paul Hamilton

Address: 4 Dorothys Way, West Melton Christchurch 7671

Postal Address: 4 Dorothys Way West Melton

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: pjh_nz@hotmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

If we are genuinely a community and not just a random collection of areas then this change makes sense.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

I and my family are avid swimmers so are strongly in favour of extensions and would love there to be a meaningful 50m or 33m lane swimming pool (which will have diverse use for other water activities).

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Ambivalent but if it does proceed it would seem to be more of a benefit to the Rolleston community so suggest a targeted rate for Rolleston rate payers.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I strongly suggest we do this to get ahead of potential water contamination issues that other parts of the country have suffered. I think science and common sense strongly supports the case for chlorination, and peoples taste preferences or facebook-pseudoscience based opinions (the main objections I have seen in the media) should be given less weight in the decision.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

I think the public good argument of water races is tenuous given the damage that mismanagement of water resources by commercial farming practices has caused. I'd like to see a more user pays focused approach rather than community pays.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Makes sense. Only danger I see with consolidation is putting a lot of power in fewer hands and creating nepotistic outcomes. If this can be recognized and mitigated (eg avoid long term appointments of people in the decision making process) then should be fine.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Makes sense, build for the future, with pragmatism, and avoid under-investment creating problems in the future.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

Strongly in favor of this in all regards, but wish the connections to Rolleston could be brought forward from 2026/27/28 as this is essentially a meaningless target with no accountability. Could community volunteer work bring these dates forward??

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for an extension to SAC is noted. The suggestion of a 50 metre pool was initially explored but not progressed due to significant capital and ongoing operational costs as well as the recognition that this facility is primarily intended as a local and regional facility as part of a Canterbury network rather than a national / international facility. Some of the earlier business case and rationale will be updated and shared again with Council. his submitter introduced suggestion of a 33 metre pool and this is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter's neutral position on the indoor court project is acknowledged. The local Rolleston rate is the preferred funding option based on the view that the Rolleston community would receive most of the benefit. The needs analysis for the facility demonstrated that considerable demand for use of this facility exists outside Rolleston.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and your support for chlorination.

Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach.

The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. “We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water

Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted along with the recommendation that the Community Grants Panel membership decisionmaking avoids nepotism and refreshes the Panel membership at regular intervals.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments In favour but requests Rolleston to West Melton (2026/27), Rolleston to Springston (2027/28), Rolleston to Burnham (2028/29) projects be brought forward. The projects that proceed these have a higher priority based on expectation, demand and coordination opportunities with other strategic projects

e.g. Stage 2 of the Southern Motorway. The suggestion to use voluntary/community labour is not appropriate give the size and complexity of these types of projects.

[100024] - Mr George Anderson

Address: 2 Riverside Lane Tai Tapu 7672

Postal Address: PO Box 25 Tai Tapu

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021 244 9274

Email: george@littlebrew.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) Support District wide rate would see this as a more logical way of allowing planning across the district, planning capex and operations based on needs and not having underutilised facilities being subsidised across the District. Greendale and Rhodes Park for example you would think are community facilities now competing for the same business.
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) Fully support all expenditure on extension of this fantastic community facility.
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) Support district-wide rate this will be a hub used by a broad range of Selwyn residents.
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) Would support evidence review and research on impact of irrigation schemes on residential water supply.
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21) Support proposed rate scheme. Support public good of maintaining waterways that support habitats for wildlife in public areas.
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23) Fully support proposed community grants allocation and proposed scheme.
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) Support these developments. Would support activities that provide additional income like co-working spaces, private cafe operator (Prebbleton), social enterprise utilisation and small business utilisation of kitchen spaces or other facilities.
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) Existing parking is substandard and you're building a district from the ground up so if the space is needed to house staff its a necessary cost.
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) Support the strategy but would see a missing inter-agency piece of work with CCC to manage the connection between Prebbleton and Hornby that is pretty dangerous even as an experienced cyclist. Active Transport to Work should be a driving force in the strategy and guiding decisions on priorities.
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? Would support investigation of projects that could contribute towards a coherent main street in Tai Tapu that supports mixed use.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the extension of the Selwyn Aquatics Centre is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter's position re support for a district wide rate for the Indoor court project is acknowledged. No comment is made on re support for the facility but it is clear the submission suggests that the facility will act as a hub for use by a wide section of the Selwyn community. This position supports the needs analysis conducted around this facility and its strategic positioning in both Selwyn and the greater Canterbury facility network.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council monitors for potential catchment impacts on drinking water. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk

assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include

the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for

livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged. The submitter would like to see options explored that would increase revenue for the facilities. As part of developing the plan and financial model for each facility Council will look for opportunities to reduce the net operating costs.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Council's Strategy includes how Selwyn and Christchurch City's main cycling networks will connect together. The City Council will be developing its "South Express" Cycleway to connect to Templeton and Hornby, including to the existing Rail Trail starting south of Hornby. The Greater Christchurch Partnership is promoting active transport as part of its travel demand initiatives.

Topic: Township Planning AND / OR District Plan Review - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Thank you for your submission. Planning staff support the points raised in your submission however the work programme for the Strategy & Policy team does not currently include the development of a Tai Tapu town centre master plan, which would include workstreams to investigate mixed use development, including township coherence. This work would likely be delayed at least until after the District plan Review has been completed and other workstreams have been prioritized.

[100025] -Canterbury basketball Association Mr Paul Duggan

Address: 13A Bishopdale Court Christchurch 8041

Postal Address: PO Box 16604 Hornby Christchurch

Phone (day): 021 520 598

Phone (mobile): 021 520 598

Email: ceo@canterbury.basketball

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

The Canterbury basketball Association is responsible for the administration of basketball within the greater Christchurch area, including Selwyn. At present, basketball is one of the fastest growing sports in new Zealand, and by 2020 it will be the most popular High School sport in the country, should present trends continue. In Canterbury, it is already the most popular, with over 12% of all high school students playing in organised basketball competitions. The Selwyn Junior basketball club has started operating in 2017, and has entered 5 teams in CBA club competitions in 2018. The number of teams participating in the Selwyn Primary schools competition has increased from 10 teams in 2014 to 33 in 2017. At present there is a distinct lack of indoor facilities for basketball in both Christchurch and Selwyn, and this results in teams playing very short games (12 minute running clock halves), and some schools missing out due to a lack of capacity to accommodate teams. Basketball would use a multi court facility extensively, both after school and on weekends. The multi court facility would enable easier coordination of referees and coaches for competitions, and also enable local and regional tournaments to be hosted at a single venue. Such a facility would also enable the CBA to run a Midnight basketball program in Rolleston for at-risk youth, similar to what we run in Aranui.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The Canterbury basketball Association support for this facility is acknowledged. The submission supports the needs analysis for this facility demonstrating rapid growth in basketball demand in Selwyn and the lack of facilities which is a significant inhibitor for increasing participation and innovative programs (such as "midnight basketball") particularly supporting youth involvement . The multi-court proposal for this facility provides a potential for servicing both local demand within Selwyn and wider Canterbury regional indoor facility shortages and Canterbury basketball will be a significant user group for this facility.

[100026] -1969 Mr Julian Bowden

Address: 68 Crofton Road Harewood 8051

Postal Address: 68 Crofton Road

Phone (day): 0274300018

Phone (mobile):

Email: juliansophieemily@hotmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) On behalf of Mainland Football we would like to support the proposal as outlined in the LTP document. Mainland football is responsible for the delivery of football to the community for the area covering Ashburton through to Nelson. The proposal of adding indoor courts to the Foster Park venue we believe would add real value to the wider Selwyn community by giving its residents access to a quality sports venue. Mainland Football has the responsibility to also deliver the game of Futsal. This sport is one of the fastest growing sports in the country. Especially in the youth sector. Mainland Football is always looking for multi court venues as we struggle to cope with the increased demand from players. A facility like the on proposed for Foster park would allow us to grow the game in the Selwyn district by working alongside the local club and schools to develop Futsal opportunities. It also increases the ability to run Tournaments and Festivals where families and communities can come together. It would also create an environment where sports could collaborate to provide programs and products that would give more opportunities to be active in more sports. With regards to funding options we would be in support of the Councils preferred option.
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The support for the Indoor court facility from Mainland football is acknowledged. The growth if the game of futsal (indoor football) has been dramatic nationwide and demand within the Selwyn community has been demonstrated in the needs analysis conducted around this facility. The facility would provide Mainland Football with the ability to provide both local and regional competition/ tournaments and festivals within Selwyn. The Selwyn United football club is attempting to position itself with mainland football as one of the key Futsal delivery agencies in the Mainland Region (Nelson to Ashburton).

[100027] -n/a Mr Paul Robinson

Address: 77 Tramway Road Kirwee 7543

Postal Address: P O Box 274 Kirwee 7543

Phone (day): 021 277 2690

Phone (mobile): 021 277 2690

Email: paul.robinson@helloworld.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

No

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Seems a good idea to have a decent community asset so that's all good.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Prefer option 3. In our location we should be able to utilise another SDC asset at West Melton so see no real need to pay for a facility we would not use greatly

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Chlorination is highly volatile subject. Yes that some should be based on assessment but surely the main issue is contamination of waterways by effluent? Personal choice will be to explore de- chlorination filters shuld anyone not be keen on the concept. I don't know enough about it all. Similar to the argument to 1080...for and against will be strong.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

No. Should be user pays. We have 2 races via our property and we are required to maintain them for others to enjoy? really?

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

No problem

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Yes. Prebbleton is too close to Rolleston to warrant facilities? Why is Kirwee never mentioned here? There no commercial space being available with growing developments...why?

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

If its needed and justified sure.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

support any external cycleway and walkway in the region

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Yes. Living very close to the centre of Kirwee on Rural Lifestyle land that cannot be easily sub-divided under the current plan. We have other properties further west of our location on Tramway Road that are well less in size than ours, next door is approx. 3-4 Acres yet other sections permitted for sub-division along Courtenay Road and between 2-4 km away from the township are approved for 2 acres lots and apparently further development on the rural block on the western side of Courtenay have been earmarked for sub-division yet our property despite being much closer to the township carries a different zoning which makes application for subdivision into say 2 x lots of 2.5 acres seemingly difficult or at discretion of SDC.

Bearing in mind the extension of the Kirwee Reserve which will literally be across the road from us and the fact that SDC purchased the old Plantation block neighbouring the reserve for future growth of the Township I would like to think that our central location should be considered suitable for smaller lots consistent with Windsor Drive / Crozier Drive etc.

The location of a local Chicken Farm under commercial zoning should bear no relevance given there are residential sized lots far closer to that location than we are. The advice from SDC in the past to prepare a submission (which I was told could be at a cost of \$10,000) with little or no guidance to its possible success is unacceptable. Staff in planning seems extremely hesitant to provide any real guidance. Surely the vision has changed for the area to allow a consistent lot size across all sides of Kirwee especially given the proximity to the centre and its near facilities should be a fair consideration.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments The submission support of the Indoor court proposal is acknowledged. Support for the funding option around Rolleston ratepayers paying for the facility is also acknowledged. The needs analysis for this facility demonstrated that it would operate as a regional sports hub and utilised extensively by ratepayers outside Rolleston.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in

particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.” Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no

evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also

contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter does not believe that a facility is needed in Prebbleton because of proximity to Rolleston. The proposed Prebbleton Facility replaces an existing well-used hall but also provides the potential for a multi-purpose venue that will also service broader indoor recreational needs which cannot be met from facilities in Rolleston. The submitter mentions that Kirwee is not included. Kirwee has a hall/community centre that operates autonomously and services the Kirwee Community. The submitter would like to see commercial space made available as part of these facilities. The facilities can be designed to enable commercial use of spaces to generate income and this will be looked at as part of the project plans where appropriate.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support.

Topic: Township Planning AND / OR District Plan Review - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Thank you for your submission. It is noted that this is not a matter to be considered in the Long Term Plan however it is noted that the Selwyn District Plan Review will be considering rural and residential zone densities and growth of townships, including provisions for commercial activities, as matters in that review. Making a submission on the District Plan Review is the appropriate channel. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others.

[100028] - Mr Joshua Thomas

Address: 38 Broadbury Avenue Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: survent@orcon.net.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I think it's a good idea if the funding provides for necessary maintenance or a significant benefit to the local community and reasonable benefit to the wider community. Fundraising or local buy-in can also help bring a sense of ownership and pride, this is still a good option to provide funding.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Has Council considered increasing hours the pool is open to accommodate increased use? Over \$1m per lane seems a large investment, will the benefit really be worth that?

Will the price of admission be raised a little?

How about a child care service or lease for a child care provider?

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

I think the planning for this is a great idea. Can the money be more slowly saved via a trust so the impact on rates is more spread out? Plan for construction in 2023-2024.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

The money would be best spent on proactive maintenance and upgrades. I do not support chlorination unless there is a failure in the supply which needs treatment whilst the infrastructure is repaired/upgraded.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

If the facilities are needed, I support the proposal.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

\$2.7m is a lot for 385m². That's over \$7000 per sqm. No way a commercial build needs to cost that much.

Council is getting ripped of if they sign a contract for that. Commercial, including fit out, can be build for half of that.

Design needs to be cost efficient and the tender process must be competitive.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

I support increased cycleways within a township area. However a much smaller percentage of people will use these longer cycleways. There are roads already suitable and the \$5.5m investment will not bring about worthwhile outcomes for that much.

Maintenance costs are now shown and large vehicles will drive over them causing damage. Spend this money within townships!

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Looking forward to seeing development of the town square. Please make it more attractive than the Council buildings! They look like a jail. Someone needs to redesign the water tank towers, they look like security outposts.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Fees and charges associated with Council aquatics are reviewed annually. Latest review and increase occurred in November 2017. Review processes include benchmarking fees and charges against similar facilities and districts. This process will be continued with regular reviews and associated adjustments in fees and charges will be expected in outyears. Some limited investigation has previously occurred related to Council provision of limited childcare arrangements; the health and safety as well as other associated compliance is significant and associated costs have been deemed to significantly outweigh benefits.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments Submission support for the Indoor court proposal is acknowledged. The submission suggests delaying the building of the courts until 2013-24. The impact would be that the courts are built too late to meet the demand which is very current. The needs analysis demonstrated that the need is now and that that need will only grow over time. Sports such as Basketball, futsal, badminton, volleyball are currently very facility deficient already.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment

methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. “We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution

system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged. The requirement for these facilities has been demonstrated through needs assessments/feasibility studies.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The budget allowance is arguably generous but consideration during the design phase will need to be given to the lifting of part of the HQ accommodation complex to IL4 rating to meet requirements for the building to operate as a civil defence emergency operations centre. It is most likely that the build will be tendered.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is generally correct that the longer off road cycleways can be expensive compared to use however this has to be balanced against providing people a safe and healthier transport alternative who would not normally consider it if having to ride on the road. These types of projects align with the Government's transport and funding priorities. Council also has included in the 2018 LTP a \$400,000 per year discretionary township footpath extension programme so it is considered an appropriate balance has been achieved.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Rolleston Town Centre: The submitter wishes to ensure that an attractive development is created with the Rolleston Town Centre proposal. The Council has engaged a design team and prepared a scope for the project that we are confident will result in an attractive and functional outcome for this important development. The scope requires a highly distinctive design concept which sets the standard for the buildings and town centre as a whole. The design is to demonstrate: light and bright with clear visual connections, future proofed, sustainable, functional but nonetheless beautiful and to set a new development standard for public buildings in the Selwyn District.

[100029] - Mrs Carole Logan

Address: 644 Weedons Road Weedons 7678

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 3473042

Phone (mobile): 0276062035

Email: clogan_nz@yahoo.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? I would like to write with regard to the Rolleston Foster dog park. This park was never big enough from the day it was built! The population of Rolleston was around 10,000 or so at that time I beleive. As you know it is well over double that now. Originally there was talk that the neighbouring 5 acres could be added to expand the park, however this was sold to the education department for the high school. The dog park is also the grounds used by Selwyn dog training club and this means that several times a week only half of the dog park is able to be used by other dogs. I don't know how many dogs there are in Rolleston and its nearby surrounding areas but there are a lot! The dog park is regularly crowded with so many dogs there really isn't room for dogs to really stretch out safely. Many of the dogs there are uncontrolled and unruly. They have no dog etiquette and dogs can often be intimidating and aggressive to other dogs. This is a dangerous situation. It is not uncommon for there to be dog fights of varying degrees. Owners try to break these up potentially meaning getting bitten themselves. Dogs racing around in an area this size can lead to people being bowled over and I have seen this happen. Children are also often there and I shudder as it is a totally inappropriate place for them, but they come and we can't stop them. We can only make it as safe as possible for them. I therefore would like to see a second dog park built in Rolleston. This would take the pressure off the Foster dog park and give people a choice of where to take their dogs. Our current dog park is simply not big enough! A second dog park would also mean that when the park is in use by the dog

club there there is a viable alternative for other residents dogs to use and play in during the times when the park is closed for their events at some weekends as well as for training evenings. The dog park at Leeston is not a viable option. Apart from being too far away, a lot of Rolleston residents who have come from Christchurch have probably never been out that far, it is not upkept. The grass is usually so long it is difficult to walk in and little dogs would get lost! And it is very small. So we need a new dog park in Rolleston to cater for the increasing number of dogs living there and in the surrounding areas. It is a simple matter of numbers. Rolleston has well and truly outgrown the existing dog park. Can this please be added to the 10 year plan, hoping it won't take nearly that long.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The extension to the dog park is scheduled for 2019/2020. One of the key points to consider will be how the extension can best cater for the clubs requirements compared to the general public requirements. Also to be considered will be issues around specific areas for small and larger dog varieties.

The reserves bylaw is under review in 2018 and issues around the activities of the dog park need to be considered as well as the linkage to the animal control bylaw.

[100030] -Canterbury Volleyball Association Inc Mr George Williams

Address: C/- 75 Lyttleton Street, Somerfield Christchurch 8024

Postal Address: PO Box 33130 Barrington, Christchurch 8244

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0272259220

Email: president@cva.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) - NO
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) - NO
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) Volleyball is the number 2 sport for girls in Canterbury and number 5 overall, with about 3 times as many players as futsal or badminton. Canterbury Volleyball Association would like to offer our expertise on how an indoor facility can be set up to meet the needs of Selwyn volleyballers - both recreational and competitive. We have been involved with consultation on the Metro Sports Facility in Christchurch, and have several members of our committee with relevant expert knowledge and experience.
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) - NO
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21) - NO
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor Courts project is acknowledged. The submission points to the needs of volleyball in particular. The needs analysis for this facility identified the lack of volleyball facilities both in Selwyn and across the greater Christchurch region.

[100031] -Lincoln Badminton Incorporated Mr Peter Thomas

Address: 11B Sheridan Drive, Selwyn 7614

Postal Address: 11B Sheridan Drive, Rolleston Selwyn 7614

Phone (day): 021784524

Phone (mobile): 021784524

Email: petert@email.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) no

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) no

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Lincoln Badminton Inc is a local badminton club which has operated in the Lincoln community for 50 years. Originally running at the Lincoln High School gym, and then moving to the Lincoln Centre since it opened. With access to 5 courts at the new facility, it has enabled the club to expand to 130 members including 65 primary and high school children. Lincoln Badminton is the largest club in Canterbury and one of the largest in the South Island. It is no doubt that access to a good quality, well located and reasonably priced facility has contributed strongly to the clubs ability to grow and enjoy continued support of its members. We offer support to the proposal to build a multi-sport facility in Rolleston, as it would allow for the development of a successful badminton club in Rolleston. It should be noted that badminton is one of the few sports in that it can only be played indoors, so the growth of the sport is closely related to the availability of suitable facilities. Minor sports such as badminton simply could not exist were it not for shared facilities which are supported by councils and communities. It is essential that any new facility fully considers the widest range of potential needs and uses. Fortunately, badminton is quite easy to accommodate. We would welcome any further questions or comments you may have in relation to this submission.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) no

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21) no

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23) no

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) no

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) no

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) no

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? no

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments Support for the indoor Court proposal is acknowledged. The submission points to the specific needs of badminton and the success of current clubs particularly around the Lincoln events centre. The submission supports the needs analysis for the facility which pointed to the growth potential of badminton in Selwyn and the need for additional indoor facilities.

[100032] -Sport Canterbury Mr Kevin Collier

Address: 1 Brynley Street Christchurch 8140

Postal Address: P.O. Box 2606 Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 3735060

Phone (mobile): 0274959537

Email: kevin.collier@sportcanterbury.org.nz

Submission

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Council note the support within this submission for Selwyn Sports Trust as a Strategic Partner of Council. Consideration will be given for what sport and recreation activity, if any, is appropriate for consideration within Community Grants Programme.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Community Facilities: Sport Canterbury's support for the prioritized investment in facilities for sport and recreation and particularly the indoor court facility at Foster Park and Selwyn Aquatic Centre extension is acknowledged. As stated in the submission the indoor court project was identified as a priority in the

Canterbury Spaces and Places Plan – A Regional Approach to Facility Planning document as part of a wider Regional network of indoor sports courts.

District Wide Rating for Community Centres, Halls and Reserves: Sport Canterbury's support to move to a district wide approach for rating these activities is acknowledged. It is hoped that this will provide a mechanism to engender more consistent levels of service for facilities over time. The provision of new and improved facilities will go hand in hand with a more professional operating approach which will see a range of programmes that will increase access for all people in the community.

Community Grants Process: Sport Canterbury's support for the changes to the community grants process is noted. Sports and recreation groups will have the same access to these funds as any other community group.

Walking and Cycling Strategy: The support for investment in walking and cycling projects that will help to promote active and healthy lifestyles and reduce vehicle trips is noted.

Regional Funding Models: The Council would welcome further discussion on funding models for regional facilities alongside other partners and is keen to ensure that investment in facilities takes consideration of the regional context and is sustainable.

[100033] - Mrs Jessie John's

Address: 15 Maitland crescent Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 15 Maitland crescent Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 027331

Email: sheep010@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

I would like to see a 50m long pool or 2x25m pools

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	When preparing the business case for the SAC extension, consideration was given for a 50 metre pool. As part of a Canterbury wide network of pools, 25 metres for SAC was considered appropriate to meet the community demand and to efficiently manage the financial investment in aquatics.

[100034] - Mrs Lee Brehaut

Address: 560 Drain Road Doyleston 7682

Postal Address: 560 Drain Road RD 2 Leeston

Phone (day): 033244450

Phone (mobile): 027 695 66 44

Email: lee.brehaut@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I support this proposal

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

I support this proposal

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

I support the larger proposal if it will service the needs of different age groups, and physical and mental capabilities within the community. I hope that consultation regarding development and planning will involve Council approaching a wide range of organisations for their views.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I would prefer it to not be necessary to protect public health, however, I am concerned about the leaching that is happening and think it will be inevitable. If it comes to that, I would support this proposal

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

I support this proposal

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I support any simplification to the process. I would be interested to see the criteria to which applicants will be addressing. Please don't go down the track of a one size fits all model.

I worked for DIA in Community Development investigating and preparing Lotto applications for the funding committees to consider. In my experience a single application form is unlikely to cover all situations effectively and could defeat the purpose of combining the Community Grant schemes.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

I sure do! I am very disappointed to read the proposed new Community Centre for Leeston (2025/26) is to come after the renewal of community centers at both Hororata (2023/24) and Prebbleton (2020/21).

How much longer are the Leeston residents to be held to ransom by the influences surrounding the Leeston Rugby Clubrooms? When was the possibility of using the Rugby Clubrooms as a Community Centre first mooted? My understanding is that it was many years ago, and still Leeston has NO Community Centre. Now I read it is at least another seven years away. Why is this so? Why is Leeston behind those communities who at least have a community hall facility.

I get the impression that for some reason or other, unknown to me as a local ratepayer, the Leeston Township Committee appears not to see the development of a Community Centre as a priority. What influences are working behind the scenes that keep blocking such a project?

In the 10+ years I have lived in the Doyleston/Leeston area, I have seen way more development comparatively in Doyleston, by way of public facilities, than in Leeston.

A consistent group of people exercise twice weekly in a cold, depressing (private use) hall at Leeston where over colder months numerous fan heaters are used to support existing heating. The hall and its toilets are in a poor state and do nothing to encourage public use. There is nowhere else for this group to run from yet it epitomizes community involvement and provides social interaction and physical activity for 40 to 50 people. I cannot help but wonder what community based organisations are absent from Leeston due to either inappropriate or no suitable facilities from which to run.

What is needed to change the minds of Councillors to bring forward the community facility needs of Leeston?

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Long overdue. If the reception area is to be altered I hope there will always be someone at the counter to welcome visitors/ratepayers. Not a good look to have people waiting to be served and no one in attendance.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

I am looking forward to seeing a start made on the Doyleston/Leeston Walking/Cycleway. Having walked along the main road between these two areas I can say from experience, it was not pleasant, not one I would do by choice or expect others to do – definitely not children.

More people are wanting to cycle as a recreation and are looking for places to ride in safety, the distance between Leeston and Doyleston is an easy ride. But because of the berm camber, it is hard to walk well away from the road edge. I would never cycle on this road.

This cycleway is in the District Plan for 2018/2019 and I believe is an excellent project to enhance the live, work & play mantra of Selwyn District. I only hope this isn't another situation like that of the Community Centre saga. I ask that you give the residents of Leeston and Doyleston an indication of confidence that this project will be completed in the timeframe as planned.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor court project is acknowledged. The submission stresses the importance of a wide range of ratepayers being able to utilize the facility. The multi-court, multi surface proposal for the courts will provide for a wide range of uses and users from across the Selwyn community.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for this proposal should it be required. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission

[100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. "During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ." This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] "Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which

this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for

wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support is noted as well as suggestion that, in our intent to simplify the process, we should avoid the risk of the process becoming so narrow we unintentionally restrict consideration of new and different opportunities for funding.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter notes that there is currently no community facility serving the Leeston Community and suggests that this project should be brought forward in the 10 year programme. Staff concur with the submitter in terms of the demonstrated demand for a facility to meet the needs of the Leeston community. Currently this project has been timed for commencement in 2025/26 and completion in 2026/27. The timing has been assessed in terms of funding availability and in consideration of other investment decisions noting that Council cannot do everything in the first three years of the programme. The proposed funding plan includes Council contributions in terms of reserves development contributions and a grant as well as a significant loan component. Therefore bringing the project forward would impact on cash flows in accounts and the general rate as well as the timing and magnitude of the district and/or local rate.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action

That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Planning and design work on the Leeston to Doyleston Cycleway started in 2017. To avoid the roadside issues the submitter references another alignment for the pathway is needed however this will require the cooperation of the adjoining land owners to achieve this. Council is continuing to progress the project and overcome its challenges.

[100035] - Mr MARTIN CUMMINGS

Address: 415 Newtons Road Weedons 7675

Postal Address: 415 Newtons Road, Weedons,

Phone (day): 3479080

Phone (mobile): 021389350

Email: martin@fordbaker.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

A district rate and development/reserve fees used for capital development where sourced.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) Selwyn / Rolleston pool needs to be 50 metres - for the community and to create a swimming hub for the greater Canterbury region .

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

We need a hub to service the greater district and this needs to be complimented with youth recreation facilities such as skate parks and encourage "Time Out" type outlet, cinema etc as if the town solely looks at sport the social behaviour of teenagers will be very poor

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Definitely - unsafe water is unsafe . As a rural lifestyle property owner we had to get our water tested and town people should expect clean water.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21) I say one rate but would like to see the now none operational races due to change in levels since earthquake (Newtons Road & Wild Road) be piped and effectively shut down.

As am owner I would continue to pay the water rate for say 5 years to contribute to piping the useless ones.

Also we have not been cleaned out for 8 years

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

None

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

None

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Never - you are over staffed - it is a holiday camp. No accountability - get in the real world!

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

Not Required

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Quarries should not be permitted in the Inner Plains Zone - never intended in this zone where 4 hectare subdivision is permitted .

Subdivision of Inner Plains to 2 hectares should be as of right

Contribution to the Christchurch Covered Stadium should be made - have to fair - and should be a capitation sum paid by all surrounding districts from Ashburton to Hurunui

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for an extension to SAC is noted. The suggestion of a 50 metre pool was initially explored but not progressed due to significant capital and ongoing operational costs as well as the recognition that this facility is primarily intended as a local and regional facility as part of a Canterbury network rather than a national / international facility. Some of the earlier business case and rationale will be updated and shared again with Council.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments Support for the indoor court project is acknowledged. The submission stresses the importance of this facility providing facilities for youth age groups. It also points the fact that the project needs to be complimented by other youth focused facilities so that a wide range of activities are available to youth in Selwyn. This approach is already being supported and activate with new skate facilities being developed in Leeston, Darfield and Lincoln (and proposed for West Melton)and proposal for the Rolleston town centre and Foster Park project and new Prebbleton Reserve to incorporate upgraded/new youth 'parks' or facilities.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for this proposal. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment

methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. “We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution

system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The ‘Water race user – Annual charge revenue’ is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the ‘Water race user – Per hectare revenue’ is rated per rating area where service is available and ‘All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue’ is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Submission acknowledged but comments are not agreed with

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The submitter is not in support.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	No comments made.

Topic: Township Planning AND / OR District Plan Review - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. The District Plan Review will be considering quarries in the rural zone as a matter in that review. Quarries are a legitimate rural activity and this is supported by the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. The debate over whether quarries should locate in the Rural Inner Plains zone will occur through the District Plan Review. This will be a publicly notified process where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue. The proposed Selwyn District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020. The same applies to the subdivision density in the Rural Inner Plains zone. If you wish to make a submission to have the zone reduced from 4ha minimum lot size to 2 ha minimum lot size, making a submission on the District Plan Review is the appropriate channel.

[100036] - Mrs Hannah Drury

Address: 25 Cameron Crescent Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 033472672

Phone (mobile): 02102989326

Email: Hannahpfaff@hotmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

The pool that is built should be 50 metres long with the ability to be split into two 25m pools. It should have eating all round it suitable for large swimming competitions. It should be 10 lanes wide. I would also like to have hydrosides and more fun stuff for older kids like diving pit with diving boards. I don't think a gym is needed as there are already numerous gyms in rolleston.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Happy to have indoor courts. Good to have all options of sports in the area.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Yes I agree with chlorination of water when necessary.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted. When preparing the business case for the SAC extension, consideration was given for a 50 metre pool. As part of a Canterbury wide network of pools, 25 metres for SAC was considered appropriate to meet the community demand and to efficiently manage the initial capital expenditure as well as the ongoing operating costs. The original business case will be revisited and refreshed for Council information regarding 50 metre pool consideration. Submitter support for youth water play activities noted . Submitter not supporting gym is also noted, and the current cost benefit analysis underway will further investigate.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor court project is acknowledged. The submission supports the needs analysis for the facility by stressing the importance of providing a wide range of sporting and recreational options. The indoor courts will provide a range of sporting and recreational options that cannot be provided for through outdoor open space.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for this proposal. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission

[100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. "During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ." This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] "Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which

this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100037] - Ms Megan Smith

Address: Kilkenny Close Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: 8 Kilkenny Close, Lincoln

Phone (day): 021-045-4154 

Phone (mobile): 021-045-4154 

Email: Megan62tm@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

There needs to be more lanes. Suggest a 50 metre pool which can be divided into 2 x 25 m pools.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I disagree with chlorination of public water. People can. House whether they want to filter their water within their own homes if they are concerned about health risks.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted. When preparing the business case for the SAC extension, consideration was given for a 50 metre pool. As part of a Canterbury wide network of pools, 25 metres for SAC was considered appropriate to meet the community demand and to efficiently manage the financial investment in aquatics.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts

stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic.

<https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial

and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100038] - Mrs Hazel Littlejohn

Address: 262, Ridgens Road Christchurch 7671

Postal Address: 330, Ridgens Road

Phone (day): 021473166

Phone (mobile): 02102594047

Email: halj1962@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

AS a member of the Selwyn Dog Training club I feel that we have out grown the dog park (Foster) or the the growth of Rolleston has out grown the dog park. We are experiencing disruptions during classes of dogs that are not under control, running around. Classes have to stop for safety reason so that the owner/owners can retrieve their dog/dogs. We feel that for health and safety reasons we would need to fence off training areas at class times or offer alternative (additional) dog park during class times. There are a number of children within our club that are members, training as well as elderly members. To have a dog that is not under control or sometimes show aggression towards other dogs does cause concern.

For the long term planning for the future ,we would like to see an additional dog park offered to the residents of Selwyn. AS one member pointed out we wouldn't be allowed to run across a rugby match or training class, so it should be the same for dog classes.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The extension to the dog park is scheduled for 2019/2020. One of the key points to consider will be how the extension can best cater for the clubs requirements compared to the general public requirements. Also to be considered will be issues around specific areas for small and larger dog varieties.

The reserves bylaw is under review in 2018 and issues around the activities of the dog park need to be considered as well as the linkage to the animal control bylaw.

[100039] - Mr Alan Peacock

Address: 125b Horndon Street Darfield 7658

Postal Address: P.O. Box 86009, Rolleston West

Phone (day): 3478 690

Phone (mobile): 021 351 650

Email: alan@independentsigns.co.nz

Submission

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

I have a proposal I wish the council to consider.

1.I would like assistance from council to seek funds to apply for a water bore right, for a new water bottling plant to put in the Izone.

2.I want to put in a state of the art bottling plant and I need council help to apply for and gain a 25 year water right.

3.I want this to be a pilot plant, as I'd like to see one plant of this type put into each local body in New Zealand. I don't know if you have followed Patrick Gower's report on this Cloud Ocean Water saga where they've drilled this 170 metre bore on the Kaputone Wool Scour site, but the numbers are staggering. Firstly the volume of water they're allowed to draw off, and secondly the potential income which runs in the hundreds of millions of dollars retail per year. Now, as no one can own the water, I propose:

4.to charge a bottling fee per unit filled.

5.I also propose that once costs for wages and operational/marketing/development/finance expenses are taken off, all profits will be returned to the Selwyn Community... In other words a not-for-private-profit company. My belief is, if we can market this correctly (and I do need assistance with funding for a feasibility study first), that with a few short years, instead of effectively paying rates, we could have the first district in the country where residents get a rebate that is higher than what they have to pay to council for services. 6. If we can make this work, then we can expand this model throughout the country.

7. This proposal requires "thinking outside the square", and would be enhanced by government acting to restrict foreign purchasing of strategic water resources and local bodies who would be prepared to consider a different model for running their districts; one that could be a heck of a lot better for their residents.

I wish council to consider this proposal. Yes, I recognise this is a BHAG (Big Hairy Audacious Goal), but we live in one of the most sensitive regions of the country as far as water use is concerned. While this proposal represents bold thinking, I can see no reason why it could not run alongside other uses for water in the region.

A search on Google reports that for each litre of milk produced there is the use of over 1000 litres of water. Surely that alone makes this concept worthy of consideration? Patrick Gower reports the retail price for a litre of water in China is \$10. A 500ml bottle of Fiji Water from a mini-bar in Los Vegas is US\$17. There is ample evidence that the value of water can far exceed milk.

In terms of marketing,I am again thinking outside the square. Those on council who are aware of our activities with Flight GSE Ltd which operates here in Rolleston will know that much of my work takes me into the South Pacific. That has given me a first hand awareness of water issues in the region. On Tarawa in Kiribati they have a population of over 100,000

with extremely poor access to quality water. I propose that as part of the feasibility study we research water shortage issues in the Pacific and look to serve that market first. By targeting those markets in the Pacific we also have an advantage also in lower freight costs, coupled with two on-shore container ports in the district.

We're not seeking to pitch initially to high cost markets. Rather I believe we could serve those markets where access to water at a FAIR PRICE will serve to give us back a fair ROI while enhancing the good reputation of New Zealand.

There is some very simple business logic in this proposal. Encouragement from council, inclusive of financial support for water schemes is obviously not without precedent in the Selwyn District. I am asking that council consider this precedent that has been set, when considering this "outside the box" proposal that potentially could deliver a key change in the way councils, and central government, look on the precious water resource that New Zealand has in relative abundance.

Kind regards

Alan Peacock Darfield.

Topic: Investment opportunities and requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	No comments made.

[100040] - Mr Damien Volkner

Address: 258 Whitecliffs rd Glentunnel 7673

Postal Address: 258 whitecliffs rd glentunnel

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0276090900

Email: damien.volkner@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) Selwyn is such a large area It would be unfair to be made to pay more for a hall/reserve people properly wont visit. I.E live in castle hill paying for a hall upgrade in Horoata etc.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) No, although I don't see myself using it I can see the benefits to the district.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) No, cover as many sports courts as possible.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) Yes, speaking for myself and others in the community who have passed their concerns onto me (I'm a committee member for the community there) Living in Whitecliffs most have really enjoyed the fresh spring water there and cant stand the taste now some choosing to buy bottled water as they cant stand the taste of it now. Most who have spoken to me didn't mind occasionally having to boil the water which was to be expected after floods etc. I would say that at least 70% of the community are against the chlorination and want it stopped.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) As long as my rates aren't contributing for it in leeston and Prebbleton.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) Seems big enough as it is ? Manage the space better its not a very old building size requirements come into the planning of it including forecasting future needs. I believe its to soon to be expecting rate payers to pay for office upgrades.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) Whitecliffs to Glenntunnel Cycleway needs to considered for safty of children walking/riding to school, We having an increasing rate of children living there and due to the long very blind S-bend it is far to unsafe for kids to ride through there. Having a pathway would open up walking and riding opportunity's for family's

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the extension of the Selwyn Aquatics Centre is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the indoor court proposal is acknowledged. The "cover as many courts as possible" comment supports the need for a multi-court facility which supports the proposal as outlined in the LTP.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports

the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. "During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ." This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] "Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and

concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter supports the proposals subject to the costs being borne by each community and does not want to pay for facilities they will not use. This view is consistent with the current targeted rate funding approach for community centres and halls. This matter will be considered in the discussion and deliberation on the district rating proposal.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Action Plan and transport funding forecasts includes a \$504,000 project in 2032/33 to construct a cycleway between Glentunnel and Whitecliffs. Currently it is seen as having a low priority/use demand. In places, it will be technically difficult to construct which may meant the budget will need to be increased when this this is better understood.

[100041] - Mr Gareth Parr

Address: 37 Hinterland Drive, Prebbleton 7604

Postal Address: See above

Phone (day): 021730963

Phone (mobile): 021730963

Email:

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

yes we need to be able to cater for all ages groups within our community. At the moment i believe we do not within Prebbleton and the hall we have is under resourced with a lack of land/ car parking.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

to train the athletes of tomorrow in our own background this would be vital.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

if Selwyn is going to grow then an indoor facility would be required. I would also like to see an extra hockey court

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

We need to ensure that those making \$\$ out of water are charged more than those using for residential purposes. I believe we need to ensure that we prepare for when water becomes harder to obtain by ensuring all new houses have a grey water recycling system.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

N/A

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

N/A

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

we really do need to have a propose built option within Prebbleton.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

all offices in one site always ends up more economical

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

This sounds great however is there a link from town to Prebbleton?

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Traffic and traffic safety is an issue within Prebbleton and i don't believe the new over passes will fix this. We need to update springs road to ensure it can handle volumes by using roundabouts or lights. There are too many accidents and lives are being put at risk daily.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor Court project is acknowledged. The submission supports the needs analysis which identified that a community of the size of Selwyn should have an indoor sports hubs as part of the sporting infrastructure network and that it would promote growth (through retention of residents and attraction of new residents).

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission

[100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. "During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ." This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] "Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which

this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter’s support for the proposal to provide a purpose built facility to service Prebbleton is noted.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Stage 2 of the Southern Motorway will provide a connection from the Rail Trail north of Prebbleton to the existing cycleway alongside Stage 1 that links to the central city. The 2018 LTP also includes a \$512,000 project in 2024/25 that will link Prebbleton to Templeton and the City Council cycling main network. A \$500,000 project to upgrade Springs Rd north of Prebbleton including cycling facilities is identified for 2020/21. Will require the cooperation of the Christchurch City Council.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Current traffic patterns are very volatile in and around Prebbleton relating to the construction of Stage 2 of the Southern Motorway. Once completed it is expected this will improve as motorists use the Shands Rd Interchange. The 2018 LTP includes funding a \$24 million arterial intersection package on the perimeter routes around Prebbleton. Council's 20 year transport funding programme includes \$1.5 million for upgrades on Springs Rd starting in 2030. However this may need to be brought forward or rescope based on how Prebbleton may continue to grow and emerging related local traffic demands.

[100042] - Mrs Laura Williams

Address: 8 Bluff Street RD1 7673

Postal Address: Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: fairlightwilliams7@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I support this. I hope that the long-term investment in these buildings will pay off as all of the older halls need maintenance as well as the new build costs, so it will even out over time. These centres, halls are reserves are central to community.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

I support the extension. I hope that any café would be leased to a small local independent business, or a business that is for social good (like Addington Coffee Co-op), i.e. something that adds to the culture and value of the place, rather than a chain like esquires etc.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

I believe that the people who will benefit the most from this will be those who live in the area, so I support a locally funded outline, i.e. Rolleston Pays.

I would prefer for Darfield and Leeston to also have smaller facilities for indoor sports (or for the Council to take on the Coalgate Indoor Sports Centre) to service the surrounding communities.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I prefer limited chlorination based on a risk assessment, NOT universal chlorination.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I think whatever is done with this, it needs to be better publicized and more accessible online.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Much needed. I am always supportive of community facility development.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Counter proposal: instead of building extensions in Rolleston, build extensions on both / either Leeston or Darfield Libraries and move some of the Council there. Part of SDC's problems are that they are too centralized and not in touch with regions. Decentralising might help SDC with some perspective and also help provide better services to the rest of the district.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

I am supportive, BUT I also think that should be a bike path between Darfield and Glentunnel and efforts made to make cycling between Whitecliffs and Glentunnel safer. I've seen many near misses on the curves along that road.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

The rates increase averages look fine, BUT the breakdown looks like it will cause hardship on people's budgets. For people in Coalgate / Glentunnel / Whitecliffs to have rates rise 9+% two years in a row, while Lincoln gets a 0.7% reduction followed by a rise is crazy.

People moved to these areas knowing what the rates and costs were, and their budgets are set accordingly. Balance the increases to make it 6% (or something) EACH year rather than 9.2, 9.6, then 3.6.

It is easier for people to manage if it is more predictable. And to take 9+% on while Lincoln gets a reduction (even for one year) is insulting when Lincoln is getting \$18m invested, and we can't even get a bike path.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted as is suggestion for a social enterprise cafe operator. While Council is satisfying itself regarding cost / benefit analysis for cafe offering , consideration can also be included for different options for cafe delivery models.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor Court project is acknowledged. The submission support a "Rolleston pays" option. The needs analysis showed considerable support and potential use from outside the immediate Rolleston area and that a "regional hub' concept was needed to support the smaller single court facilities in other areas.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for chlorination based on a risk assessment. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk

assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include

the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted along with suggestion of improving publicity and allowing online applications, which are both recognized in the process underway as important elements.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The council when it opened the Rolleston HQ in 2007 moved away from being on 2 "main" sites, Leeston and Darfield. A number of major advantages of having the Rolleston HQ include (1) a more joined up staff workforce on one site (2) having Rolleston as the principle site for Council results in a more central location within the District for ratepayer who needed to visit council offices (3) employing staff who live in Christchurch is easier due to the shorter travel distance than previously travelling to Leeston or Darfield

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments A Darfield to Glentunnel (Coalgate) Cycleway is not included in the 2018 Walking and Cycling Action Plan as no demand has been identified for such a link previously. It would be 12km long and a preliminary estimate of \$3.5 million. This would need to include fitting a "clip on" or similar cycle lane to the Hawkins River Bridge. Being alongside SH77 it would require the approval of the NZTA. It can be added to the Action Plan for completeness but would have a low priority. The Action Plan and transport funding forecasts includes a \$504,000 project in 2032/33 to construct a cycleway between Glentunnel and Whitecliffs. Currently it is seen as having a low priority/use demand. In places it will be technically difficult to construct which may mean the budget will need to be increased when this is better understood.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100043] - Mr Simon Carolan

Address: 904 Waterholes Road Rolleston 7678

Postal Address: 904 Waterholes Road RD 8

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: simontcarolan@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) Yes, why should the community of Claremont be charged when there is no such centre or hall close by
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) Agree this is needed
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) Yes, we do not want this!!!!!!!
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter questions why the community of Claremont should be charged a community centre rate when there is no such centre or hall close by.

The introduction of a district-wide rate for community centres, halls and reserves reflects that Selwyn residents are increasingly using facilities right across the district - not just in their own neighbourhoods. Facilities like the Lincoln Event Centre and Southbridge Hall, and reserves at Weedons, Rhodes Park in Tai Tapu, and Whitecliffs are examples of local facilities that are frequently used by residents from other communities. Under the current system, however, these users are not necessarily funding the facilities.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington

water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a

manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100044] -Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd c/- David Lovell-Smith Ltd Julie Comfort

Address: Not provided Not provided Christchurch

Postal Address: PO Box 679

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: julie.comfort@dls.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Comments on the Development Contribution Policy - see attached.

Topic: Development Contributions Policy - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	No comments made.

[100045] -Mainland Football Mr Martin Field-Dodgson

Address: 127 Cranford Street, St Albans Christchurch 8014

Postal Address: PO Box 21122

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 02040934297

Email: martin.fielddodgson@mainlandfootball.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

As the body responsible for running Futsal in the region we acknowledge that the sport is severely restricted due to the lack of available court space provided by current facilities. The proposed hub at Foster Park would provide the only facility in the region with 4 courts (the next biggest facility we have access to has 2). This would provide the surrounding areas not only with access to a fantastic facility, but also the ability to attract major competitions such as Regional Championships, Secondary School Champs and Nationals.

The current proposal would also provide a range of supporting facilities that align with the quality of the sporting fields available. Changing and storage rooms, along with meeting spaces would add to an already impressive outdoor complex and would also increase the capability of the area to attract top quality outdoor competitions and tournaments.

Mainland Football fully supports the incredible work of Selwyn United and believe that in conjunction with other sporting codes add significant value to the community.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support for the Indoor Court project is acknowledged. The submission focusses on the needs of Futsal both from a local and regional and potentially a national perspective. Council needs to ensure the facility keeps a "community focus" and does not seek to over-specify the facility in the hope of attracting national events. The submission supports the facility needs analysis conducted last year which identified a lack of futsal facilities for a rapidly growing sport.. It also stresses the importance of providing changing, toilet and social facilities for the greater Foster Park outdoor facility which from a cost perspective should be integrated in one integrated building.

[100046] - Ms Sok Chuey Lee-McDonald

Address: 182 Paige Place. RD8 Christchurch 7678

Postal Address: 182 Paige Place. RD 8 . Chc 7678

Phone (day): 033477145

Phone (mobile):

Email: mcdonaldsvc@yahoo.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

Community hall should be paid by the people of the district that are using them not by the community that do not use them. Ie try and save cost for the already overly burden rate payer.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Yes. Do we need to over burden rate payer with extension of the swimming pool which alot of older people do not use and in the winter alot of kids do not use them. Isn't what we have suffice. Moreover, what rate payer pays in rate, they have to pay again when they use the swimming pool which is quite dear. For a serious leisure swimmer, to go few times a week just to keep fit , it break their budget. Alot of us in Selwyn District are has mortgages, children and on small pay. Sports group use the facilities to train and compete and rate payer is subsidizing them. Have a little thoughts for the average wage worker or the retirees! Yet helping to pay for the facilities, the rate payer has no equity shares in swimming pool. No logic in that.

Provide basic facilites like connectivity thru' access road that is not there. We don't have deep pockets. Elect council cannot continuing to increase rate with luxury that rate payer cannot afford.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Yes, you are asking the majority of non-sporting type to fund the cost of indoor sports hub for sporting group who then paid again to book to use the facilities. It does not make sense. Do not keep justifying increase in rates.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Yes. Selwyn District Council has been approving consent to business that has potential to pollute the underground water and the consent conditions does not seem to be working as the water quality (nitrate n nitrite level) has been on the rise since 2009 at a fastest rate than before. Ground water at 54m seems to be contaminated the most while those at 95m seems to be OK. Ecan monitors those acquifers but cannot do much because jointly they (SDC & Ecan) has approve alot of business/farms that has potential to pollute with conditions that is suppose to minimise the effect on environment but in reality the adverse effect on environment has been ignored on the excuse they cannot pint-point the violator. That is not fair on residents/ community and the country. Clean & uncontaminated Water is a scare resource yet Council is not doing enough to protect it. Chlorinating water should not have been a necessity if the water is clean. So the business community is dirtying the water and residents has to pay to drink water with chemical in it that has harmful long term effect.

Why can't we stop the pollution and spend money on stopping contamination instead?!

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water rates with a standard district rate across all three water rate schemes? (see pages 20–21)

This appears to be a trick question. If property with a rate that is already paying the \$300 and \$17 per ha is going to pay additional \$20 for standard district rate, where is all this additional money going into?

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Any rate payer funds that is utilised to support a community cause should be identifiable and accountable to rate payer and audited by independent group that is rate payer represented.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Why is there a need for a new community facilities.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Why should SDC need so much spaces and paid vehicles and rate payer has to pay for them. Aren't the objective is to serve the betterment of ratepayer not keep burdening ratepayer to obtain better comfort for over-staff Council. Often seen some staffs leisurely talking among themselves at SDC office. Is this an indication SDC is overstaffed. If so, some staff cuts could save cost and make the need for extension unnecessary. After all, for all important technical opinion and comment, the expertise is outsourced and not performed by SDC staff.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

There is no need to supplement National Party Cycle and Walk-way. There is need to provide a shorter path for properties along Larcomb and northwards coming from Rolleston Hubs to turn right into their properties. This is a genuine need as their access to main south road has been taken away from them thru' CSM2 expansion. Yet no council members has bother to look into this.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Pls provide access road for people in Paige Place sub-division to Weedons Road in your 10 year Plan. They have to travel 16.5km to send kids to school on their return trip one-way. There is need to cut an access road from Paige Place to Weedon Rd so that they can minimise their km run to use Rolleston Hub/schools/clinics/dentist/swimming pool/sport facilities.

How can you include this in your plan/budget?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments It is noted that the submitter considers that SAC is not utilized by older residents and by children in winter time. This is not evidenced in statistics on usage. Submitter also considers that Swim Club is unfairly subsidised by rate payers. Continuing attention is paid by Officers to ensure equity of access and use.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council supports the protection of source water. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water

reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.” Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the

drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to

water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The suggestion that all recipients of grants should be publicly identified and accountable to the community is currently being incorporated in to the process. The suggestion for independent auditing of grant recipient books would potentially significantly increase the administration cost, however Councils ability to view the recipients financial reports / records in particular circumstances can be considered as part of the process.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter has asked about the need for these facilities. The proposed Hororata facility replaces the aging and damaged hall that is no longer fit for purpose and provides a new modern multi-use facility that can service both community, cultural and recreation needs. The project is supported by a feasibility study and has strong advocacy from the local community who are also willing to make substantial funding contribution. Leeston currently has no dedicated community facility to meet both current and future needs. This project is supported by a needs assessment that identified a deficit in provision and significant latent demand for community space and activities. Prebbleton has grown rapidly and the current facility is aging and no longer fit for purpose for this community. A new facility would provide a modern venue with sufficient space to cater for a range of activities and programmes that cannot be accommodated in the current hall.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Walking and Cycling Strategy relates to those within the District to be funded by Council and not any specific Central Government national or regional projects.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Discussions with the submitter have occurred in recent times with both Council staff and the NZTA on this. The NZTA had consulted previously as part of the CSM2 project and advised residents that there would be no continuing private property access directly to the new motorway. Access to the general area will still be available via Berketts Rd from the motorway. The submitters legal access is from Paige Place not SH1. Paige Place is only legal road for 280m, beyond this it is a private ROW system. There is no requirement for a further public roading connection to Weedons Rd as other local roading links to Rolleston are available. To extend Paige Place the ROW would require the use of the Public Works Act and then upgraded to a public road standard by Council. In addition further private land purchase and new road construction would be needed beyond the existing ROW system to connect the additional approx. 600-700m to Weedons Rd.

[100047] - Mr Gary Doyle

Address: 782 Weedons Road, 8 R.D. Weedons, Christchurch 4678

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 03 3478458

Phone (mobile):

Email: doyleg@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

Yes, in favour.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Yes.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

Yes

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Yes

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100048] - Ms Mary Roughan

Address: 4 Guinea Drive Prebbleton 7604

Postal Address: 4 Guinea Drive Prebbleton

Phone (day): 027 244 3314

Phone (mobile): 027 244 3314

Email: mary@equipc.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) No

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) I support this

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) I support this

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Yes I do. I strongly oppose any chlorination of water in Selwyn. One of the reasons I built a home here is due to the fact the water is not chlorinated. I would be devastated if this chemical was added. We have not needed it in the past so why would we need it now. Keep the status quo in this area please.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21) I support this.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I support this

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

I support this

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) I support this.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) I support this.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? No - please just keep chlorine out of our water! Thanks

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor Court project is acknowledged. No comment on funding options is provided.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that

some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with

chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your support.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support.

[100049] - Mr Adam Thomas

Address: 286 Brookside Road Rolleston 7678

Postal Address: 286 Brookside Road RD8 Christchurch

Phone (day): 021 144 3470

Phone (mobile): 021 144 3470

Email: jarakthomas@hotmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Chlorination has a negative impact on water quality, in terms of drinkability. When in the city (Burnside) recently for a meeting, I was immediately struck by the unpleasant chlorine smell when I got myself a glass of water. The odour made me feel like I was drinking pool water. The same comment was made by the others at my table.

The Dutch stopped chlorinating their water in 2005 through the use of alternate disinfection treatments, use of non-plastic PVC pipes for reticulation, and increased monitoring of the system.

Canterbury water is an amazing resource. Please protect it and keep it pure to our taps through careful management.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100050] -Greendale Community Trust Mrs Ruth Warren

Address: Warrens Road RD1 Greendale

Postal Address: Greendale

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: rwifwarren@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Refer Attached document

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support is noted. Within this submission there is a suggestion that this level of Community Grants Programme funding is a significant cut to previous. This is not the case and Officers will investigate where this confusion has arisen. In addition the support for local history and heritage within the Community Grants Programme is noted.

[100051] - Mr Justin Smith

Address: 14 Chert St Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 021725309

Phone (mobile):

Email: ijustwantmyname@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

N/A

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
With two boys who frequent the pool on a casual basis, I feel this extension is much needed with the current capacity of the pool already stretched during peak hours.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) A facility with which this community absolutely needs.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) N/A

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor court facility is acknowledged. The needs analysis for the project supports the submitters comments around "a facility this community absolutely needs".

[100052] - Mrs Jesse Broom

Address: 6c Henely Close Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 6c Henley Close Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0275885377

Email: broomjk@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) NO

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) I think that this needs t go ahead, there is not enough space for all the children when there are swimming lessons are happening and other children are missing out and also so are the children are in lessons they are crammed into small spaces

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) I think that this is a great idea,

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) Please do not add any, i do not want to buy bottled water

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

NO

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Please make the Rolleston Library bigger with spaces to actually study at, there is not enough space for more than one person to sit at and do any work with space

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor court project is acknowledged. The submission around the library is also acknowledged and the need for study space is being considered as part of the concept design currently being developed.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes

the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hruddy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer

The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water

borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The concept/need for study space at the new library is acknowledged and is being incorporated into the concept design currently.

[100053] -Broadfield Netball Club Miss Megan Carpenter

Address: Robinsons Road Broadfield 7614

Postal Address: 12 Stern Crescent, Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0276417777

Email: bfnumpires@gmail.com

Submission

Broadfield Netball Club plays in the Selwyn Netball Centre competition at Lincoln Domain. The club has five senior teams, one masters team, two social teams and four primary team (approx. 102 members). A majority of the club train at Broadfield Domain courts, with the senior A & B team training indoors when facilities are available (e.g. Lincoln Event Centre). Both the Senior A & B team play inside the Lincoln Events Centre on a Saturday.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) proposal to develop indoor courts at Foster Park. The Senior A & B team would be keen to use this facility for their weekly trainings since they play indoors on Saturday. It is The Broadfield Netball Club support the proving difficult to book facilities in Selwyn for practices. If Selwyn Netball Centre were to use Foster Park for indoor matches on a Saturday, it would give more of our club members exposure to playing inside and the competition would not be effected by weather.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor Court project is acknowledged. The submission focuses on netball needs and the desire to become an indoor sport. This transition is a nationwide one where netball is attempting to improve the quality of the sporting experience by playing and practicing indoors. Netball is potentially a major user group for the proposed indoor courts.

[100054] - Mrs Tracey Cron

Address: 14 Dunlop Cres Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 14 Dunlop Cres Rolleston

Phone (day): 3474464

Phone (mobile): 0211675380

Email: traceycron79@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
I really support the need to extend the aquatic centre. My family use it a lot and it can get really busy. . I would like to see a deeper pool for aqua jogging, as I don't like touching the bottom of the pool as I can't jog upright then. It would be great to have another kids play area with a few slides going into the pool or a splash pad etc..
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) The foster park development is fabulous. Yes I support the need for some indoor sports courts. I would love to have a squash court, and indoor netball, futsal spaces. Nicer toilet facilities would be great, that can also be positioned close to the playground as well. The hockey field should have been built at full size.
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) I do not want chorline in my residential water supply please.
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) It is great that you have included tracks around foster park for walking/biking. Id love more of that sort of thing.
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the extension of the Selwyn Aquatics Centre is noted. Submitter suggestion for deeper pool, additional children's play space and water slides is noted

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support of the Indoor court project is acknowledged. The need for the project to incorporate toilet facilities servicing the playground has already been built into the concept. The demand for squash facilities did not come through during the needs analysis. Some demand for squash facilities has been identified lately and it is unlikely that such facilities could be incorporated in the facility from a space/budget perspective.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water

reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.” Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to

disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The submitter is in support - commends Foster Park pathways.

[100056] - Mrs Joanna Burnett

Address: 33 Burnham School Road Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 7614

Phone (day): 33478322

Phone (mobile): 021660448

Email: Numbereightwire@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Make it a 50mtr pool and include a diving pool and hydro slide

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The support for an extension to SAC is noted. The suggestion of a 50 metre pool was initially explored but not progressed due to significant capital and ongoing operational costs as well as the recognition that this facility is primarily intended as a local and regional facility as part of a Canterbury network rather than a national / international facility. Some of the earlier business case and rationale will be updated and shared again with Council. Submitter suggestion for a diving pool and hydroslide is noted.

[100057] - Mrs stephanie Broomhall

Address: 397 Trents road Prebbleton 7604

Postal Address: 397 Trents road

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021778374

Email: stephaniemortimer@hotmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) community centres which nurture connections in Prebbleton are most welcome and encouraged to be able to retain our village and community.
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) It would have been really cost effective and meet more needs if school and community pools were kept and invested in, this creates a strong sense of community and provides a local facility accessible to all in the area. Where as one large facility does not.
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) This can not happen, a blanket practise for ease of managment does not suit the majority and seems just a slap in the face for common sense and common good. There should be no permanent chlorination schemes and if there is contamination a one off would be exceptable under community consultation. If an area has ongoing issues then individual filtration systems should be made available and cost effective to install. This was it is the consumers choice on how they filter their water.
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) Community facilities are lacking in Prebbleton in a rapidly growing area, and a huge growth in young families. Seems only sensible to invest in this area.
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) Springs road cycle way is needed. Promote healthy use of transport for Prebbleton residents to commute to work and the many many students that attend school in town from Prebbleton. Cycle way that connects to hornby, to the motor way cycle way and into riccarton through sockburn. It would really ease traffic congestion if we had a safe alternative other than to get into our cars or our children take the bus to school.
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments The submission was silent on SAC extension but supported Council continuing to invest in community pools as well as continuing to support school pools. Council is continuing to invest in community pools and continues to support school pools.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine

Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the

opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's view that there is a lack of community facilities in Prebbleton to service this growing community and a need to invest for the future is consistent with Council's assessment of the situation. Support for the proposal to provide a purpose built facility to service Prebbleton is noted.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Stage 2 of the Southern Motorway will provide a connection from the Rail Trail north of Prebbleton to the existing cycleway alongside Stage 1 that links to the central city. The 2018 LTP also includes a \$512,000 project in 2024/25 that will link Prebbleton to Templeton and the City Council cycling main network. A

\$500,000 project to upgrade Springs Rd north of Prebbleton including cycling facilities is identified for 2020/21. Will require the cooperation of the Christchurch City Council.

[100058] -WRPS Mrs Kelly Franks

Address: 282 brookside road Rolleston 7678

Postal Address: As above, postcode 7678

Phone (day): 021914675

Phone (mobile):

Email: Kellyewen_849@hotmail.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
Yes, think this is funimentally important, included more family changing rooms, my husband often takes our little girl Swimming and they often have to wait to get showered And dressed

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Sounds. Like a great facility for the whole community

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The support for the extension of the Selwyn Aquatics Centre is noted. In addition submitter request for increased number of family change rooms is noted. Council management is confidence these are included in extension design.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support for the Indoor court project is acknowledged. The submission implies a need to provide a wide range of activities for the whole community which is consistent with proposal for a multi-court, multi-surface project.

[100059] - Miss Nik Newton

Address: 22 Quartz Drive, Stonebrook Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 22 Quartz Drive, Stonebrook, Rolleston 7614

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0272426780

Email: thenewfuders@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

yes please - we need more room. This would be awesome for our local and wider community. Please do not put up the swimming lessons fees up too much. I and many people think they are quite expensive at the moment and most of the time it takes a long time for the children to move up a level because of different teachers and most of the time some teachers look like they cant be bothered being there.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Great Idea - cant wait for this.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

please no!! Friends in CHCH hate it - smell and taste is awful

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

i think you need to focus on the community first - you have a new building please spend the money where it is needed first - in our growing community.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the SAC extension is noted. The submitter commented on affordability of lesson fees and Council is reminded that the reviews do incorporate benchmarking against other facilities. Concern from submitter regarding time taken for students to progress up levels is noted and Council management is investigating process and communication associated with progression. In addition Council management noted concern about instructor attitude and will follow up to ensure standards of excellence in customer service are maintained.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water

reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.” Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to

disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	No comments made.

[100060] -Environmental Protection Agency Mr Allan Freeth

Address: Level 10, 215 Lambton Quay Wellington Wellington
6140

Postal Address: Private Bag 63002 Waterloo Quay

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: info@epa.govt.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Refer to the attached letter

Topic: Enforcement Comments and Issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Hazardous Substances and New Organisms are part of regulatory portfolio and will continue to be covered under our Environmental Health Officer's role which is currently contracted out to Food and Health Standards NZ (2006) Ltd under an Health Services Contract. When we have an HSNO issue we work very closely with agencies such as Environment Canterbury, Worksafe and the FENZ to resolve the issue. Council will be continuing to look for avenues to promote safety across all facets of compliance which will include significant environmental and safety risks which fall under the HSNO Act.

[100061] - Mrs Anna James

Address: 5 Ryelands Drive, Lincoln Christchurch 7608

Postal Address: 5 Ryelands Drive, Lincoln, Christchurch

Phone (day): 033252522

Phone (mobile): 0272222742

Email: anna@prof.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

NO

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

YES. As a family who use the Selwyn Aquatic Centre on a regular basis, and also the parent of a competitive swimmer who uses this facility for swim meets etc, an extension to these facilities is much needed.

Firstly, I would suggest extending the current 25m pool to a 50m FINA approved swimming pool. I would recommend (similar to the main pool in Dunedin) that this be able to be separated with a dividing wall running the width of the pool. This can then split the 50m pool in to two separate 25m pools - enabling them to be used simultaneously for different activities (eg 1 half lane swimming, and the other half for recreational use).

Another important factor that needs to be seriously considered is the lack of seating around the main pool especially. There have been a lot of swim meets that wouldn't allow spectator entry, simply because there isn't the space. At the meets where spectators are welcome, it's most standing room only. Dunedin pool has a mezzanine floor with tiered seating that would easily seat more than 500 people. This is a fabulous addition!

I would also suggest extras such as a water-based playground and bombing tower (as Timaru Pool has) and a hydroslide if this is financially viable. The Timaru hydroslide is supervised by one staff member at the bottom only, as the top of the slides are run with a red/green light system and have camera's watching to make sure users are following the rules for their own safety.

A cafe would also be a good extra, but not essential in my opinion.

I would personally be more than happy for a rates increase to help cover the costs of this extension.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

YES. I believe both of these planned developments are much needed for the area, and will help attract people to the district - helping to put more money in our local pocket. I would support a rates increase to pay for this.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support is noted. When preparing the business case for the SAC extension, consideration was given for a 50 metre pool. As part of a Canterbury wide network of pools, 25 metres for SAC was considered appropriate to meet the community demand and to efficiently manage the financial investment in aquatics. Consideration is being given to how SAC might incorporate access to outdoors (as per outdoor seating and also to accommodate greater numbers of patrons at any time). Some consideration will be given to interior seating within budget parameters. In consideration of an outdoor space consideration for cost benefit of waterbased playground and bombing tower can be included. Cafe is undergoing cost benefit analysis and alternative service delivery models will be considered.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	No comments made.

[100062] - Mrs Emma WOOLFORD

Address: 12 Donatello Drive, Rolleston Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 12 Donatello Drive, Rolleston

Phone (day): 0211113573

Phone (mobile): 0211113573

Email: emmadanielw@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
Yes - I believe it's short-sighted to only create another 25 metre pool. A 50-metre pool would make complete sense and would give Selwyn a greater draw-card for holding sports events. I believe at the time the pool was created initially, submissions were put in for a 50-metre pool. The pool is way above capacity most of the time for training so it would make sense to do something like the old QE2 where you could modify a 50m pool to make 2-25m pools, then open it up for major events. A commonwealth games rep (Celyn Edwards) trains at Selwyn yet races in a standard 50m pool - why not spend the money outright and future proof the major pool facility for the Selwyn area?
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support is noted. When preparing the business case for the SAC extension, consideration was given for a 50 metre pool. As part of a Canterbury wide network of pools, 25 metres for SAC was considered appropriate to meet the community demand and to efficiently manage the financial investment in aquatics.

[100063] - Drucilla Kingi Patterson

Address: 289 Kensington Avenue Rangiora 7400

Postal Address: Rangiora

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: greenmoonstudio@outlook.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

First would like to speak part of my submission

To install an emergency management road behind the Canterbury aero club airport to develop public rail service from Rolleston to Cheviot pass through to Christchurch new Stadium and University

I shall be setting up Strategic Planning Centres Hamner, Christchurch Airport, Selwyn, Kikouria

Will require community and council engagement

Core focus Forestfire prevention Bio Security Boarder Security Emergency Management City to City Events Film and game development

\$30,000 emergency management software

I have lobbied the government to host the 2026 Commonwealth games They are looking into it and other events We need more then one 50m pool If you have a 50m pool you will bring in people from out of town which will Help pay for it plus keep swimmers at a international level Drucilla Kingi – Patterson 289 Kensington Avenue Rangiora

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for an extension to SAC is noted including suggestion for 50 metre pool to support proposal for Selwyn to host the 2026 Commonwealth game. The suggestion of a 50 metre pool was initially explored but not progressed due to significant capital and ongoing operational costs as well as the recognition that this facility is primarily intended as a local and regional facility as part of a Canterbury network rather than a national / international facility. Some of the earlier business case and rationale will be updated and shared again with Council.

Topic: Investment opportunities and requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Public transport incl Light Rail - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter provides no details on what is envisaged for an emergency access road behind the Aerodrome. There is an unformed road that is there which it is presumed the intention is to use this somehow. The proposed rail service is considered very aspirational and well beyond that considered necessary to provide a affordable and sustainable public transport system in the long term. The Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee that includes Selwyn, is developing a 30 Year Public Transport Business Case for the Greater Christchurch area and even this will struggle to make the case for rail based services in the short to medium term at least.

Topic: Social initiatives / issues - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments It is noted that the submitters suggestions regarding Council increasing its role in visitor promotion, building capacity of local small businesses (e.g. through educational workshops / forums) and advocating for increased internet / broadband coverage across the district are currently considerations within Council's reviewed Strategic Plan for Economic Development.

[100064] - Mrs Delys Brough

Address: 25 Taylor Place Prebbleton 7676

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: delys@corcoranfrench.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I support the district wide rate provided the development of new community facilities at Prebbleton goes ahead. Prebbleton has a well maintained reserve (which I am happy to pay for), but very poor community hall / facilities.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

I strongly support the extensions to the SAC. A new 50m pool would be ideal together with a café (with indoor and outdoor seating).

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

I strongly support the proposal to develop the indoor courts complex and associated facilities. I prefer funding option one.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

If chlorination is not made mandatory, I prefer Option 1 - only introduce chlorination if required after a robust risk assessment process.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

I agree with the replacement of the current rating system for water races but consider the yearly rate % increase for \$20 public good rate should be 6% (not 10%) in line with % increase for water race users.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I prefer a transparent and understandable community grants funding scheme. If the Council can deliver on spending less on administration costs and more dollars to community groups, I support it.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

The new Prebbleton Community support facility is desperately needed and I strongly support it.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

I support the extension for the additional office space, BUT NOT for additional car parking space. Private businesses do not provide car parking for their staff and extending the car parking is inconsistent with the Council's Walking and Cycling Strategy.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

I strongly support adopting the draft Walking and Cycling strategy and major projects outlined.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

We have experienced significant roading disruption in Prebbleton which was worsened in the nearly 12 years we have lived here.

The roundabouts / traffic lights at certain intersections (Springs /Marshs, Shands / Blakes, Springs / Hamptons and Shands / Hamptons) need to be fast tracked. So do the road improvements next to Blakes, Hamptons and Trents.

Any improvements to Springs Road to allow children to cross it safely near the school are also welcome.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted. When preparing the business case for the SAC extension, consideration was given for a 50 metre pool. As part of a Canterbury wide network of pools, 25 metres for SAC was considered appropriate to meet the community demand and to efficiently manage the financial investment in aquatics. Consideration is being given to how SAC might incorporate access to outdoors (as per outdoor seating and also to accommodate greater numbers of patrons at any time).

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for a robust risk assessment process. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all

supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time.” This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. “The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley’s Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-

products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for

livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments With this proposal Council's intent is to increase level and transparency of Council investment in community groups without any significant increase in administration.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: Staff concur with the views of the submitter in terms of the demonstrated need for a new community facility to service the Prebbleton Community. The submitter's support for the proposal to provide a purpose built facility to service Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Council needs to meet the current District Plan requirements. the additional carparking of 122 allows for the following: - replacing the carpark to be removed when Moore Street is extended (38) - allowing for a park n ride facility - 40 - additional carparking for the HQ facility - 44

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is in support.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The Council's proposed \$24m package of Prebbleton arterial intersection upgrades, including the road widenings, starting in 2019 and ending in 2023 will be difficult enough already to deliver considering the scale and complexity of the projects to design and construct, including likely private land purchase.

[100065] -Selwyn District Council Sister Cities Committee Mrs Allison Rosanowski

Address: 2 Norman Kirk Drive, Rolleston Rolleston 7643

Postal Address: PO Box 38 Darfield 7541

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 027 290 4592

Email: Paul and Allison Rosanowski

Submission

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

1. Financial Commitment from Selwyn District Council • The amounts budgeted for the next ten years represents a reduction in funding for the Sister City Committee. • It is noted that the suggested small increase each year is presumed to meet rises in inflation and should not be less than inflation. • The Sister City Committee submits that the budget be allowed a rollover of unspent funds up to a maximum of \$10,000 per year. This has been the previous practice. • Expenditure each year varies and is difficult to forecast accurately because of uncertainty regarding incoming Sister City groups. This current year's total expenditure is in excess of \$12,000. Donations from other organisations have been essential to balancing the budget.

2. Development of a Selwyn District Council Sister City Garden • That the Selwyn District Council Parks and Reserves department in association with the Sister City Committee establish a Selwyn Sister City garden. • Suggested locations of a Sister City garden are part of the development of the new Rolleston Town Centre or alternatively at Foster Park. • A Rolleston location is preferred as Rolleston is the centre of the Selwyn District. • The Sister City Committee would liaise with our Sister Cities to ensure that each segment of the garden has plants representative of their district.

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	The Submitter requests that the Sister City budget be permitted a rollover of unspent funds up to a maximum of \$10,000 p.a. The annual budget for Sister City visits is \$6,300 p.a. plus inflation. Staff recommend the Sister City visits budget be increased to \$10,000 p.a. plus inflation. However, staff do not recommend this budget be carried forward.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Staff comment as follows: 1. the proposed budget is seen as appropriate 2. Guidance from the council on whether a sister city reserve area is needed would be appropriate. Staff advice would be that the reserve planned for around the Rolleston Town centre must be in keeping with the reserve exchange decision so probably achieving a sister city themed approach in this area is limited. Foster Park, despite its size, under the current development plans would not have room to accommodate the request. Consideration could possibly be given to an area in the District Park but that consideration will need to be balanced with the other requests.

[100066] -Selwyn Dog Training Club Ms Shelley Baikie

Address: Springston Rolleston Road Rolleston 7683

Postal Address: 347 Lake Road South RD3 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: outwestk9s@gmail.com

Submission

We at the Selwyn Dog Training Club have some ideas moving forward for how our club and the community can thrive with the new Long Term Plan (LTP).

As it stands now, we occupy the area known as Foster Dog Park. Our club membership is currently at 97 members, with growth to 130 by the end of the year projected. We are one of the largest dog training clubs in the South Island. When our club was established in 2003, the population of Rolleston was just under 2000. This was, of course, pre the Christchurch Earthquake, and the expected growth of Rolleston was projected to be significantly less than what has eventuated. The population as of June 2017 is currently 14,650. There was also an option to acquire the 5 acres which has now become part of Rolleston College.

We believe that as a club, we have outgrown the space we currently have. The public, and club members, are becoming more and more frustrated at the interruptions to our classes.

We train at the Foster Dog Park 3 nights a week, between 6pm and 9.30pm, as well as a small group on Sunday mornings. During this time, classes are held for members of the public to help them teach their dogs good manners, basic agility training, as well as competitive obedience and agility training. We hold our classes on our allocated part of the park, closest to the clubrooms, however this is not always respected by members of the public. We are constantly battling with loose dogs disrupting these classes, members of the public not having their dogs under control, dog attacks and abusive comments that we are 'taking over the park'. Many of our members have had their dogs attacked by others while training, which is a serious concern for us as a club, as well as the safety of the public.

As the Rolleston Reserves Committee are aware, the SDTC lease the land so we can hold classes at these times. We also book the park exclusively 12 days a year, where we can close the park to the public to hold events. We do our best to advertise the days that the park will be closed well in advance, through social media, flyers and notices on the gates as you enter the park. In our eyes, this is no different to a rugby club shutting a park to the public for games on a weekend.

We would like to propose the following to be considered for the next LTP:

A fence, with gates, be erected to cordon off our training area. This could be shut to the public during class training times and re-opened on completion of the classes. A second dog park for the community of Rolleston. There were plans for a second dog park but they are believed to have fallen through. Leeston recently gained a dog park, but it is 20 mins away and many people simply walk their dogs to the current dog park. While it was a great initiative by the SDC, we strongly believe a second park in Rolleston is well and truly overdue, and would take the pressure off of our club. Should a second park go in, it would possibly give us the option to have exclusive rights to Foster Dog Park on our training nights, while giving the public a space to safely exercise their dogs elsewhere.

We urge the council to consider a second dog park for the Rolleston area, which we firmly believe is overdue.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments

Provision of Additional Dog Park Space in Rolleston: Staff concur with the views of the Selwyn Dog Training Club in regard to the need for additional dog park areas to service Rolleston. The LTP does include some measures to address this issue: There is a budget in 2019/20 to extend the existing Foster Park Dog Park when the stopped part of Goulds Road is redeveloped. This could add around 3,000 m2 of additional space and allow for some reconfiguration. This would be the appropriate time to consider the Club's use and any changes as requested in their submission. The exclusive use of an area for the club would require an amendment to the lease agreement and public consultation on this matter. The Large Scale Park is planned to commence development from 2021 and it is likely that a dog park would be developed as part of this park to service the eastern part of Rolleston. Staff have looked at possible options for a dog park in West Rolleston but no specific site has been identified. The use of part of the Holmes Block for this purpose has been mooted but does present problems for recreational use given the sewerage treatment activities on the site. If another dedicated dog park was to be established the cost would be in the vicinity of \$250,000 (based on the recent Leeston project and including a toilet). The recent review of the Dog Control Bylaw has included a number of off-leash areas for dog exercise in Rolleston. This includes: Foster Park, Brookside Park, Rolleston Reserve and Dryden Reserve.

[100067] - Mr Ken Chapman

Address: 32 Kendon Drive Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: akchapman@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

This would make sense as all towns have similar facilities, although of a different size.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

I support an extension to the pool only. No need for café/courtyard or fitness / wellbeing space as there are two new commercial fitness centres now in Rolleston.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

The Sports Hub is a great facility which I support. However, I note there is no provision for a bowling green in the plan. Bowls is now becoming a younger person's sport, particularly at the top level. The playing surface does not have to be grass (preferred), but could be synthetic.

Maybe the existing library building / car park would be a suitable if there is no space at Foster Park.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Consultation required on the amount of use it would get in each town.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

I support this in all areas. The sooner the better.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Council does need to be satisfied that both the inclusion of a cafe space and/ or a fitness and wellbeing space are sound financial business propositions. Investigation actively underway regarding cost / benefit analysis for cafe offering and fitness / wellbeing offering associated with SAC development.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter has suggested that consultation is required to determine the level of use for each facility. The proposed Hororata facility is supported by a feasibility study that indicates potential use and activities. In preparing the study extensive communication with the community was undertaken to define usage. Leeston currently has no dedicated community facility to meet both current and future needs. This project is supported by a needs assessment that identified a deficit in provision and significant latent demand for community space and activities. Consultation with stakeholders and potential users was carried out in developing the needs assessment. Prebbleton requires a facility that would provide a modern venue with sufficient space to cater for a range of activities and programmes that cannot be accommodated in the current hall. Further consultation on the types of uses that will inform the function of the facility will be carried out subject to the project being approved. When the functional design briefs are prepared for each facility further assessment of the usage requirements will occur which will include communication with the community and potential users.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support.

[100068] - Mrs Ann Jarman

Address: 201 Essendon Road RD1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day): 03 318 8539

Phone (mobile):

Email: pkjarman@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Refer Attached document

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

[100069] -Glentunnel Community Centre Mrs Pam Reynolds

Address: Glentunnel Library Post, Glentunnel 7638

Postal Address: Glentunnel

Phone (day): 03 318 2377

Phone (mobile):

Email: chair.glen.cc@selwyn.govt.nz

Submission

Submission supplied as PDF or Word document, printed and attached as the following page.

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

Funds be available when required for the ongoing maintenance to ensure that the Community Centre - Glentunnel Building is kept at the current high standard.

Please find attached the long-term budget projects for the Community Centre, Glentunnel.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	Glentunnel Hall Budget Changes: The Glentunnel Hall Committee has submitted an amended 10 year plan based on their priorities. This basically rejigs some projects (timing and costs) and provides for two projects that were not currently identified. This includes the provision of a storage shed (\$38,000) and re-shingle of the car park (\$9,000). Overall the total cost of the projects submitted is \$87,500 compared with the current uninflated provision of \$86,500. As the difference is relatively minor and the programme is based on the committee's priorities staff would support the proposed amendments.

[100070] -c/- Kingcraft Drive Residents Mr Peter Somerville

Address: 2/39 Kingcraft Drive Prebbleton RD 6

Postal Address: RD 6

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: petelloydsommerville@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Refer attached document

Topic: Township Planning AND / OR District Plan Review - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	Thank you for your submission. The District Plan Review will be considering rural and residential zone densities as a matter in that review. The matter raised in your submission is a matter for consideration through the District Plan Review and not the Long Term Plan. If you wish to make a submission to have the zone reduced from 1ha minimum lot size, making a submission on the District Plan Review is the appropriate channel. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others.

[100071] -Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board.. Christchurch West Melton Zone Committee Dr. Robert Wynn-Williams

Address: 914 Shands Rd Christchurch 7676

Postal Address: 6 R D CHRISTCHURCH

Phone (day): 03 3252155

Phone (mobile): 021 256 8804

Email: sga@farmside.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

no

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

no

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

no

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

no 5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

I agree that most of the water race network should remain for biodiversity purposes as de facto alternatives to the wetlands and small streams which have been destroyed in earlier times. However, the major beneficiaries are all the residents of Selwyn and beyond and they should pay. Our particular water race, and I presume others in the district, is now so unreliable that we have had to put in pipes and troughs as we can no longer rely on it for livestock. My estimate would be that our race has been running for at the most 4 weeks out of the last 3 years, that is hopeless for livestock and of little benefit for biodiversity. You can not charge for a service that is hopelessly unreliable so be certain when you strike the rate on individual properties that they in fact receive the 'service'. I know there a number of properties down stream from me which are theoretically on the network but have had no water for many years.

I image many farms will now have piped water and when you increase their water race rate sharply you will come under pressure to close more and more. I think you need to look more closely at how many farmers on the system actually rely on the water for livestock and irrigation. On this basis you will need to increase the proportion of funding from a public good rate.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

no

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston?
(see pages 26–27)

Don't

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

- * Accelerate the cycleway programme

- * Delete Jones Road option as unnecessary with the Rolleston to Templeton link

- * Add a Lincoln to Tai Tapu link via Perymans Road

- * Work with KiwiRail and community groups to develop a cycleway from Arthurs Pass to Darfield. Then you would only need to add Kirwee to Rolleston to create another Alps to Ocean trail.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

No

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The proposed programme to deliver the cycleway projects is already ambitious. The Jones Rd project is to connect the Rolleston Industrial Zone to the Weedons Interchange and therefore to the CSM2 cycling connections to Templeton, not as an alternative to the CSM2 links. The Lincoln to Tapu Project for 2019/20 is using Perymans Rd as the on road cycle link. The 2018 Walking and Cycling Action Plan already includes projects connecting Kirwee to Springfield. Its is envisaged the rail corridor can be used but there is no assurance of this yet based on KiwiRail Health and Safety requirements. It has already been identified these Malvern could form part of or a subsidiary local route to any future Mountains to Sea cycleway.

[100072] -Selwyn Arts Trust Mr Michael McEvedy

Address: Not provided Not provided Not Provided

Postal Address: Not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: mmcevedy@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Refer to the attached document

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments Submitter proposed consideration of performing and static arts in planning for Rolleston Library and Community Centre. Officers note this planning is already included. Submission also requested performing arts consideration as a component of future community centre builds / rebuilds across Selwyn and this is noted

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Rolleston Library/Community Space is currently proceeding developed design phase. The requests/aspirations of the trust will be considered as part of that design phase and feedback provided to the trust.

[100073] -St Johns (John Sunckell, Chair of Selwyn Central & Ann Shepherd, Chair, Malvern) Mr Michael McEvedy

Address: Not provided Not provided Not provided

Postal Address: Not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: mmcevedy@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Refer to the attached document

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Submission proposed SDC funding for St Johns. Such a proposal would be considered within Strategic Community Partnerships component of Community Grants Funding, which is currently fully committed unless Council decides not to fund a proposed partner or increases the level of funding. Submission did not specify amount of funding requested but notes \$350,000.00 per annum is required.

[100074] - Dr. Nick Howell

Address: 6/456 Curraghs road RD6 Christchurch 7676

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 03 347 7419

Phone (mobile): 021048 0581

Email: nickthevet@gmail.com

Submission

There is obviously a lot of interest currently in the proposed Fulton Hogan quarry near Templeton.

One factor that seems crucial to this and other such large projects is the issue of setbacks. As I understand it the SDC currently does not have any requisite minimum setback between an activity requiring consent and neighbouring properties or rights of way.

A 1km setback is apparently the requirement in Australia and would be the gold standard for here, but even if the SDC introduced a blanket 500 metre setback then we would have no such conflicts.

It is also vital that setbacks are measured from boundaries and not buildings.

My second subject is the on-going use of herbicides. The SDC should stop spraying along rights of way, in parks and around children's playgrounds. Glyphosate (the active ingredient in Roundup) is carcinogenic - we should not be willfully exposing children to cancer-causing chemicals. A brushcutter is a perfectly sensible alternative.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The first issue of setbacks requires comment from SDC planning team in relation to consent process. The second subject on Herbicide use. This is undertaken in our reserves contract as per industry best practice, the use and application of chemicals is in accordance with all relevant acts, regulations, bylaws and these specifications including NZS 8409:2004 code of practice for the management of Agrichemicals. Regarding Glyphosate specifically there are NZ EPA reports on this. Regards Jonathan

Topic: Quarry - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	Thank you for your submission. The District Plan Review will be considering quarries in the rural zone as a matter in that review. Quarries are a legitimate rural activity and this is supported by the Canterbury Regional policy Statement. The debate over whether quarries should locate in the Rural Inner Plains zone will occur through the District Plan Review. The issue of setbacks will also be considered through that process. This will be a publicly notified process where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue. It is appropriate that the matters you raise be considered through the District Plan Review and not through the Long Term Plan process. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others.

Topic: Township Planning AND / OR District Plan Review - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	Thank you for your submission. The District Plan Review will be considering quarries in the rural zone as a matter in that review. Quarries are a legitimate rural activity and this is supported by the Canterbury Regional policy Statement. The debate over whether quarries should locate in the Rural Inner Plains zone will occur through the District Plan Review. The issue of setbacks will also be considered through that process. This will be a publicly notified process where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue. It is appropriate that the matters you raise be considered through the District Plan Review and not through the Long Term Plan process. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the

community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others.

[100075] -Coalgate Township Committee Mrs Jane Huggins

Address: 3024 Coaltrack Road Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: 3024 Coaltrack Road RD 1 COALGATE

Phone (day): 3188411 (work)

Phone (mobile):

Email: stovies@outlook.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

The committee supports this proposal, as long as community committees are retained and will play an important role in project decisions. We would also ask that the Council bear in mind the hardship any rate increases will cause to those on lower incomes.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer? (see pages 16–17)

We would like to see the existing private sports centre in Coalgate continue as a community facility. The property is for sale and we ask that the Council consider acquiring the property and/or supporting the new owners to continue running the centre.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

There has been a serious lack of timely and informative communication about this, especially the recent chlorination of the Malvern Hills supply.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Re Leeston rugby rooms, does the Canterbury Rugby Union make any financial contribution to this?

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Everett Street (east end), Coalgate: Several years ago, the Council undertook to complete the proper formation of this cul-de-sac. We ask that this project be added to the plan, to be completed in 2019.

Roving Committee Secretary: We were astonished to be advised that the cost of our secretary is between \$200 and \$250 per meeting. If this were to come from our discretionary fund, we would be left with very little for other projects. We are extremely pleased with the job our secretary does and we know (some of us from personal experience) how difficult it is to be a committee secretary, as well as a productive and contributing member of that committee. We therefore ask for increased resourcing so that we can continue to benefit from the services of our Roving Secretary.

Lawnmowing: We ask that the Council adds to its mowing schedule the area known as the Common on Bridge Street, opposite King Street, in Coalgate.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments The issue of the Hororata Sports hall has not been discussed at staff level in any detail. A proposal from the interested parties should be sought so that a business case can be properly evaluated before any recommendations are drafted.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Malvern Hills was recently chlorinated due to contamination being detected in the reticulation. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water

reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.” Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the

drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The Leeston RFC building is owned and maintained by the Leeston Rugby Football Club and, as far as Council is aware, receives no income from the Canterbury Rugby Football Union. If the option to utilize this building for community use was pursued the cost would be borne by the local community.

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	No comments made.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments	A proposal should be sought from the interested parties around the business case for council investment in the Hororata indoor sports facility. Staff recommendations can then be developed through an ongoing engagement process.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Council's undertaking relating to Everett St only extended to including it on Forward Programme for discretionary township projects 10-15 years ago. It remained unfunded at the time and these types of works and programme has been disbanded since then. The Level of Service provided by Everett St is generally consistent with the rest of Coalgate and similar smaller Malvern townships making this work unnecessary without clear benefit.

Topic: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments	Current Roving Secretary arrangement for particular Committees is not funded out of Discretionary Funds, while other paid Secretarial services to Community Committees are. Council interest in consistency in resourcing arrangement. Council officers also investigating system / process improvements to encourage and provide incentives for voluntary secretarial services in the future.

[100076] - Mrs Shelley Silverwood

Address: 18 Wilfield Drive, West Melton Christchurch 7618

Postal Address: 18 Wilfield Drive West Melton

Phone (day): 0273434510

Phone (mobile):

Email: shelley.silverwood@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Yes, PLEASE think about including a 50m pool with this extension. It will prove its worth in many years to come. Finally CHCH will have a pool that can train elite athletes, hold international level competitions and I'm sure bring in revenue associated with this. Rolleston's population is only going to grow so a bigger aquatic centre is going to serve the town for many, many years.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for an extension to SAC is noted. The suggestion of a 50 metre pool was initially explored but not progressed due to significant capital and ongoing operational costs as well as the recognition that this facility is primarily intended as a local and regional facility as part of a Canterbury network rather than a national / international facility. Some of the earlier business case and rationale will be updated and shared again with Council.

[100077] - Mrs Jane Huggins

Address: 3024 Coaltrack Road Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: 3024 Coaltrack Road RD 1 COALGATE

Phone (day): 3188411 (work)

Phone (mobile):

Email: stovies@outlook.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

I support this proposal on the understanding that community committees will be retained and will play an important role in project decisions.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

There is currently an indoor sports centre operating privately in Coalgate. It is up for sale and I would like the Council to consider acquiring this facility and/or supporting the new owners to continue its use as a community sports centre.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I support the proposal but think the Council needs to provide better and more timely communication about when and why chlorination is happening. For instance, a public notice explaining the large initial dose in the Malvern Hills Water supply and information about options such as filters to mitigate the taste and smell of the chlorine.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I am happy that the Malvern Community Board administers a fund for groups and individuals in the Malvern area, and would not like to see applicants competing with the whole of Selwyn District.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

I support this proposal.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

I support this programme.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments The issue of the Hororata Sports hall has not been discussed at staff level in any detail. A proposal from the interested parties should be sought so that a business case can be properly evaluated before any recommendations are drafted.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for chlorination. We will take on board your recommendation on communication. Below are some additional comments from Council staff on chlorination.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in

particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.” Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no

evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Submitter raises concerns about Malvern Community Board losing control of its fund for groups and individuals in the Malvern area. The Community Grants Scheme, at this point in time, is not intended to replace Malvern Community Board or Ward Discretionary Funds.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is in support.

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	No comments made.

[100078] - Mrs Colene Welsford

Address: 12 Kildare Tce Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 03 325 3233

Phone (mobile): 027 240 1449

Email: cols@orcon.net.nz

Submission

10. This submission is on behalf of my seven fellow home owners in Kildare Terrace – the northern end between Gerald Street and North Belt. We wish to lodge an urgent plea for the Selwyn District Council to do something to restore our once attractive, green environment. We used to have a lovely green area across the road under the Oak Trees where families and rest home residents would picnic on hot, summer days. It was often referred to as “the jewel in the crown” as far as the Lincoln biosphere was concerned.> Now it has been turned into an area where huge construction trucks and school buses park, and local hoons in cars do “dust donuts” and delight in skidding their car tyres to burn off even more grass at all times of the day and night. We can’t open our windows on the street side because of the dust and cleaning them is a relentless job. The noise at night, often into the early hours of the morning, is so disturbing and the police have been called on two occasions. The area has also been under the surveillance of the Lincoln Community Watch at night and a resident has written to the Lincoln Community Council but had no response. When it rains the area turns into a quagmire!

I am attaching some photos of the area and my neighbour has some of the dust clouds! What do you think is the best way of tackling the problem Sam, as it is really getting us all down? Could a post and chain demarcation boundary like in Leicester Terrace, be erected at little cost to the Council, to stop further eroding of this green space? Regards, Colene Welsford

Hi All,

Thanks for the comments, I agree this area ideally needs installation of bollards/chain or wire rope along the entire length of the reserve but also considering provisions for parking and vehicle access for contractors to maintain the area. I have also informed the Lincoln community committee of this issue as consultation for their consideration.

Colene, as per the phone call this week you can put a submission in through council website for the LTP to secure funding, it is a project that will require budget allocation.

Regards Jonathan Crawford

Dear Sam and Jonathan,

Your latest correspondence (below) and recent telephone acknowledgement, state that the cheapest/most effective solution to this environmental and safety issue, is the installation of bollards/chain along the length of the reserve (as is the case in Leinster Terrace). We, as residents agree with your conclusion.

However, we cannot understand why, as rate payers, we need to put forward a submission to the Council when you have acknowledged the problem and this solution. The urgency of this restoration is evident before further denigration or accidents occur. You, as pivotal members of the Selwyn Council, have already acknowledged the need to restore the Reserve to its original state with the objective of maintaining the biosphere and ensuring paramount importance for the safety of school children who commute along the Reserve on a daily basis, and for recreational users alike.

Ideally, it would take the Council Contractors, little more than a week to install bollards and chain to restore and maintain this focal part of the Liffey Reserve. Therefore the funding should come from the on-going Council maintenance budget.

We would like to anticipate a positive, early response to our correspondence, Thanking you, Colene Welsford

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments As per the attached email correspondence a section of this reserve area along Kildare terrace has become compacted and muddy from cars and vehicles parking. To restore the area to presentable and useable reserve greenspace bollards/wire rope or chain is needed along the entire length from North belt along kildare terrace to the toilets. Provision is needed for parking and access for contractors for reserve maintenance. Renovation of the damaged area is also required including ground preparation, top soil and grass seed. Consideration is needed to also extend the bollards along Kildare terrace the other side of Gerald street. There is not as much evidence of damage on this side as trees were planted to deter vehicles, however should be completed as part of project. - There is no curbing/channeling here, is this required? - Large number of bollards will have some impact on grounds operational maintenance going forward, i.e spraying, weedeating, mowing.

Regards Jonathan

[100079] -Ellesmere Art Group Trust t/a Lakeland Art Gallery Mrs Averil Southward

Address: 80 High Street Leeston 7683

Postal Address: c/- A Southward R D 3 Leeston

Phone (day): 027 820 3045

Phone (mobile): 027 820 3045

Email: lakelandart@yahoo.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Yes - We agree that this is a good start to acknowledging the need to support the Arts in our district.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support for Community Grant Scheme noted.

[100080] - Mrs Averil Southward

Address: 76 Pacific Drive Rakaia Huts 7683

Postal Address: R D 3, Leeston

Phone (day): 3242118

Phone (mobile): 027 820 3045

Email: averilandbill@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

Yes - I agree that this is necessary

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

No - I do not agree on chlorination treatment in any form or any water supply.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Yes - I agree that this is a good starter for a fund for the Arts but would have wished for a larger contribution.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Yes - can only comment on the local Ellesmere district but agree that this is necessary for Leeston

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the extension of the Selwyn Aquatics Centre is noted.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudey has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is

organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic.

<https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system

minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for contestable Community Grants Scheme is noted. Submitter would have like a greater \$ investment in Arts.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's view that there is a need for community facilities in Leeston to service this community is consistent with Council's assessment of the situation.

[100081] -Selwyn Netball Centre Mrs Lyn Miles

Address: 6 Devine Drive, RD8 Christchurch 7640

Postal Address: North Belt Lincoln

Phone (day): 0272286292

Phone (mobile): 0272286292

Email: selwynnetball@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) no
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) no
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) yes
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) n
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23) n
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) no
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) no
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) no
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? no

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100082] - Mrs Steph Kimber

Address: 362 Hawkins Road Hororata 7544

Postal Address: P O Box 33 Hororata

Phone (day): 033180808

Phone (mobile): 0274182150

Email: kimber.fencing@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) No
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) I support this
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) I support this
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) Not entirely comfortable but would hope that correct assessments have been made to ensure health.
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21) I support this
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23) No comment
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) I FULLY support the Hororata facility
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) If required then I support it
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) I support this
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? I respect that the council is acting appropriately and fairly.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the extension of the Selwyn Aquatics Centre is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is

perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is

generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The ‘Water race user – Annual charge revenue’ is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the ‘Water race user – Per hectare revenue’ is rated

per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's support for the proposal to provide a new community facility in Hororata is acknowledged.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support.

[100083] - Miss Anna Macauley

Address: 614 Dalethorpe Road Sheffield 7580

Postal Address: 614 Dalethorpe Road, RD1, Sheffield 7580

Phone (day): 0274305986

Phone (mobile): 0274305986

Email: amacauley@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

This is my submission for the proposed chlorine in the water. On the Dalethorpe Intake, of which I have lived here for at least 25 years through the UV treatment plus more recently the chlorination treatment phase.

Healthwise I have suffered greatly in recent years from severe eczema on my skin causing numerous visits to the doctor. It is able to be smelt strongly in the shower and it has been brought to my attention (having previously lived on the farm where the intake is) that the water has been continuously chlorinated for some time, which would explain the skin conditions and the smell of the water at my current residence.

Having lived in the area I believe that there is an extremely low risk of harm to the residents on this line as there has been no long term affects pre chlorination to the residents. Many of whom have been here for 50+ years.

My concerns are health based: 1. People with inflamed skin conditions should not wash in toxic chlorinated water

Why is the Dalethorpe supply already being treated with chlorine on an ongoing basis when there is no need to. It was always in times of high turbidity that this would happen and this was always a last resort. It is not needed in our everyday life.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100084] - Mr John McKeage

Address: 41 Duncans Rd Hororata 7572

Postal Address: PO Box 55 Hororata 7544

Phone (day): 03 3180004

Phone (mobile): 022 3817606

Email: john@mckeage.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

The Hororata Hall is in desperate need of replacement and a new community centre to replace the hall is very much needed in Hororata. 120 years of use combined with financial shortfalls and earthquake damage have made the current hall unfit for purpose.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's view that the Hororata Hall is no longer fit for purpose and needs to be replaced is consistent with Council's assessment of the situation and the proposal to provide a new multi-purpose facility for the community. Support for the proposal to provide a purpose built facility to service Hororata is noted.

[100085] - Ms Susan Eden

Address: 47 Wrights road,, Sheffield Sheffield 7500

Postal Address: 47 Wrights road, Sheffield

Phone (day): +6433183647

Phone (mobile): 02102379328

Email: edengirl47@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Number 4. The water is not the same taste now in Sheffield. tastes horrible and smells.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100086] - Mrs Melissa Russell

Address: 14 Maitland Crescent Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 14 Maitland Crescent rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: Melissapaigerussell@gmail.com

Submission

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
Extending the pool is a no brainer, its always busy but, I think it's short sighted to only be putting in a 25m pool. A 50m pool would be much better, perhaps one that can be split into two 25m pools, the options of use are endless if this is done. Our athletes can train in selwyn properly, we could have diving or waterpolo facilities without compromising swimming lessons etc. We could hold competitions are bring people to the district. It just seems silly to only put in another 25m pool. Cafe is a great idea. A wet play area and hydrosrides would be awesome too.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support is noted. When preparing the business case for the SAC extension, consideration was given for a 50 metre pool. As part of a Canterbury wide network of pools, 25 metres for SAC was considered appropriate to meet the community demand and to efficiently manage the initial capital expenditure as well as the ongoing operating costs. The original business case will be revisited and refreshed for Council information regarding 50 metre pool consideration. Support for cafe is noted. Support for water play area and / or hydroslide is also noted.

[100087] -Primary Sports Canterbury Mrs Lyn Miles

Address: 6 Devine Drive, RD8 Christchurch 8140

Postal Address: PO Box 2606 Christchurch

Phone (day): +64272286292

Phone (mobile): 0272286292

Email: info@primarysportscanterbury.org.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) no
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) yes
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) yes
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) no
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21) no
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23) no
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) no
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) no
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) no
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? no

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the SAC extension is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100088] -Hororata Citizens Committee Mr John McKeage

Address: 41 Duncans Rd Hororata 7572

Postal Address: PO Box 55 Hororata 7544

Phone (day): 03 3180004

Phone (mobile): 022 3817606

Email: hcc@hororata.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

The Hororata Citizens Committee feel that district wide rates give a fairer and more equal burden to all ratepayers over facilities in Selwyn. Small rural communities are often faced with a much higher rate levy for facilities than those residents in larger communities such as Darfield or Rolleston. Ratepayers, users and visitors to all of Selwyn's facilities should have an equal share and say in the funding for them.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

The Hororata Citizens Committee fully endorses the ability for everyone to be able to safely pursue sporting, social or healthy exercise in any type of facility, park or council provided space.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

The Hororata Citizens Committee fully endorses the ability for everyone to be able to safely pursue sporting, social or healthy exercise in any type of facility, park or council provided space.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

The Hororata Citizens Committee have no group submission on this issue.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

The Hororata Citizens Committee have no group submission on this issue.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

The Hororata Citizens Committee have no group submission on this issue.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

The Hororata Citizens Committee are fully committed to providing community facilities and services to our township, district residents and visitors. Rural communities too often have an unequal ability to share in the services, entertainment and works that councils and others offer that residents of larger centres are able to enjoy. To combat this, rural communities such as ours have halls with dedicated committees running them to bring the much needed services and entertainment to their towns. Hororata is no exception to this, and has been doing so with our current hall for over 120

years. That long continuous service combined with funding shortfalls and earthquake damage, has rendered the Hororata Hall unfit for the modern era and in desperate need of replacement. The local community along with the Hororata Citizens Committee, Hororata Reserve Management Committee, users of the Hall and the Reserve and other community based organisations have banded together to focus efforts on funding and the building of a new community centre in Hororata alongside the Selwyn District Council. Presentations on this have been heard by council and we hope to gain district wide support in this long term plan process. While Hororata has a small population within a large land area, our drive and energy to give back to our community is stronger than most other towns within Selwyn. The success of the many large and small events held in Hororata can only be improved with a community centre right alongside the event spaces. We are envisioning a hall capacity of 230 persons (approx) making the hall the largest out of the halls nearby. This figure is necessary to enable the local school to utilise the facility and to cater for large indoor events currently only available in Rolleston or Christchurch. The Hororata Citizens Committee urge the council to give due consideration to this submission.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

The Hororata Citizens Committee have no group submission on this issue.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

The Hororata Citizens Committee fully endorses the ability for everyone to be able to safely pursue sporting, social or healthy exercise in any type of facility, park or council provided space.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING THROUGH LONG TERM PLAN FOR 2018/19

HEATING Currently, Hororata Hall Budget for 2017/18 includes \$3,758 targeted for Floor Covering Replacement. Requests in the past to utilise this funding allocation have been turned down by council staff for various reasons. The Hororata Citizens Committee would like this funding allocation to be reallocated to a new purpose to enable the hall to keep functioning in a healthy and compliant manner. We request that the aforementioned \$3,578 plus any extra costs needed, be used to purchase two heat pumps for the hall and meeting room to replace the current inadequate radiant heaters currently installed. We are cognisant of the status of the hall and its future, but feel that the time frame that the hall is still in use before a new community centre is built warrants the inclusion of such an upgrade. This equipment, of course, can then at the appropriate time, be relocated to the new community centre thereby reducing costs during the build. We feel that the health and wellbeing of hall users and the general public are being compromised by the lack of suitable heating.

DECOR Currently the Hororata Hall has two main decor features within it: wooden panelling dating back to the original construction, and above the dado, wallpapered plasterboard. The wallpaper was installed approximately 30 years ago, and since then has suffered damage through fair wear and use, alterations and earthquake repair etc. Parts of the walls are unsightly enough to imagine that no one would consider hiring the hall for a special occasion and this limits us in attracting public use of the hall. We request funding to either paint or re-wallpaper the affected areas (foyer, meeting room, main hall) totalling approximately 90sqm. This area does not include the supper room, kitchen, pantry or toilets.

MAINTAINING THE CURRENT HORORATA HALL If the submission process makes it clear and the council agree that a new community centre is not needed in Hororata, the Hororata Citizens Committee request and require that the council invest in the current hall to bring it up to legal code in heating, insulation, ablutions, security and all other areas necessary to make the hall fit for purpose following on from the immediate 2010/11 earthquake repairs and to maintain that level to enable the hall to remain a valued community asset for the next 20 years or more. The committee strongly feel if no new community centre is to be built, that a minimum standard must be maintained for a period not less than 20 years. It is clear to all who visit that the current state of the hall does not meet a standard the council and the public would expect from a community owned facility. An estimate over that time frame has been suggested at \$1,000,000.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the SAC extension is noted

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The Hororata Citizens Committee view that the Hororata Hall is no longer fit for purpose and needs to be replaced is consistent with Council's assessment of the situation and the proposal to provide a new multi-purpose facility for the community (subject to all funding being confirmed). Support for the proposal to provide a purpose built facility to service Hororata is noted. Hororata Hall Additional Items: The Committee propose reallocating the budget in 2018/19 for floor coverings (\$3,758) to provision of heating (heat pumps). Staff can see no issue with this request. The committee would also like to have a project included to paint part of the hall. Given the timeframe for replacement staff believe this is a reasonable request and the hall account currently has a healthy surplus. The estimated cost of this is \$2,000. The committee have asked Council to consider a contingent budget (\$1,000,000) for upgrading the hall if the new facility does not gain support through the submission process. It is recommended that this matter is re-considered at the conclusion of the LTP consultation process and during the deliberations. However previous assessments have suggested that given the condition and limitations of the existing building further investment is not warranted.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action

If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments

Hororata Hall Additional Items: The Committee propose reallocating the budget in 2018/19 for floor coverings \$3,758) to provision of heating (heat pumps). Staff can see no issue with this request. The committee would also like to have a project included to paint part of the hall. Given the timeframe for replacement staff believe this is a reasonable request and the hall account currently has a healthy surplus. The estimated cost of this is \$2,000. The committee have asked Council to consider a contingent budget (\$1,000,000) for upgrading the hall if the new facility does not gain support through the submission process. It is recommended that this matter is re-considered at the conclusion of the LTP consultation process and during the deliberations. However previous assessments have suggested that given the condition and limitations of the existing building further investment is not warranted.

[100089] - Mr Neville Jones

Address: 517 Days Road RD4 7674

Postal Address: Springfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: nevillecjones@gmail.com

Submission

Selwyn District Council Long term plan

The plan is upbeat about growth and new facilities and lots of expenditure.

Whats missing? any real focus on a clean-up of our environment. The natural environment is the one thing that most needs a long term plan, and this long term plan does not cover it.

Water Quality improvements focus on chlorination of drinking water, but makes not mention of the health hazard our natural waterways have become.

Natural waterways are missing from the plan, and should not be.

After huge amounts of negative national level publicity about the state of waterways in Selwyn District Council it's surprising that there is NO significant mention of these problems in the plan, and no plan to remedy them. Is it possible that SDC is pretending there is no issue.

I would like: 1. Acknowledgement that lowland waterways in Selwyn are in poor health, and in most case, getting worse. 2. Reporting on natural environmental indicators, perhaps in easy /short form graphics like the population ones on page one of the 4 page glossy summary. 3. Reporting on the % of waterways threatened by stock access and plans to decrease this 4. Reporting on the % of waterways with riparian planting and plans to increase this 5. Management of rated 'drains' in my (L11) catchment improved by adding a ecological /restoration requirement with a program of riparian plantings. Current management is akin to using the waterways as a toilet, and the committee of locals that are delegated to run the system have expressed zero interest .

Biodiversity is missing from the plan, and should not be.

Lowland Selwyn has some of the worst biodiversity in NZ. Selwyn should dramatically increase the resource it allocates to this area: to fund a Team of biodiversity staff with a proper budget.

Currently Selwyn appears to want to 'contract out' of direct action in this space, and instead offers minor support for organisations like Waihora Ellesmere Trust (WET), Te Ara Kakariki and others.

For several years SDC did not replace their Biodiversity officer which was a setback to progress. While the works of the volunteer groups is laudable, they are no substitute for having sufficient in-house council staff and expertise in this area. And being in the driving seat.

There are other agencies and organisations who can play a role in this area: DOC, ECAN, Living Water initiative, CAREX research group, QE11 etc. But SDC needs to put energy and commitment in and work to coordinate these groups into a larger and more ambitious initiative.

I have undertaken riparian planting along 2 km of SDC managed rated waterway, where it adjoins my property. Dealing with the variety of agencies felt uphill and it should not. SDC should role out a program to work with adjoining

landowners to get these waterways fenced off and planted with proper setbacks. SDC should just do it where the waterway is on its own land. These projects will take 3-6 years to complete so it needs an ongoing commitment of energy and resources.

Its good to see some work AT LAST on the Tarerekautuku Yarrs Lagoon reserve, and I'm hopeful that a first management plan later this year can lead to major ecological and public access improvements for an area with a history of ill treatment and neglect. I would like proper funding allocated to actioning the works necessary to protect this rare bit of remaining (mostly) natural land, wetland and waterway. END

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Selwyn District Council notes your wish to see greater environmental reporting on the state of the waterways in the district. Efforts are underway within Council to improve waterway and drainage management in the District and to improve the management of the Drainage Liaison Committees.

Selwyn District Council notes your wish to see the development of a biodiversity management unit within Council that is equipped with relevant and skilled staff.

Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection, management and enhancement within the district.

In recent years our planning department and biodiversity coordinator - who is now employed full time - have developed strong and effective working relationships, and associated joined up work programmes, with relevant agencies and stakeholders, including the Environment Canterbury Selwyn - Waihora Zone staff, Living Water, CAREX, Fish and Game, and the Department of Conservation.

The Council and will continue to support the Waihora Ellesmere Trust Te Ara Kakariki and recognises the need of the Trusts to have financial security into the future.

The Council recognises the good planting works that you have undertaken along the waterway beside your property and recognises that improvements need to be made in the management of waterways in the district.

Council staff appreciate the support and input of stakeholders such as yourself in the development of a Reserve Management Plan for Tārerekautuku Yarrs Lagoon and agree that suitable funding should be made available for the future restoration and management of the lagoon.

Topic: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Council will continue to manage the waterways under its control in a sustainable way. Council has a water quality monitoring program which will help inform future investigations and work programs.

[100090] -Little Rakaia Boating Club Mr Graeme Patterson

Address: 36 Ocean View Road Little Rakaia Huts 7683

Postal Address: RD 3 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: graeme.patterson@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Refer to the attached document.

Topic: New Infrastructure requests - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	In March 2017 Council approved the release of the full funds in the Rakaia Huts boat ramp special account. this equated to ~ \$47.4K which was to be used to pay off debt and to engage services to design and provide estimates for the restoration/protection works. As this project would not be on Council land nor be a council asset, any funding from council would either be a draw on general reserves, or from council investment income. There is no allowance for funding in the draft LTP 2018-2028 Support for this project, at any financial level needs to be balanced against all other grant requests Council has received.

[100091] - Mrs Juanita Phillips

Address: 43 Leeston Road Springston 7616

Postal Address: 43 Leeston Road Springston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission supplied as PDF or Word document, printed and attached as the following page.

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

Refer attached document.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

If it is totally necessary to extend, do a 50m pool, but no café or gym as this is taking business away from established café etc

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Good idea. Option 2 seems to be the best option.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Do not do it unless absolutely necessary as it is another cost and if the wells are maintained and the water checked, shouldn't be necessary.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

How many large community centres are necessary throughout the District? Should only be done as and when the money is available.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Shrink the staff.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

Nice to have, but not necessary. Not value for money

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

The advertising of this plan was poor. A black and white document with main points could have been in with the rates. The meeting times have been poorly advertised and are at unsuitable times and venues for working people or those with children to attend.

Could have been on the rates document and then you could have said with a clear conscious nobody was interested.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments District wide rate for halls and community centres

The district wide rate will fund the net operating costs of halls and community centres, the renewal and improvement costs as well as new facilities. The new facilities are spread around the district including the recently completed Dunsandel community centre and the proposed new facilities in Hororata and Leeston.

The district wide rate proposal reflects that ratepayers benefit from a range of facilities across the district and that residents don't just use their closest facility. Having a mix of different facilities means that the community can enjoy a broad range of events and activities. For example, residents in Springston are very well served by their local hall, the Rolleston Community Centre and the Lincoln Event Centre. It is fair that they contribute to this network of facilities.

The Council appreciates the support from its large number of volunteers, and recognises that it is the volunteers that helps local community centres/halls to serve their community so well. Council is keen to have as much voluntarily commitment as we currently have and will encourage them to continue. The committees that currently run the Council's community centres/halls and reserves will have a role to play into the future. They will be an important group for the Council to engage with to ensure the quality of maintenance and service being delivered at each facility remains or improves in the future. They will also be an important group to advocate on behalf of their local community for the needs and interests of their specific population to be met for each facility. Local Committees will have an input into the budget setting process, although the final approval rests with the Council.

Hire charges will continue to be levied but the Council will look to make them more consistent. To date, meeting room hires and charges have been at the discretion of each individual committee which has created a range of hires and charges across the district. The Council will consult with Committees to establish a reasonable and equitable schedule of charges. In addition, Council will look to ensure facilities are consistently promoted to increase utilisation.

The increase in rates for a typical property in Springston is 6.3% in 2018/19 and 6.0% in 2019/20, with a forecast average increase over 10 years of 3.3%.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for an extension to SAC is noted. The suggestion of a 50 metre pool was initially explored but not progressed due to significant capital and ongoing operational costs as well as the recognition that this facility is primarily intended as a local and regional facility as part of a Canterbury network. Some of the earlier business case and rationale will be updated and shared again with Council. In

regards to the submission not supporting a cafe and a gym, further cost benefit analyses is taking place to ensure that there is a cost / service benefit . In addition, both cafe and gym options are only intended to be progressed if deemed to meet an unmet need and alternative models of delivery by other than Council (social enterprise, business, fundraising for relevant clubs / groups) are being considered as part of this consideration.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is

perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is

generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter questions the need for these facilities and believes they should only be provided when the money is available. The proposed Hororata facility replaces the aging and damaged hall that is no longer fit for purpose and provides a new modern multi-use facility that can service both community, cultural and recreation needs. The project is supported by a feasibility study and has strong advocacy from the local community who are also willing to make substantial funding contribution. Leeston currently has no dedicated community facility to meet both current and future needs. This project is supported by a needs assessment that identified a deficit in provision and significant latent demand for community space and activities. Prebbleton has grown rapidly and the current facility is aging and no longer fit for purpose for this community. A new facility would provide a modern venue with sufficient space to cater for a range of activities and programmes that cannot be accommodated in the current hall. The timing for provision of these facilities is spaced out during the 10 year planning period to ensure they can be funded at the right time and with the appropriate mix of funding for each project.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is not in support.

[100092] - Mr M Douglas

Address: not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: not provided

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

These should all be self-funding from subscriptions, entry fees; and charges to the business groups who provide lessons at the pool. I disagree that the current pool system is struggling to accommodate customers as there doesn't seem such overuse whenever I have been there.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

a. At least once a week I have to go to the end of our road to unblock the race. When I am too busy, I contact the ranger direct. My first submission is that we need a BETTER SERVICE, NOT MORE FEES. One elderly chap used to cover the whole area and never a problem. Now there are two.

b. My rates would incase by \$117.51, so clearly I am against this proposal.

c. Better, professional service is needed.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

Good idea. Fully support

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

Build them by all means, but not at a specific rate increase to rate payers not living in those areas.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

Strongly against. Keep staff levels to a reasonable level. I am aware of one section at SDC which had one member only one or two years ago - now has four!

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28 –29)

Strongly against. Several times a day I drive my car along the roads adjacent to the Rolleston / Lincoln cycleway and there is no-one at all cycling on them. An absolute waste of rate payers funds, al for a feel-good idea at the time.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

(a). Yes, on shingled roads in the district - refer ATTACHED

(b) SDC just has to note that a lot of rate payers are now on fixed incomes. We receive a rise of \$6 on our pension this year (\$12 per month). How in the hell is this going to cover even + two year's rates increase? Our small savings takes us a little over the rates-rebate allowance.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? Yes. Land use. I am disgusted that the Selwyn District Council permit the use of excellent, productive farming land as land on which to build housing. There is ample land in very close vicinity to the central Rolleston which is light land and ideal for building houses.

Take for instance the land bounded by Brookside Road/ Edwards Road/ Ellesmere Junction Road. This area is of very light Lismore Loam soil/ has the council reticulated water supply right along all of its boundaries and easy access to the sewage system. The SDC has already permitted a subdivision on Dunns Crossing Road halfway across to Edwards Road. My submission is that such land should be made automatically available for building of residential housing. I understand that the N.Z. Govt also support such land for housing.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments While it is Council's intention to minimize cost on the aquatics centre, it is not possible for both capital and operating costs to be fully met by users. Council's Finance Policy does play clear expectations on Aquatics Centre generating a certain level of revenue. The current arrangement related to Learn to Swim lessons is at capacity at the times school aged children are available to take lessons. There are some times on certain days when the facility is not fully utilized and Council officers continue to explore options for increasing utilization of the pool at off peak times..

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for a contestable Community Grants Scheme is noted.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter supports the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton subject to them being locally funded. Council will make a decision on the funding approach for these facilities in consideration of feedback on the District-wide rate proposal.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is not in support.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitters request to seal all 1,000km of unsealed roads in the District to address dust issues is unaffordable. Equally the request to subsidise the application of network wide dust suppressant is the same. Council trials have indicated some success but as expected these are only short term. Council is facing mounting pressures to maintain its unsealed roads to a safe and trafficable standard within what is affordable and that prepared to be subsidised by the NZTA without also directly funding dust suppression for private benefit.

Topic: Township Planning AND / OR District Plan Review - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. The land within Rolleston Township which has been zoned for residential and business use has been strategically planned and consulted on with the community through the development of the Rolleston Structure Plan in 2009. That process considered the use of rural productive land

for greenfield development and it was considered appropriate through that process to rezone the land on balance to accommodate future growth.

The area of land noted in the submission being the land bound by Brookside Rd / Edwards Road / Ellesmere Junction Road is zoned Rural Outer Plains and is not envisaged for future urban development at this point in time. The minimum lot size for subdivision in the Outer Plains zone is 20 hectares. This area sits well outside of the Rolleston Structure Plan area. It is envisaged that this land would for the foreseeable future continue to be maintained as rural land.

The Rolleston Structure Plan area, if once it is zoned appropriately to its entire extent, would cater for approximately 10 years of residential housing capacity.

[100093] - Mr Stan de Rooy

Address: 987 Bealey Rd Christchurch 7671

Postal Address: 987 Bealey Rd, Charing Cross RD1 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 027 272 1239

Email: stanandtee@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) I'm in full support of everyone paying the same share for district wide community centres, halls and reserves.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) I support the need to increase the aquatic facilities for a growing population.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

I fully support the need for an indoor courts and sports hub at Foster Park. With the ongoing growth of sports and in particular junior and youth sports a suitable indoor facility and sports hub is needed for Rolleston. At present a Club like Selwyn Football is restricted in providing local Futsal opportunities for Selwyn's youth due to the lack of suitable indoor facilities.

The development of the indoor sports complex would allow this as well as many other indoor sports. A community sports hub would be a great asset to the district, allowing Selwyn's sport clubs to come together (when appropriate) and showcase the various sports on offer within the wider Selwyn District.

A district wide rate would seem the fairest way of sharing this cost to cover access to all of Selwyn's residents. I support option 1.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

With our young and old using water for drinking, any potential cause of disease or ill health must be eliminated. I fully support the chlorination of any water supplies that are a potential risk to the community. Option 1.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

Recognising the "look and feel" that water races bring to the Selwyn District, I support the introduction of a wider rating regime as proposed by Council.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

I'm in favour of this proposal.

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) I support the proposal.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) I support the proposal.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

I support the proposal.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the extension of the Selwyn Aquatics Centre is noted.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for this proposal. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington

water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years.”

Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. “A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the “natural” pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a

manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. [https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment](https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/Reasons%20why%20chlorination%20is%20required%20in%20addition%20to%20UV%20treatment) UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Thank you for your support.

Topic: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The support for a contestable Community Grants Scheme is noted.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is in support.

[100094] -Two Rivers Community Trust Mr Brian Knopp

Address: Not provided Not provided Not provided

Postal Address: Not Provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: knopp@claritynet.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Refer to the attached document.

Topic: Additional Housing - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Community housing is not an activity that this council has ever seen as core to its activities. Affordable housing matters have to date been dealt via RMA approvals or as in the Abbeyfield housing at Leeston, by allocating the Rata Foundation funds that council was granted to that project. A number of other community organisations have provide affordbale/community housing within the District and are arguably best placed to continue to do so. The question of whether the funds from the sale of houses in Ritso Street belong to Malvern has been asked previously. The answer is that the proceeds are District funds and any link to former special funds that may have arisen have been considered and resolved by council decision making that the funds are District assets and are used to support the District's funding needs.

[100095] -Cass Holdings Mr Wilfred van Slooten

Address: 29 Cass Settlement Road Cass 8042

Postal Address: 7 Inglewood Place Christchurch 8042

Phone (day): 027 464 1638

Phone (mobile): 027 464 1638

Email: fredvs@slingshot.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

Yes. The proposal would increase our rates at Cass by 48% overnight and rising significantly in future years. This information is support by an email from the Selwyn District Council after a request for actual rates information based on the proposed changes. (See attachment.)The nearest community halls located in the villages of Castle Hill or Arthurs Pass are over 25 kms away and we have not used or paid for these community halls before and we don't see why we should start paying for these halls now.

There are no nearby Reserves that the Selwyn Council maintains (nearest one would again be Castle Hill or Arthurs Pass) We maintain our own private green spaces at our expense. We are on rural land and we do not see why we should be paying for services provided to other towns and villages in the Selwyn District.

We oppose the change that will see Ratepayers that do not currently pay for Community halls and Reserves, pay for Reserves and Halls and get no benefit from them due the excessive distance from their dwellings.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
No

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

Yes. The proposal would further increase our rates by 15%. The sports courts are located 108 kms from our dwelling and we should not be paying for facilities that are impractical to use. A two and a half hour return trip to a sports hub is just not practical. We support Option 3. Targeted rate paid by Rolleston ratepayers

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) No

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

Yes. We should not have to pay for water races we receive no benefit from which are located over 50 kms from our dwelling.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23) No

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) Yes Funding issues only. Refer to answers for Question 1.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) No

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) No

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Yes We strongly oppose the issues above that would increase our rates by over 50% overnight when the plan is implemented, with a further increase of 15% a year later. The services and facilities would be impractical for us to use which we receive no benefit from and have never paid rates for before. The proposed changes would make us face our biggest rate increase in the history of the property for no benefit to us whatsoever.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Council's proposal is to set a uniform rate on all properties accross the District. As this property has 3 dwellings, the impact of the proposal on the rates payable for the submitter is substantial.

The alternative approach is to design a rating system with Zones or exemptions. This would substantially complicate the rates system. The Council's aim has been to develop a simple system.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's view that, they should not pay for these facilities as they live remotely and will not use them, is noted. It is unclear whether they support the proposals or not but they do not agree with a district rate approach to funding these types of facilities.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The Council's proposal is to set a uniform rate on all properties accross the District. As this property has 3 dwellings, the impact of the proposal on the rates payable for the submitter is substantial. The alternative approach is to design a rating system with Zones or exemptions. This would substantially complicate the rates system. The Council's aim has been to develop a simple system.

[100096] - Mr Warren Wright

Address: 497 Bluff Rd, and 756 Dalethorpe Rd Sheffield 7580

Postal Address: 497 Bluff Rd, Sheffield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021 343 700

Email: warren.wright@scorch.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer? (see pages 16–17)

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

Kerry and I farm deer and cattle on our 110ha. We are aware that chlornation has happened occasionally over the last year or two. While we have not seen any resistance to stock drinking the chlorinated water, we would like to see some data/trials supporting this. We do support option 1 on page 18-19 of the Long Term Plan proposal, however if we were to be permanently chlorinated, we would like some assurance that stock would not be affected.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Thank you for your submission. Chlorine is currently used on a number of our rural water supplies. Concerns of stock not drinking the water. has not been a problem that has been regularly reported. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudey has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour

problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).” Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the

following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

[100097] - Mrs Caroline Gieseg

Address: 17 Faulks Drive Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: 17 Faulks Dr Lincoln

Phone (day): 02102439138

Phone (mobile): 02102439138

Email: caroline.gieseg@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Springs Ward - Birchs Rd footpath & kerbing upgrade. Please make sure that this includes creating a proper footpath along the stretch of Birchs Rd between Grangewood Drive & Barton Fields Drive. It is currently dangerous with cars veering onto the shingle at the side of the road to pass cars that are turning or waiting to turn into Craigs Thompson Drive. The number of pedestrians, especially young children using that strip of road is increasing, as the population of Barton Fields has increased & they are walking to & from school. Birchs Rd is too busy and dangerous for young children to cross at peak time & it is not practical for them to do this to utilise the footpath/ cycle way on the other side of the road.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The 2018 LTP includes \$250,000 project in 2018/19 to provide kerbing and a footpath along the western side of Birchs Rd next to Barton Fields.

[100098] - Mr Peter Redfern

Address: 37 Elmhurst Road RD1 Darfield 7571

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021327064

Email: elmhurst@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

No

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

No

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

No

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

No

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

Yes- see attached submission document

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

No

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

No

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

No

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

No

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

No

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

The Council has been operating a water race system in parts of Selwyn for approximately 130 years, supplying water to rural properties primarily for livestock purposes. Although the demand for water races to supply water for livestock is declining, water races bring other benefits to the Selwyn community. These include environmental benefits such as providing a water source for wildlife, and habitat for some endangered species, along with aesthetic benefits to many townships and residential areas. These other benefits are acknowledged and supported by the submissions received from the Te Taumutu Runanga [100261], Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board [100330], Waihora Ellesmere Trust [100298], Christchurch City Council [100271], and Fish & Game [100343]. The revised rating structure provides a balance between environmental benefit and farming use. This will ensure that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races still fund the majority of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes to the costs. Over time, as the traditional use of water races for farming declines, the wider community will pick up an increasing proportion of the costs. The 'Water race user – Annual charge revenue' is rated on a per rating unit where service is available, the 'Water race user – Per hectare revenue' is rated per rating area where service is available and 'All rateable properties – Public/environmental good rate revenue' is rated per rating unit. The additional benefit to the proposed new rating structure is the provision of three standardised rating factors to replace the existing 10 rating factors.

[100099] - Mr Daaron Reynolds

Address: 84 Preston Ave West Melton Canterbury West Melton
7618

Postal Address: 84 Preston Ave

Phone (day): 0274440119

Phone (mobile): 0274440119

Email: dreynoldselectrical@xtra.co.nz

Submission

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

We already have enough Gyms and Cafes in the Rolleston Area,these Businesses Pay Rates and delivery a great service for the Rolleston Area. Why not Consider another 25 mtr or 50 mtr or both 25mtr and 50 mtr,it will never be cheaper than today to build these pools and extensions. Think Big this area is only going to grow.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The support is noted for extension to Selwyn Aquatic Centre swimming pool. The submitter is opposed to investment in a cafe within the premises. The cost of the cafe component of the development will continue to be focused on and efficiencies made wherever possible. The submitter is also opposed to investment in gym type facilities in the development. The business case for wellness / gym facilities is currently be refreshed and will take account of existing operations in locality.

[100100] - Ms Caitlin Miles

Address: 33 Market Street Christchurch 7632

Postal Address: 7632

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 223143874

Email: caitlinrose.miles@live.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)

N/A

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)

N/A

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)

N/A

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)

I do not see the introduction of chlorination to any more areas in selwyn as a need. It seems to me that SDC is jumping on the CCC bandwagon of chlorinating the water - which residents throughout Christchurch have been frustrated with and do not like. City councillors are in the same boat. I strongly disagree about introducing chlorination and will personally be rovable if I see this happening despite what a large number of people have said. By that I mean the quick poll - which when I took it said 86 per cent of people did NOT want to see any chlorination.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)

N/A

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)

N/A

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)

I would like to commend the council on providing leeston with something it has needed for a long time. We do not have adequate community facilities for our growing population and it would be great to see something of a high standard with necessary facilities brought to the area.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Below are comments from Council staff.

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination based on a risk assessment. This is the Council's preferred option. The effect of this work is to increase the water supply rate by around \$10 per ratepayer, and these costs have been included in the Council's proposed rate increase. 2. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for all Council water supplies. A further \$25 per ratepayer. 3. Not to proceed with chlorination of additional water supplies and continue to rely on existing and proposed treatment methods not involving chlorination. The Council does not favour this approach. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North

Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. “During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an extremely low level and well below the World Health Organisation guideline level for lifetime exposure. Acceptable levels for the compounds are included in the DWSNZ.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “Chlorine was introduced widely as a water disinfectant early in the 20th century and still remains the most common drinking disinfectant used around the world, including New Zealand. This widespread use has been a major factor in reducing illness and deaths due to waterborne diseases. A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant. The Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand set a maximum acceptable level for chlorine in drinking water at 5mg/L. Drinking water supplies are treated with chlorine at much lower levels than this, with the aim to retain a residual level of chlorine in the far reaches of the reticulation of 0.2 mg/L. Chlorine, in reaction with natural organic matter present in source water, can form a wide range of disinfection by-products. Factors that influence the formation of disinfection by-products include the chlorine dose, the concentration and types of natural organic matter that are present, temperature, pH and detention time. In the majority of cases to which this proposal applies, the water will be ground water containing very little natural organic matter. While every effort should be taken to minimise the formation and concentration of chemical disinfection by-products, this should never be done in a manner that compromises disinfection as poor microbiological quality represents a greater and more immediate risk to human health than short term exposure to disinfection by-products.” This position is also supported by Water New Zealand who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/> Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source

to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 7. Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's view that there is a need for a modern community facility in Leeston to service this growing community is consistent with Council's assessment of the situation.

[100101] -Coleridge Habitat Enhancement Trust Miss Toni Barlow

Address: 11 Mana View Road Paremata 5026

Postal Address: Porirua

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 022 628 3216

Email: coleridgehabitattrust@gmail.com

Submission

Submission supplied as PDF or Word document, printed and attached as the following page.

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Council recognises that native habitat loss has been considerable over the Selwyn District and has employed a full-time biodiversity coordinator whose top priority is the management and protection of existing biodiversity. As part of the District Plan Review process the (native) vegetation clearance rules are being reviewed by a working group of stakeholders. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue.

Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection and management, associated monitoring and enforcement of rules.

In recent years our planning department and biodiversity coordinator have developed strong and effective working relationships, and associated joined up work programmes, with relevant landowners, agencies and stakeholders, including the Environment, Living Water, CAREX, Fish and Game, and the Department of Conservation.

Topic: Camping Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Council is this year developing a camping strategy. The strategy is being developed in response to the upsurge in demand for freedom camping, and, to better position the Selwyn District to benefit from growth in the tourism sector. The strategy will prescribe actions that Council, across all activities, should take to ensure there is an appropriate balance between, demand, supply, and impacts - both positive and negative. The submitter raises a number of points relevant to this work that require further discussion, and contributing to the development of the strategy would enable that. Key stakeholder groups, which includes the submitter, will be contacted directly and invited to engage with that process. Consultation on the draft camping strategy is programmed to commence at the end of June 2018.

It is also recommended that the submitter be referred to the District Plan review to ensure the regulatory framework concerns they raise can be appropriately considered.

In respect to the Draft 2018 – 2028 Long Term Plan, provision has been made within the Community Facilities programme to continue Council's investment in the provision of public toilets on State Highway tourist routes, and maintain and service all existing and proposed new facilities. The plan identifies Government's Tourism Infrastructure Fund as a key opportunity to support this work. The plan also makes provision for the increase in reserves staff resources approved in 2017 to be maintained and support the management of camping activity across the district.