



SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Draft Long Term Plan

2018 - 2028

SUBMISSION BOOKLET TWO
Submissions 100102 - 100202



[100102] -Ellesmere Heritage Park Mrs Brenda Lester

Address: 1618 Leeston Road Leeston 7683

Postal Address: 1618 Leeston Road Leeston

Phone (day): 03 3254354

Phone (mobile): 0211190909

Email: brenda@brenelalpacas.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)

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)

Yes

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)

Yes

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

No

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 Ellesmere Heritage Trust submission seeks to have the proposed Leeston Community Facility located at the Heritage Park and also wants the project to have "higher priority" in the LTP. The assumption is that higher priority means bringing it forward. 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.

There are a number of potential sites for the facility in Leeston and a thorough process is required to assess all the sites as part of the planning work for this project. Some site options will impact on the eligibility of funding (reserve development contributions). The information provided by the Ellesmere Heritage Trust in their submission can be used as part of the site assessment process for this project (subject to it being approved as part of the LTP process).

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter has a wide ranging view on what constitutes a cycle trail that falls well beyond the scope of Councils Walking and Cycling Strategy such as an undefined trail alongside the banks of Lake Ellesmere. If there are such opportunities it would be for the community and/or interest groups to advocate these to a detail to enable Council to determine if it has an obligation to facilitate them as part of its Strategy

[100104] - Mr Ken May

Address: 1342 Courtenay Road Kirwee 7571 Kirwee 7543

Postal Address: P.O. Box 164

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: kannen1342@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)

I can accept the principle of a district-wide rate for community centres, or halls, however, I can't accept that there can be any component in that rate for community centres, or halls, applied to Kirwee ratepayers, as the Kirwee Community Hall is not a Council-owned facility. It is on private land and was built by the community, for the community and is managed by a community committee. The hall is our local Civil Defence assembly point and, apart from the fact that the Kirwee Community Committee arranged through the Council, for funds to be made available to wire the hall into the water supply generator circuits, to provide power in the event of a significant disaster event and power outage, the only other funding for the Hall, by the SDC has been to pay the insurance on the building.

The projected rate for Kirwee starts at \$100.00, which, with approximately 600 rate-paying dwellings, equates to approximately \$60,000.00 being 'stolen' from the community, although it is accepted that some of that money will be used to pay for the insurance. If the Council saw fit to make an annual grant such that the annual grant, plus the cost of the building insurance met the annual rate grab, then that could probably sit reasonably well with the Kirwee ratepayers. On-going maintenance and running costs require some significant fundraising within the community and this could be a way to appease the appetite of those increasing costs.

The rate for Reserves has its benefits within the community, but with an obvious push by the Council for centralised facilities, one wonders where the money will go?

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

Several questions come to mind about the use of this facility, a facility that I see of being of little personal benefit, especially as I would need to travel 21 km, which seems a bit reckless in these times of reducing carbon emissions.

My first question is what is the cost structure of the current facility, in terms of payroll, operating costs and debt recovery? Secondly, has anyone carried out a survey to assess the usage of the facilities and residential origin of those users?

Thirdly, promoted as a Selwyn-wide facility, is the reality that it is primarily a Rolleston facility, with the vast majority of of the users being Rolleston residents? Fourthly, should upgrades be facilitated by a regimen of 'user pays'?

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)

My preferred option is a Targeted Rate paid by Rolleston Ratepayers. Again, this is a plan to develop facilities in Rolleston, which will only end up attracting sportsmen and sportswomen to Rolleston. Definitely a user pays option and must not be levied off the general ratepayers, many of whom will never use the facilities. This one must end up as a 'user pays' development.

I have to say that the plan as shown for Foster Park offers absolutely nothing to the ratepayers/citizens who don't play contact sport. There are no Bowling, or Croquet facilities planned, which makes me wonder if the Rolleston Rugby Club designed this plan. It certainly doesn't embrace the community and make one want to support it.

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)

Between 4 September 2010 and today, the Kirwee water supply has had one significant e Coli event, which, it turned out, was due to earthquake damage to the reservoir and that damage was mitigated by a large-scale maintenance programme.

Currently, our water is UV treated and as far as I'm aware, no other unnecessary chemicals are added to our water. We don't need chlorination, and long may it stay that way.

The Central Government may run scared over the Hastings water contamination issues, invoking Public Health scaremongering, but Council has an obligation for avoid poisoning our ratepayers unnecessarily.

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 comment, other than to state that another increase does nothing to improve the temper of the voters. The fact that non-users pay for something that they don't use is certainly an issue worth discussing.

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 certainly see this as a step forward!

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

I have no problem with the development new community facilities in these townships, providing that the local communities FULLY support the developments and fund them.

In the last twenty years I haven't had any need to use facilities in Hororata, Leeston, or Prebbleton and I don't foresee any likelihood of that changing in the next twenty years.

Facilities in a community, for a community, must be funded by that community.

Don't rob Peter to pay Paul!

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 the extension is absolutely necessary, I have no objection, but Council will be under extreme scrutiny over this project. I have observed that there are a number of offices in the Darfield Service Centre.

Unless it is necessary for each librarian to have his/her own office, surely this would be an ideal place for emergency teams to establish offices, closer to the predicted rupture of the 'Great Alpine Fault'? What, in fact, are these offices used for

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

There has been talk for quite some time about the 'Mountains to the Sea Cycleway'. It would be great to see significant progress from Arthurs Pass to Rolleston, then the completion of connection through to the Little River Cycleway, followed by the connection of the other listed cycleways to a 'central' hub.

Long overdue to see some serious commitment to this!

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

In 2017, I made a submission, on behalf of the Kirwee Community Committee, concerning the widening of Courtenay Road, Kirwee, south of SH73 to the quietening zone.

The submission was made on the basis of the volume of large vehicles using this stretch of road arriving at and departing from the Field Days site and the damage to the verges of Courtenay Road in the residential section of the road.

In a little less than eleven months, the next Field Days (2019) will be held and still nothing has been done to comply with our submission.

Are we being ignored on this matter? I notice that this project isn't listed, so does Council see this as not being a priority? The damage done to the verges was repaired by Council and one can only assume that Council expect their ratepayers to repair their own verges at their own cost. Will they get a Rate Rebate for doing this?

Can we expect something to be done before the Field Days?

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments There is no proposal for the Council to 'take over' responsibility for the Kirwee hall that operates outside the current rating system.

Residents in the district often use the reserve or community centre/hall that is closest to them but is becoming far more common to attend community centres/halls or reserves that are not located close to where they live. Foster Park and the Lincoln Event Centre draw people from all over the district for sport and community events. Similarly Lincoln and Darfield netball courts have for many years been the hub of netball in the district. Many of the facilities that we have developed and are proposing to develop, such as the new indoor courts, are designed to meet the needs of the whole district, not just the local town.

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 Submission does not support SAC development on basis of the facility not being a Selwyn facility but a Rolleston limited facility and support for a user pay model of funding to pay for upgrade. Council is advised that usage of SAC is definitely broader than Rolleston and additionally extends to include ChCh city patrons as well as patrons from other parts of district. User pay model is not feasible for building or operating development.

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: 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	The submitter comments about the Darfield Library being used in a civil defence emergency event. Depending on the response required to an event will dictate which of the council's facilities are used.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The Mountains to Sea Cycleway concept and proposal was developed in 2009 by Environment Canterbury as part of a regionally based initiative that included Selwyn. Funding was requested from Central government for a feasibility study as part of a national tourism initiative. It was declined. A similar opportunity has presented itself and Council is making another submission relating to undertaking a feasibility study for at least the section within Selwyn.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	For the 2017/18 Annual Plan the Council did not support the submission made at the time to fund the seal widening of Courtney Rd to facilitate the annual field days

[100105] - Mr Kevin Dunn

Address: not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: sirion@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?

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council staff have integrated the 'Six principles for drinking water in New Zealand' into our planning documents. 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 The Submission requests that the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund be retained as a separate Community Grant and specifically focused on biodiversity and conservation. The Submitter would like to see the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund level of funding increased. Officer recommendation is to retain the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund as a separate fund at this time.

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Selwyn District Council notes your wish to see the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund increased above its current level of \$45,000 per year by asking ratepayers across the district to contribute more towards biodiversity protection and management. This will assist the Council to meet its responsibilities towards biodiversity and the development and protection of land, as stated in the Resource Management Act.

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.

[100106] -Lincoln University Dr. Catherine Elliot

Address: PO Box 85084 Lincoln 7647

Postal Address: PO Box 85084

Phone (day): 034263493

Phone (mobile):

Email: catherine.elliott@lincoln.ac.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 agree with the idea of rate payers funding these.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) I agree, more swimming facilities are desperately needed. However, why not consider working with the Lincoln University Recreation Centre to have another swimming location outside of Rolleston which is conveniently located and operated by LU. Lincoln Township is in need of a swimming facility and the university has plenty of land for building such a 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) 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) I do not agree with the chlorination treatment of any 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)

Water should be paid for by everyone according to how much they use. Water is gold and allowing farmers to use as much as they want for next to nothing allows (and maybe encourages) them to waste it.

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 have no comments.

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

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 consider putting more funding towards making SD streets safer for people riding bikes (from 8 to 80 years old). Electric bikes are making commuting longer distances a reality for some people. I know a lot of people who would commute to Lincoln from the city if they felt like they would not be hit by a car in the section from the motorway roundabout to Prebbleton where the Rail Trail starts. Please consider making this section more biker friendly. I ride it every morning and cannot blame anyone for feeling unsafe because it certainly can be unsafe! There are millions spent on the new motorway and much smaller percentage spent on cycleways. Please consider the number of people you can get out of traffic by getting them onto bicycles. I have spoken to a lot of people who are considering electric assist bikes but still need convincing given Springs Road has no cycle lane coming off the roundabout.

Thanks for considering.

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. The submitter also proposes SDC continue to work with Lincoln University and encourage aquatic facility development in Lincoln on University land. It is understood some work has already occurred in this regard, but officers are open to further investigation in this regard.

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 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: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter requests safer streets for cycling and the emergence of ebikes meaning more people can travel longer on cycleways. This is discussed in the 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy. 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. 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.

[100107] -Upper Waimakariri Group (UWG) Susan Hall

Address: not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: smahall@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?

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council staff have integrated the 'Six principles for drinking water in New Zealand' into our planning documents. 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 Community Grant Funding noted with a suggestion to keep Selwyn Natural Environment Funding separate. It is intended that this funding will be retained in a separate community fund at this time.

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Selwyn District Council notes your wish to see the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund increased above its current level of \$45,000 per year by asking ratepayers across the district to contribute more towards biodiversity protection and management, and regenerative land uses. This will assist the Council to meet its responsibilities towards biodiversity and the development and protection of land, as stated in the Resource Management Act. The Council also notes your link between current land management practices, biodiversity loss, and negative effects to drinking water quality – including the possible need for chlorination.

Council notes your wish to see the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund kept separate from other community funds to reflect the importance of environmental protection and enhancement projects, and to avoid the fund being lost among other community projects.

Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection and management, associated monitoring and enforcement of rules. The Council commends and supports the new strategic direction of Environment Canterbury to focus on the protection and management of terrestrial biodiversity. In recent years our planning department and biodiversity coordinator have developed strong and effective working relationships, and associated joined up work programmes, with the relevant agencies and stakeholders.

[100108] - Mr Tim McVie

Address: 47 Othello Drive Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 47 Othello Drive Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: tmcvie@hotmail.com

Submission

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

Agree that a bigger pool facility is needed. And if you do the upgrade, why not make it awesome, and put in a hydroslide / outdoor pool too.

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)

it would be really, really god to have squash courts included in this facility. I am a squash coach, and travel into Christchurch for my work. I know of many people who would benefit from Courts in Rolleston.

This is an all-year round facility that would be well used by people for all ages. A must for any developing town.

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 also proposed hydroslide and outdoor pool be included in the development.

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

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

[100109] - Ms Bella Huddleston

Address: 260 Gillanders Road Greendale 7671

Postal Address: 260 Gillanders Road RD1 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: bellaandgerald@xtra.co.nz

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)

Our water is from the Malvern Hills water supply and has been chlorinated for some time now. It was called emergency chlorination to begin with, but it has not been un-chlorinated since the emergency has ended. We noticed immediately that it was chlorinated and still daily notice the smell and taste.

We strongly object to it being chlorinated, we live in Canterbury the home of fresh water, people come to visit and rave about our water and when we go elsewhere one of the first things we notice is the bad water there. Well this was how it was in the past.

While we understand that sometimes in an emergency the water might need to be chlorinated short term, having chlorine in that water always is disgusting, unhealthy and unnecessary.

If it continues to be permanently chlorinated then we will have to look at getting our own well.

Thank you.

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.”

[100110] -Sheffield Waddington Community Committee Mr Hugh Paterson

Address: not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: shefwad.cc@selwyn.govt.nz

Submission

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

The Sheffield-Waddington Community Committee would like to apply for extra discretionary funding to pay for the secretarial services of the SDC Roving Committee Secretary.

Our Committee has benefited very much from the Roving Committee Secretary services.

Work is completed efficiently, correctly and consistently.

This can only be beneficial to both the Council and our Community.

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	Submitter request for the Sheffield-Waddington Community Committee to receive additional discretionary funding to pay for secretarial services.

[100111] - Ms Megan Harlick

Address: 52 Shadbolt lane Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 021 1579120

Phone (mobile): 0211579120

Email: meganandjamesj@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 am fully supportive of an extension to the current aquatic centre facility and believe that the proposal is the minimum upgrade required. I would however, like the council to be more focused on future proposed growth within the region and look at a more sustainable option such as a 50m pool with a movable bulkhead. I appreciate that the SDC is in part guided by the wider Spaces and Places document which was developed post 201/11 earthquakes and the "requirement" for there to be only 1 50 m pool in the wider Canterbury district, however I would also like to draw attention to the lack of progress by our CCC neighbours in this area and the continued delays. As a result, swimmers across Canterbury are missing out on opportunities to train and compete locally in such a facility and an entire generation has missed out on such opportunities due to the obstacles faced as a swimmer. In addition, the growth in the district and the increasing demands being placed on the current facility are not likely to be resolved should the current proposal be adhered to. Already the demands being placed on the facility far out strip the addition of a 25 m pool.

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 am fully supportive of the development of a indoor court/sport hub facility to compliment the other developments occurring at the Foster Park location. A facility such as that proposed will provide massive benefit to the wider Selwyn District not only from a sporting perspective but also a viable option to host a number of community and commercial events which are currently untenable. It has long been recognised that hubbing of like minded groups increases productivity and efficiency through the sharing of resources, expertise and knowledge and is a model demonstrated across NZ. The proximity of such a hub to sporting facilities is not only sensible but necessary. Indoor facilities such as those proposed will allow sports within the district to increase participation thereby meeting the needs of the community and supporting the goal of a healthier, more active population in an attempt to reduce the number of incommunicable diseases and illnesses that are currently on the rise. In addition, there are a number of sports and activities (e.g., basketball) in the district that have been undercatered for historically that would provide increased opportunities for our young people to engage in healthy and positive pastimes. As a strong supporter of netball I also see massive benefits to the Sport in the Selwyn District for such a facility - allowing games to be played inside has been proven to increase enjoyment and therefore participation rates. No doubt a change to the current delivery models will be required to allow and enable all potential tenants to access the spaces, however change is inevitable with progress and will in fact mirror the changes in society and possibly allow for greater engagement from people otherwise unable to commit to traditional sport delivery models.! User pays is inevitable - however I don't believe that the Rolleston ratepayers should wear the brunt of rate charges as the development of this facility will be both utilised by residents from all areas within the District, but businesses and individuals will also benefit from its development. In addition an ongoing user pays model will be required to ensure the upkeep and ongoing maintenance of such a facility. There are numerous examples of where this has been done successfully and economically (e.g. the Edgar Centre in Dunedin) which should be explored further. Key to this

however, is ensuring the focus of the development is on function not form - something I am sure will be kept at the forefront of all decisions being made.

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)

I am supportive of all recommendations to increase the safety and accessibility of cycling and walking within the District.

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. The submitter did draw attention to delays in CCC 50 metre pool as part of the regional network of pools . It is understood some progress is now being made by CCC.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - 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

[100112] - Mirjam Hosburgh

Address: Not provided Whitecliffs not provided

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

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)

Is this the reason why Whitecliffs has a rate increase of 9% for the next few years? What does Whitecliffs people get for this rates increase?

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)

Strongly disagree. Please fix infrastructure. In the meantime, I'd rather have both water notices.

Note: is the Council aware that byproducts of water chlorination (CBP) increases the production of free radicals which are associated with cancer. CBP's also can cause respiratory disorder and neurological problems.

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'd rather see the money spent on the smaller communities who don't get too much value back from their rates. Supposed increase rates 9% for Whitecliffs. We don't even have a footpath in Whitecliffs.

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

URGENT - footpath / cycleway between Whitecliffs and Glentunnel. Unsafe to walk / cycle. Footpath in Whitecliffs.

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

Fluoridation of water: Strongly against fluoridations. Fluoride has been a known neurotoxin for a long time. Also, there are many studies and published documents that have demonstrated that increased fluoride exposure is directly linked to increase periodontal disease.

Cleaning of drains in Whitecliffs: mainly the Whitecliffs Road drain is being cleaned. When ringing the Council why Hector Street was only half done, the answer was - not enough money to clean the drains. Get real Council - another 100 metres??!!

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter questions whether the community of Whitecliffs has a rate increase of 9% for the next few years because of the introduction of District Wide rating for community centres, halls and reserves. The submitter also asks what Whitecliffs residents receive for this rate increase.

The average increase for Whitecliffs residents is projected to be 9.2% for 2018/19 and 9.7% for 2019/20, with an average increase over the 10 years of 4.8% p.a. These increases are largely associated with the introduction of a district wide rating structure.

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: 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.

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 mean the budget will need to be increased when this is better understood.

Topic: Drains - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Thank you for your comments on the Whitecliffs drain maintenance. These have been passed on to our operations team.

Topic: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Council currently has no plans to provide Fluoridation.

[100113] - Mr Bill Taylor

Address: 33 Rotherham Drive West Melton 7619

Postal Address: West Melton

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: bian8@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, this facility is in high demand. Consequently if you are going to extend the pool it MUST be a 50m pool. There should have been a 50m pool right from the start. Now we will be doing this again in ten years time. With the forecast population growth, it's crazy to think of another 25m pool.

You could save money by shelving the proposed skate park in West Melton. I don't think it 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)

I am strongly against chlorination of our water. As long as the wells are secure, we should enjoy some of the purest water in the world.

The chlorination issue is no more than a beat up from central government with a one size fits all.

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 Council's proposal on this matter.

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)

Provided this is the most cost effective way I support this, but please make provisions for extra growth.

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?

Both my wife and I use your exercise programme at the Rolleston Community Centre - they are excellent and you can be proud of a great facility. This is matched by the personnel both at the front desk, and instructors. Well done.

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. The submitter suggested not investing in skate park in West Melton and contribute this money towards 50 metre pool. The price differentiation is vastly in excess of such a potential saving

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: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100114] - Mrs Dianne Westaway

Address: 3/1299 Courtenay Road Kirwee 7543

Postal Address: PO Box 263 Kirwee

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: westaway45@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 Kirwee ratepayer, I would like to know what the Council is considering with regard to the Kirwee Community Hall. As it is owned by the Courtenay A & P Association and relies on fundraising for its upkeep.

Would the Council consider granting the Kirwee Community Hall a special annual grant to help with maintenance? I understand that the Council wishes to have an overall rating system, but there are exceptions.

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 seems to be no facilities for the older members of the community e.g. Bowling Green. Could some thought be given to establishing an indoor law bowls green.

There is nothing like this in Canterbury, and I feel this type of facility would be beneficial to the entire area. There is a movement within bowls to establish other forms of the game to make the game more appealing to all ages and to utilize indoor facilities.

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 it has to happen, then chlorinate, but it would need to be provided to be the last resort.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments There is no proposal for the Council to ‘take over’ responsibility for the Kirwee hall that operates outside the current rating system.

Residents in the district often use the reserve or community centre/hall that is closest to them but is becoming far more common to attend community centres/halls or reserves that are not located close to where they live. Foster Park and the Lincoln Event Centre draw people from all over the district for sport and community events. Similarly Lincoln and Darfield netball courts have for many years been the hub of netball in the district. Many of the facilities that we have developed and are proposing to develop, such as the new indoor courts, are designed to meet the needs of the whole district, not just the local town.

The proposal does not currently include a provision for grant payments to facilities that fall outside the rating system.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments It should be noted that there are lawn bowls clubs reasonably close to Rolleston located in the communities of Lincoln, West Melton and Dunsandel.

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.”

[100115] - Mrs Laura Chisholm

Address: 29 William Street Prebbleton 7604

Postal Address: 29 William St Prebbleton

Phone (day): 0224778270

Phone (mobile):

Email: aj_lfchisholm@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) Not ideal. How shall the district-wide rate be allocated for funding given the vast number of facilities and the degradation of some facilities? Some community facilities are presently run down and not operating at the same level as others. Which is likely why other facilities are utilised more. And perhaps some committees are more proactive relating to this than others. Perhaps provide a programme of where key/significant funding shall be allocated and when? A priority list.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) Extension definitely necessary. 50m competition pool required. More family change facilities required.

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) Indoor courts and sports hub need to cater for all basic sports with full sized courts etc - not just sports currently on trend. Trends come and go. The facility needs to cater for all sports offered at schools in the district. District wide rate preferred as it is a new facility for all.

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 think chlorination treatment should be introduced at all to any community in Selwyn. I understand the mishap we had up north - but a blanket chlorination for NZ is not the answer. We are a vastly rural community - so how many people would actually be utilising chlorinated water? Is there another more effective treatment we could use? Increase public awareness and suggest more effective "in-home" treatment options available to those who would like it.

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 comment.

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) Depends on where funding is coming from - district-wide rate or targeted rate?

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 comment.

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

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? Health Hub - great idea but a 24hr clinic (or 8pm to 8am) is most definitely required. Current facility does not allow emergency walk-ins if you are not a patient with them. Given the number of people, accidents etc in the Selwyn area this is a necessity.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Maintenance and renewal budgets will be based on the Council's Activity Management Plan for the hall or community centre. These plans are based on an assessment of the condition and use of the building, and future maintenance and renewal needs. As the plan is needs based rather than a funding allocation it means that work that is required will get done rather than being determined by the availability of local funds. Local Committees will have an input into the budget setting process, although the final approval rests with the Council.

The activity management plans are available on the Council website.

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. The submitter also requests consideration for additional Family Change rooms and these are included in planning of the development.

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.”

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: It is unclear whether the submitter supports the proposals or not and this would be subject to how they are funded. Council has sought views on a district wide funding model and has provided information on the rating implications for this and the current targeted approach for each project. A final decision on the funding approach will be made as part of deliberating on the submissions received on this matter.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Health Hub Project: The submitter supports the Health Hub concept and would like to see a 24 hour emergency clinic provided as there is no current service available. The submitter's request is acknowledged and can be considered as part of developing more detail on the range and extent of services provided through the Health Hub.

[100116] - Ms Katarina Te Maiharoa

Address: 42 Hillsborough Terrace Christchurch 8022

Postal Address: 42 Hillsborough Terrace, Christchurch

Phone (day): 0274483696

Phone (mobile):

Email: ktemaiharoa@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)

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)

The environment needs to be cleaned up before any chlorination is to be used. Clean the area of the sources of water and where the water travels from and to.

Pipes need to be fixed or replaced to prevent chlorination being a permanent additive.

Keep the water from being chlorinated.

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 race systems are an unnatural feature to the landscape. That water should be returned to the rivers where possible. The feature of the races in reserves and localities could be kept for the aesthetics.

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 a great idea for a walkway and biking way! As long as it doesn't run next to dairy farms because the stench of animal feces is terrible.

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

The Selwyn District Council needs to manage it's land use better and use the evidence supplied by local, university and professional environmentalists and ecologist to make informed decisions on environmental protection, enviro restoration and farming practices.

The land management of the council has so far lacked the integrity needed for an environmentally sustainable plan that has been profitable in the short term but will meet its fatal end through environmental degradation in the long term.

The council needs more ecologists on it's staff and board who are informed with qualifications to show that they understand the impacts of Council decisions and to help steer the council toward sustainable practices and restoration of degraded lands and waters.

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: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Selwyn District Council notes your desire to see improved land use management and the need for informed decision making regarding environmental protection and restoration, and farming practices. Also noted is your suggestion that the Council have a qualified ecologist on staff to help steer the Council towards sustainable practices and the restoration of degraded lands and waters.

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.

[100117] - Mr Drury

Address: 25 Cameron Crescent Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 25 Cameron Crescent Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

I wish to make a submission relating to the proposed extension to the Selwyn Aquatic center.

As on of the pools most regular swimmers and somebody who has considerable experience in competitive swimming over more than 30 years, strongly support the proposal to construct an additional pool in Rolleston.

This is a community necessity with a growing population. The many different user groups makes it difficult for the general public to access lane swimming today.

However, I would recommend some amendments to the proposal. These are as follows:

1. Making the additional pool a 50m pool with boom that would allow it to be used as either a single 50m training/competition pool or as two separate 25m pools. There are no other competition grade 50m pools in Christchurch at present with the only other option being the new Metro Sports facility which has been plagued by multiple issues. Other 50m pools across the south island are either outdoors (Jellie Park, Timaru, Nelson) and closed for half the year or as far away as Dunedin and Invercargill. The new QE2 pool "could" add a 50m pool "at a later date" and "if required" which means it is years away. Whilst a 50m pool may be an additional near term cost, it could be offset by taking on board notes 3 and 4 below. In addition, the cost now would be significantly less than doing it in the years to come.

2. Ensuring that there is sufficient spectator space to cater for the many competitions that the pool already holds. Some current events require both competitors and spectators be ushered in and out for their respective races as there is woefully inadequate seating.

3. Removing the fitness center. Rolleston and the Selwyn district is already exceptionally well catered for in the private sector and does not need additional public funding. A brand new sports center has just opened in the center of Rolleston and the events centers / community halls happily cater for fitness classes - the plan is to build a new one of these in Rolleston as well. The money for the fitness center could be better spent on items 1 and 2 with a greater emphasis on promoting and freeing up land for the private sector to invest in the general fitness arena.

4. Re-scale or remove the Cafe. \$1.1M on a Cafe and outdoor courtyard is quite frankly outrageous (that's two complete new houses, including land, in a local subdivision). Whilst the details are yet to be determined, I would expect the running of the Cafe to be outsourced like other similar models which means any profit won't even go back to the council for re-investment into the community. With the playing fields and playground over the road, the benefits of some form of a Cafe may be justified. However, I would suggest leasing a piece of local land for a privately funded construction or if the council really want to invest, to scale it down to something more appropriate. Graham Condon facility does not have a cafe. Pioneer, Jellie Park and Timaru all have small indoor cafe's at no more than 20sqm each (including "kitchen" area). Ashburton has a slightly larger Cafe that also serves hot food (including chips) - seeing as this is a sports facility, I would suggest a smaller, health oriented Cafe may be more appropriate.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support for SAC development is noted. Submission proposes a 50 metre pool (and associated seating) primarily for elite swimming and also due to concerns with lack of progress of 50 metre facility by CCC. Officers advise that Hon Megan Woods in Press Release 27 April, confirms the CCC Metro Sports facility is back on track and includes a 50 metre pool complex. Submitter also proposes a more modest cafe with focus on health and does not support gym.

[100118] - Ms Helen Davey

Address: Hartley Hills Darfield 7571

Postal Address: Hartley Hills Darfield, RD1

Phone (day):

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)

This will only work if the dollars are returned to each community in a way that everyone can feel connected. This **MUST NOT** become an intellectual exercise. I must be truey social work.

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's too much sport spending. Investing in community social arts that have a much greater healing quality would be much more advantageous. Targeting of funds.

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)

Don't POISON ME! I want living water. The arguments for chlorine permanently in water are fear-based for the most part, are totally inflexible and I DON'T buy into them.

A study needs to be done independently of the ill health this causes here in SDC. This is the true 'due diligence' required by rate payers

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 strongly oppose any change to the workings of people who support actively their local hall business. **DONT TAKE AWAY LOCAL INVOLVEMENT** in running the hall, especially **SHEFFIELD**.

Decentralise! By running it from the Council, the locals lose the true community spirit. This has happened in Oxford from what I hear.

The community will be vibrant so long as they work together **LOCALLY** - not from Council offices.

Please make a conscious effort to get out of your heads and work from your hearts on community matters.

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 appreciate the efforts made in conscious goodwill by the Council staff, but I know that for healthy community service, head (thinking) must work equally with heart (Feeling).

Council employees must learn to balance all three thinking, feeling and willing to avoid the usual alienation we experience re: Council working all departments.

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 the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submission does not support the indoor facility at Foster Park. The rationale around this view is not whether or not the facility is required or the costs is to great but that further investment should be targeted to the Arts. The issue for discussion at Council level is the prioritisation of funding (sports/arts) into the Community.

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: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The submitter seems to oppose the Community Grants Programme on the basis that it will disempower local communities. This is not the intent of the Programme. It may be that the Submitter is concerned at the risk of Ward / Committee Discretionary Fund being included, which is not the intent at this time.

[100119] - Mr Brian Thompson

Address: Hartley Hills Road RD 1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: helenandbrian70@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)

Totally opposed to the permanent chlorination of the Malvern Hills water scheme. The current filtration and UV treatment is delivering water up to drinking water standards at the wellhead.

There is no need for permanent chlorination.

Chlorine is a poison and has affected several people with the recent chlorination. Problems showing up include sore throats, excema, rashes. these problems were brought up by residents at a meeting at Glentunnel Hall on 26 April 2018.

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.”

[100120] - Mrs Mary Stapylton-Smith

Address: 23 Tauhinu Avenue Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: Lincoln

Phone (day):

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)
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?

My name is Mary Stapylton-Smith. I used to live at Camp Bay in Lyttelton Harbour, and was a Community Board member on the Banks Peninsula District Council on the Lyttelton /Mt Herbert Ward for two terms.

1. I understand that a previous plan talked of traffic lights in Lincoln for the intersection between the Main Road (Gerald Street) and West Belt. It is often very difficult to get across Gerald Street, both for cars and pedestrians.
2. My second submission is regarding planning on a wider scale. There are a number of recent subdivisions in Lincoln which seem to be wholly residential. Mostly they don't seem to have benches or seats for walkers to rest, or indeed shops, or public facilities like lavatories or drinking fountains which would be of value to many.

I am well aware that such facilities are subject to vandalism; perhaps if they were all under one roof of little shopping centres which are locked in the evenings, say...

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Draft 2018 LTP includes a \$1.2 million project in 2023/24 to install traffic lights at Gerald St and West Belt at the first intersection upgrade for the Lincoln Town Centre Master Plan

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. Council staff note your concerns regarding the provision of community and public infrastructure within the new residential subdivisions of Lincoln. The facilities as noted in your submission are provided where appropriate to do so within public reserves. Council endeavours to work with developers of new subdivisions to provide the appropriate services and amenities in a strategically planned way.

[100121] - Mrs Julie Baker

Address: 311 Hollands Road, Greendale RD1 Christchurch 7671

Postal Address: Stephen's Cottage, 311 Hollands Road, Greendale RD1 Christchurch

Phone (day): 033188144

Phone (mobile): 0210364656

Email: julesbaker69@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)

Yes. We use the Malvern Water, Hartleys Road water and we do not wish it to be chlorinated. This is because of the taste of the water. I have experienced this chlorination recently. I could smell it before I cleaned my teeth and did not like the taste of it. We have never yet had a boil notice here and I don't mind boiling water if we are told to. Please do not chlorinate our water again.

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)

My water race, we are right at the end, is usually silted up and slow so I would not want to pay any extra for this facility. My sheep and ducks use it only but I do have to supplement the sheep when the water is low and no one can be seen to clear out their water races when I ring Sicon.

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 was added to this scheme due to contamination being detected in the network. Taste issues are due to the short term use of chlorination on this scheme (see below for more information on taste concerns). 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.

[100122] - Mrs Sue Wragg

Address: 550 Whitecliffs Rd Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: RD 1 Coalgate

Phone (day): 03 3182636

Phone (mobile): 0211435008

Email: kensue.w@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)
I feel the \$1.1m for a café is totally unnecessary. The leisure/current pool is often too busy for younger children as main pool is always being used for classes, spend the money on pools etc not a café.
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) The risk must be severe and permanent to justify permanent chlorination. The SDC should be under an obligation to provide the best water possible including maintaining infrastructure to a high standard. On the rare occasion that contamination has happened then a 'boil water' notice should be issued or residents can provide their own filters if they are concerned. Eczema is a known problem following chlorination and possibly other long term health problems.
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)

Under the SDC Walking & Cycling Strategy draft, it is great to see so many new pathways. I strongly believe a Glentunnel to Whitecliffs walkway/cycleway should be included in this plan. Firstly, once a village of holiday homes the number of permanent residents in Whitecliffs has increased enormously in the last 5 years and now they far outnumber holiday makers. Glentunnel has both the local school and nearest shop. Secondly, the Whitecliffs Domain is incredibly popular especially from October to March, being one of the few remaining free family camp grounds. There are no footpaths through the village and a 100km speed limit on the road to Glentunnel. There is no safety for either walkers or cyclists. Please add a walkway/cycleway through Whitecliffs and on to Glentunnel as soon as possible.

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 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.

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: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Supports the 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy. 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 meant the budget will need to be increased when this this is better understood. The Action Plan also identifies \$345,000 of footpath installations for Whitecliffs including along Whitecliffs Rd as the first priority.

[100123] -Malvern Computers Mr Jonathan Lawrence

Address: 53 Waddington Rd Waddington 7500

Postal Address: 53 Waddington Rd Waddington

Phone (day): 033183699

Phone (mobile): 0276889103

Email: malcomputers02@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)

Yes - I would prefer that chlorination not be added to our water supply as it creates a number of health problems. If there is contamination that comes in the water then the source of that contamination should be located & fixed or upgraded. I also suggest that if there is a problem with the water, that the chlorination should only be added on a very temporary basis as is the current situation.

If you are still determined to chlorinate our water, whether or not the majority want it or not (which i believe we all should be able to have a vote if we want it or not) then can you please give us an option to get a good clean supply of non-chlorinated water in our towns so we can still have a healthy choice of 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)
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.”

[100124] -CentreStage Rolleston Mr Darren Weber

Address: 12 Moore Street Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 12 Moore Street Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0279276019

Email: Darrenluvsmusic@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) I believe we desperately need a performing arts venue in Rolleston. It needs to be a space that houses at least 500 audience and has a decent stage area, with good access and a back stage area with dressing rooms, green room etc.
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	Performing Arts Centre for Rolleston: The submitter's views on the need for a performing arts centre for Rolleston are acknowledged. In the first instance staff believe that community access to the auditorium at Rolleston College should be explored which has seating for around 500 (rather than invest in an additional facility at this point in time). When the college was being designed the Council advocated with the Ministry of Education for community access to this facility and this should be followed up. As Rolleston grows over time there is likely to be a reasonable case established for a purpose built performing arts venue and this can be considered as a future community facility.

[100125] -not provided Mr Glen McGeachen

Address: not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

Cycling & Walking Strategy In general terms I am supportive of the cycle and walkway strategy as proposed within the LTP, however I would encourage the council to consider accelerating the program, and inclusion of budget/projects to the LTP, to provide a more complete network. Detailed feedback as follows:

The benefits realisation for a cycling network are back-loaded, meaning that the usage increase will not be linear with the investments made, and are more likely to be exponential when the cycling network is nearing completion, when the opportunity exists for cyclists to complete the majority of their journey on a 'safe route'. With this in mind, I would encourage the council to consider accelerating the program for completion of the cycle & walking facilities, and consider additional funding/endeavours to 'close-the-gaps' between some of the current projects proposed, to provide a more complete network between our townships. A partially completed (and given the above assertion, under-utilised) network may also make it difficult for the council to gain support to complete this in future LTP rounds.

(A recent NZ reference is https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12034342)

I do appreciate that the Selwyn cycling strategy/plan is significantly different from others, where this predominantly is an inter-township network (as opposed to an in-town network), so we generally will have greater distances involved, with lower population density. Whilst both these factors can result in a comparatively higher-cost-per-ratepayer, the greater distances can also mean that the benefits are greater too.

Whilst a commute from Rolleston to Christchurch is already achievable for an averagely fit person, the recent upsurge in e-bikes (combined with continued price/performance improvements), will easily place other longer commutes within an average persons reach (e.g. Darfield->iZone, Kirwee->Christchurch).

With respect to completing the network, funding and plans should be included in the LTP (at minimum) for Kirwee to Rolleston, to provide a connection between Darfield/Kirwee and ultimately Christchurch. This could in part leverage the proposed widening work on Hoskyns road (eventually joining onto the proposed West-Melton to Rolleston cycleway), and/or could either utilise the rail corridor/Railway road.

Whilst I appreciate that the LTP is not focussed on tourist cycle strategy, such a path could be leveraged by future road-touring routes such as Arthurs Pass (including the proposed Sheffield/Springfield->Darfield projects) or Methven/Geraldine directions. It would even help ensure that current 'road tourers' (likely to be a different target demographic, albeit some crossover, to those utilising the 'Mountains to Sea' as proposed in I15) with the likely patrons of the would be more likely to pass through Rolleston (and within reach of its shops/services) as part of their route to/from Christchurch.

Seal Widening I would encourage the Hoskyns road widening to be brought forward, as this should have been considered as part of the iZone development. There has been a large increase of trucks using this road since the development of iZone, and it is evident that 2 trucks passing each other both need to place their wheels in the shoulder/gravel. The intersection at SH73/Hoskyns also needs to be upgraded to coincide with the seal widening (obviously coordinated with

NZTA), as there has already been an increase in the large vehicles using this, and will only be exacerbated by the seal-widening programme on this road. Also see my comments above, regarding the cycling & walking strategy. This widening work could be leveraged to provide an interim on-road cycle-route, to form part of a Kirwee-Rolleston link.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments It is considered from the submitters comments that the 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy is well balanced reflecting providing new facilities both within and between townships and actively seeks to close gaps and provide missing links. It is acknowledged that there is an element that requires a "build it and they will come" but Council has to be prepared to take that risk and consider this accordingly on behalf of its ratepayers. While not implicit in its project selection criteria it is appreciated there will be a tourism benefit and should the series of Malvern cycleways proceed it can link to current Rail Trails and proposed regional ventures like the Mountains to the Sea cycleway if it ever proceeds.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Hoskyns Rd Seal widening project is programmed for 2022/23 and is second in priority in the seal widening programme. The first priority is the upgrade of Weedons Ross Rd related to coordinating with CSM2. It is understood the NZTA have finally programmed to install a right hand turn bay at SH73/Hoskyns Rd intersection

[100126] - Mrs Alanah Conner

Address: 17 king st Springfield 7510

Postal Address: 17 king st sprongfield rd1 7510

Phone (day): 033188699

Phone (mobile): 0212329274

Email: alanahconner@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)

I am not in support of chlorinating the 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)
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.”

[100127] -CentreStage Rolleston Mr Philip Dean

Address: 77 Dryden Ave Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 77 Dryden Avenue Rolleston

Phone (day): 0275398111

Phone (mobile): 0275398111

Email: Phildean@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 support this. The halls and reserves are the treasure of all rate payers in Selwyn. Without these facilities the entire region would be negatively affected.

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 of the aquatic centre. like the parks and reserves the aquatic centre is a benefit to the whole community and the funding based on a zone basis appears fair.

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 sports are a great way for the community (young and old) to get together so are the performing arts. At the moment there is nowhere in the district that allows for the performing arts to be developed or to flourish except the few private providers. The performing arts is supported by almost as many people as our most popular sports like rugby and netball. These sports have strong national support communities that ensure that they thrive. The performing arts is the poor cousin. There is scope in this new sporting facility to offer some space for the performing arts. Space like a dance studio, rehearsal rooms performance areas will meet the increasing demands of the performing arts commhnity

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)

Yes. A single contactable scheme coupled with a strong policy statement from SDC on what it will and will not support will mean that the things supported will be rightfully so more richly funded. The risk is that the loudest voice or the squeaky wheel will get a disproportionate portion of the funding.

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)

Well done..... I fully support this

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

As outlined in "3" above I would like to see the district support the performing arts by providing some dedicated performance space in Rolleston. At the moment it is impossible to book the the rec centre for anything beyond a few hours here and there. Theatre space will awaken a dormant part of The community adding richness to the Selwyn experience.

I will provide detailed information in my verbal argument outlining the depth of the interest in the performing arts

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 submission requests that some space in the Indoor court facility be developed for the arts - particularly dance. The submitter also would like to see dedicated space (eg theatre) for the arts. A central principle behind the development of the indoor court facility at Foster Park is that it be multi-purpose and the design brief that is developed could include space for arts activities although it would have to be multi-purpose in nature rather than dedicated from the point of view of both budget and space restrictions.

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. Submitter suggested need for an associated policy and criteria and a process that is transparent and equitable.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support

[100128] - Mrs Tania Lobb

Address: 3 Vasari Grange Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 3 Vasari Grange Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021617969

Email: Tania.lobb@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)

An up grade for the pool will be good and I think a 50mtre pool will be neat.

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)

An indoor area will be great for all the clubs around.

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.

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

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

[100129] - Mrs Helen Hartley

Address: 42 Shadbolt Lane Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day):

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) Happy for district wide rate.
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) Would be GREAT to see pool extension-I have stopped using it as it is so busy and weekends can be hard to access with swim galas etc so DEFINATELY more pool space-possibly with inclusion to a designated are of aqua slides. Happy to forgo the cafe area as there are so many opening now in Rolleston square.
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 view as I don't use these type of facilities.
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) option 1-based on risk assessment-makes more sense to spend money on prevention rather than cure.....!
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) nil comments
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) Nil comments
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) nil comments
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) It would be nice if the buildins looked more attractive and were generated with as much renewable sources of energy as possible-solar etc.
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) More leisure cycling and walking paths would be great-with leaflets to 'publicise' these.
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? Awesome to see planning for future health hub-would be great to include physio. radiology, out of hours so travel to town is not required.....

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. Submitter prepared to not have cafe. Submitter interested in water slide inclusion

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.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Requests more "leisure" paths and publicity on these. Council and/or developers provides pathways in reserves at every possible opportunity e.g. Foster Park

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Health Hub Project: The submitter supports the Health Hub concept and would like to see a range of services provided. The submitter's request is acknowledged and can be considered as part of developing more detail on the range and extent of services provided through the Health Hub.

[100130] -Water New Zealand Mr John Pfahlert

Address: PO Box 9740, Marion Square Wellington 6140

Postal Address: PO Box 1316 Wellington

Phone (day): 044950896

Phone (mobile): 0211509763

Email: ceo@waternz.org.nz

Submission

Water New Zealand is the principal trade Association representing the interests of the reticulated water industry in New Zealand. The Selwyn District Council is a member of the Association and several of the Council staff participate in Association activities.

We understand the Council is considering options to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment.

The Association is supportive of any proposal that introduces the chlorination of public water supplies with a residual disinfection. It has proven to be a cost effective way of reducing the incidence of enteric, waterborne diseases such as campylobacter which have the capacity to induce sickness and death of those who become infected.

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.

If the Association can assist Council further in reaching a decision please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely

John Pfahlert Chief Executive

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.”

[100131] - Mrs Rebekah Eckersley

Address: 8 Messines street Leeston 7632

Postal Address: 8 Messines street Leeston

Phone (day): 0275206480

Phone (mobile): 0275206480

Email: bekhammett@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)

This is a big NO from me. I am very passionate about this. We do not need to consume chlorine in any form. It is not good for you!! I do not want to drink this or shower in this. We are currently in Auckland and the water tastes disgusting!! My skin is so dry. I do not want this for my kids. We grew up with beautiful clean fresh water and we need to endeavour to keep it like this for the future generations. If there is an issue with the water why can this not be addressed??? Is there even an issue with the water?? Please dont waste millions chlorinating and poisoning us at the same time! Treat the source of the problem (if there is one) and not just bandaid it, please! As a country we pride ourselves on our clean green image and currently I dont think we are doing a very good job at it. I have travelled too many countries and when you drink the water, I always think how lucky we are in Canterbury to have the best water!! Please dont change this. It will be a very SAD day if our beautiful water gets chlorinated.

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 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 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.”

[100132] - Mr Gerard de Rooy

Address: 739 Ridgens Road Charing Cross 7671

Postal Address: 739 Ridgens Road, RD1 Christchurch

Phone (day): 033438103

Phone (mobile): 021330996

Email: derooy@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)

Supportive of the Proposal

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

Supportive of the Proposal. Had the original pool been built to meet projected future demand, we would not be looking at extensions now. Should have been catered for at the time. Assuming that another 25 meter pool is sufficient? Please let's not go for a 25m pool now if it means in the next 10 years we need to add a 50m pool.....

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 it 100%. Again, please let's do this properly now and commit the necessary funding. The population of Selwyn (not just Rolleston) has desperate need for indoor facilities. Having this centrally will be a great asset to Foster Park, which is recognised as the best SI facility already. The more kids/youth/adults we can keep (inter)active throughout the year the better. Most facilities will need a car to travel to, so to have it centrally makes sense. With kids having 'tasters' and short term burst of different sports and activities, a large facility is a must to cater for a variety of opportunities.

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)

As a lifestyle block owner fully understand the reasoning behind the proposal. Do have concerns that even if I wanted to use the waterrace (since I'm paying for it anyway), neighbouring properties may not be maintaining theirs, which will make it next to useless in practical terms. Effect will be increased cost but less/no value.

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)

Supportive 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)

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)

Supportive

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

Overall it is a great plan. Everything costs money, and costs will only increase in the future. Let's get this underway for the residents of Selwyn.

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 for SAC is noted. Submitter also suggests the size of the facility developed needs to meet needs for next 10 years so suggests Council recognize this in planning. Current planning is factoring in proposed population growth.

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: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for Community Grants Funding Scheme noted

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support

[100133] -Lincoln Hair Design Miss Diane Clark

Address: 9 Gerald Street, Lincoln 7608, Lincoln Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: 9 Gerald Street Lincoln 7608 Lincoln

Phone (day): 033252293

Phone (mobile): 0211680085

Email: dianeclark27@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) The proposed cycleway in Lincoln does NOT get located between the Gerald Street shops and the angled car parking at the front of the shops.
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

The traffic management and safety be improved at the Gerald St/Robert St intersection in Lincoln. This includes the trade entrance off Robert St to the car parks behind the shops. At certain times of the day the traffic is incredibly congested here.

A safety barrier or bollards need to be installed as soon as possible between the angled car parks and the footpath outside the Gerald St shops to provide safety from out of control cars. This recently happened when an out of control car drove into the dairy next door. It was only by good luck that no one was injured or killed.

I would also like to see that new shop designs are built with back door provisions and they need to provide for staff car parking and increased customer parking.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The first stage of the upgrade of Gerald St between Edward St and West Belt is in the 2018 LTP for 2023/24 and will consider all relevant improvements for this area at that time.

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. Council staff note your concerns regarding the provision of new shops in Lincoln township and your design suggestion to enable back door provision within new shops. Council Planning and Urban Design staff work closely with architects and developers through the consenting process. Council Planning and Property & Commercial staff are also working closely to implement the Lincoln Town Centre Plan which will see removal of parking in certain locations along Gerald Street and providing alternative shared parking for customers and staff of businesses in strategic locations behind the shops. This will enable safer and easier access to parking for businesses and will contribute to a vibrant town centre.

[100134] -Mermadale Walnuts Mr Brian Falkingham

Address: 620 Heslerton Road Killinchy 7682

Postal Address: 620 Heslerton Road R D 2 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021393932

Email: brian@mermadale.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)

A level playing field is better than local funding so that smaller communities get chance to grow.

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

This facility should be paid for exclusively by the users and concessions.

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)

Again user pays not the general rate payer, This type of facility could be provided by private enterprise with only a small contribution for the council to get the ideas moving.

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)

As long as the correct system of filtration/removing excess chlorine is used there is no objection but there is no excuse for ever being able to taste any chlorine.

However a non chemical process is to be preferred due the reduced risk, this could extend to local UV plants close to the end user which would guard against contaminates that enter the pipes during repairs etc.

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 basic idea is sound and it is good to see the council recognise the general good benefit of these schemes. It would ease the financial impact on the Ellesmere users if the change was phased in rather than a sudden increase next year.

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)

If the council truly needs more space to provide its public services then the extension is acceptable, but I note there are other private services operating out of the current facility (eg the AA) that could find suitable accommodation in commercial premises.

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?

I find little reference to improving or sealing roads which is a much higher priority than a swimming pool extension, all be it more expensive the long term repay of good roads is a plus to the district where as the pool is an on going cost.

There is little point in spending 31% of council income on facilities that will remain unused if the roads are only getting 13% and no longer usable due to current leading edge and future vehicles not being able to function safely without sealed roads and safe well maintained road markings.

These 2 figures need to be exchanged and the increased funding generated by the resulting even larger population increase used to develop the facilities in the following decade.

The sealing of Heslerton Road which is eroding quickly due to the heavy tanker traffic it now gets and extending the seal on Frasers/Knivets through to Leeston Rakaia Road which also has increased heavy vehicle traffic are noticeable by their absence.

Widening of Frasers Road and the addition of a center line would greatly increase safety on this road which is very dangerous in the dark.

Rates increases should remain within inflation, rate payers do not have bottomless pockets.

Perhaps not part of this plan but the rail crossing on Frasers Road is not suitable for heavy goods vehicles, they do not have room to stop and the crossing is too narrow, closing this junction to heavy goods vehicles so they use the Synlait or Dunsandel exits will greatly improve safety on the rail crossing. Alternatively dog leg the rail line as was done at Synlait so this traffic can exit safely.

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 Submission proposes redevelopment is funded exclusively by users. This is not practical

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. Your ideas will be considered further by staff. 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: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter in commenting on the location of the AA activity indicates that it could be located elsewhere. Consideration is being given to placing this activity in the Rolleston Library/Community space currently being designed.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter requests the sealing/upgrading of Heslerton Rd/Frasers/Kynivets Rd which is not considered to fall into the category of important network upgrades. KiwiRail can be contacted about the concerns with the rail crossing on Frasers Rd

[100135] - Mrs Helen Allison

Address: 64 Ledbury Drive Rolleston 7615

Postal Address: 64 Ledbury Drive Rolleston

Phone (day): 3473534

Phone (mobile): 0272747636

Email: bluehelen@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)
I wish to support the pool extension and believe the forward thinking option is to establish a new 50 metre pool on site
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. It is noted that submitter's rationale for 50 metre pool was to "future proof". A 50 metre pool is not considered by Officers to be the most cost effective way that future needs can be accommodated in the development proposed.

[100136] -Malvern Community Board Mrs Jenny Gallagher

Address: Council Buildings Rolleston 7643

Postal Address: c/- PO Box 90 Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: jenny.gallagher@selwyn.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?

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: 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: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Thank you for your support. Council staff would be please to discussed water race closure procedures with the Malvern Community Board.

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support for Community Grant Funding 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 Malvern Community Board's support for the proposal to provide a new community facility in Hororata is acknowledged.

They have also indicated support for a new playground to be developed alongside the community centre. A budget (\$33,046) is provided in the Hororata Reserve 10 year plan for 2024/25 for playground upgrading. If a new playground was to be built this would require additional funds of around \$50,000.

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 All of the referenced walking and cycling projects by the Submitter are represented in the Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy and Action Plan. The exception is a cycleway between Coalgate and Hororata. It has not been included as no demand has been identified for such a link previously. It would be 6.6km long and a preliminary estimate of \$2 million. This would need to include fitting a "clip on" or similar cycle lane to the Selwyn River Bridge. There are also a number of large cuverts along the route that would likely need extending or separate facilities being needed. It can be added to the Action Plan for completeness but would have a low priority.

Topic: Darfield & Kirwee Wastewater - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your support for the future work program on the potential Darfield wastewater network.

Council will provide an opportunity over the coming year for targeted feedback on the development of a reticulated wastewater network for Darfield and Kirwee.

Topic: Recycling facilities - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	No recommended action made.
Staff Comments	Recycling and transfer facilities: Council intends to continue to expand the range of materials accepted at the Community Recycling Days. The intention is to eventually accept general waste at these events. In time it is hoped that a similar day can be provided for farm related waste and recycling. Additionally the Council intends to continue to investigate the provision of additional strategically placed container recycling stations such as those at Arthurs Pass, for those residents who are currently off route.

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	Submission proposes SDC pay, at no Committee expense, paid secretarial services and extend the payment of secretarial services to the other committees. These proposed costs are significant and not budgeted for. It is recommended to Council that Committee discretionary funding is an appropriate fund from which the cost of paid secretarial services be met. Current arrangement has some Committees using discretionary funding for payment of secretarial services and some Committees being funded from Community Services budget. Council is encouraged to adopt a consistent approach to funding of paid secretarial services.

Topic: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Thank you for your continued support for our water supply upgrade projects. These are progressing and we look forward to reporting on there completion later in the year.

[100137] -Hororata Tennis Club Mrs Lucy Cookson

Address: 169 Leaches Road Hororata 7572

Postal Address: 2RD Darfield

Phone (day): 033180718

Phone (mobile): 0272047563

Email: tim.lucy@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)

This facility is being used for not only recreational swimming but is proving to be a valuable resource for the schools in the wider area, both for lessons and competition swimming. Extending the facility would be advantageous for the whole of the Selwyn 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)

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?

Hororata Community Centre - Hororata Tennis Club members believe that a community centre in the Hororata Reserve is a very important part of the Long Term Plan. It would not only benefit the immediate Hororata Community but would also benefit the wider community. Already Hororata has shown they are an active community, organising the annual Highland Games and this year the Hororata Night Glow. These events pull in excess of 10 000 people to the area and are proven to be events which are successful. A community centre would be used during these two events. A new community centre would also be used by other community groups, such as the Hororata Tennis Club for larger gatherings and fundraising activities. It would also be used by individuals within the wider Selwyn District. We are in full support of a Community Centre being built on the Hororata Reserve.

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The Hororata Tennis Club's support for the proposal to provide a new community facility in Hororata is acknowledged.

[100138] - Mr Tianxi Yin

Address: 24 O'Reilly Road Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: 24 O'Reilly Road Lincoln

Phone (day): 0204754321

Phone (mobile):

Email: johnyin47@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)

I do not support the proposal. I don't think rates should be used to fund the construction of the cafe which will be a commercial entity. The programme pool and fitness centre should be solely funded by targeted rates from Rolleston residents.

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 a targeted rate paid by Rolleston ratepayers. Residents elsewhere should not have to fund such a project.

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)

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)

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)

I am in support of the proposal.

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 Submission does not support the cafe inclusion in development and proposes the funding model should be borne by Rolleston residents. The current planning is ensuring a cost benefit analysis is concluded in relation to cafe development. Facility is used by Selwyn residents.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - 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

[100139] - Mrs Joanna Pitkethley

Address: 78 Renoir Drive Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 78 Renoir Drive

Phone (day): 021883687

Phone (mobile):

Email: jaredwp@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) No

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

The current facilities, while in really good condition, are not meeting the needs of the users of the facility. More pool space is required for those who wish to swim laps for fitness. It is great to see so many of the public keeping fit, but due to the uptake of swimming lessons and local schools using the facilities as well it has become cramped. Bigger changing rooms as well as family changing rooms are needed to ensure that the families in our community continue to patronise the facility. The cafe would be well supported by swimmers, those at the playground across the road as well as weekend sports people at Foster's. Many of our guests that we have brought down to the aquatic centre have expressed surprise that a cafe is not already on site

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)

An indoor sports facility would be an essential addition to a town growing at the rate that Rolleston is. It would be well supported by local schools as part of their fitness program

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)

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. Submitter requested expanded changing rooms and increase in family changing rooms, both of which are included in thinking. Submitter keen to include cafe which is part of the plan

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

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

[100140] - Mrs JACINTA COONEY

Address: 11 TINY HILL DRIVE 7614

Postal Address: ROLLESTON

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021499685

Email: jacinta_jacques@yahoo.co.uk

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 small rate would be ok
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) We need an outdoor swimming pool and another indoor pool as a priority over fitness and well-being centres (which we already have an abundance of in our community). The pool is not big enough for our community.
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) Anti-chlorine!! Only when the water supply is beginning to become infected should we chlorinate.
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) Fine.
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? I believe we should be recycling our water - that should be part of future planning asap. Even if it is expensive - it is the way of the future. It's madness, despite the expense, that we didn't take the opportunity to do this when we started developing all these houses after the earthquakes. We should re-use all water and keep fresh water for drinking, as they do in other cities (that don't even have the fresh water drinking option).

I believe the current community centre should be made into a centre for teenagers (movies, sports, games, etc) There is not enough to entertain them here in Rolleston, hence the petty crime increase.

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 Sac extension is supported but submitter suggests needs to include an additional outdoor pool rather than a wellness / fitness centre on basis there are plenty of such facilities. The planning underway regarding fitness / wellbeing will take into account existing needs and services available

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: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thanks for the comments on the future use of the Rolleston Community Centre. they will be taken into account when it future is considered.

Topic: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Council will continue to promote sustainable water use.

[100141] -Kirwee Community Hall Mrs Adrienne Begg

Address: 1232 Courtenay Road Darfield 7571

Postal Address: RD 1 Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: malcolm.adrienne@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)

As Secretary of the Kirwee Hall Committee, our Committee is against this district-wide rate. Our hall is privately owned and we do not receive any financial assistance at all from SDC. They do pay our insurance.

It took our Committee 10 years to fund raise (\$400,000.00) to bring up our hall to the standard required. We fund raise continually to help supplement the rental fees paid by users.

If this rate is adopted, we will not receive any of this money (600 rateable properties)

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)

For the future of the Selwyn District, this is probably a good idea. But the development must include activities for all ages. Target 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)

We don't think all water supplies need to be chlorinated.

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)

We think it is important for these areas to have community facilities because once you lose them, you never get them back. Communities need a place to meet and socialize. They then have an identity.

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)

Perhaps before expansions are considered to the existing building, Council should make sure the current building is being used to its full capacity.

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

Walking and cycling would make the communities more active and healthy. Children would benefit from these activities as much as adults.

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 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’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 No recommended action made.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support

[100142] - Mrs Adrienne Begg

Address: 1232 Courteny Road RD 1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: malcolm.adrienne@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 object to hall rating as our community hall in Kirwee is owned by the Courtenay A & P association. If we are to be rated for the hall in Kirwee, we will not get any of these funds to help run our hall. The SDC do not give us any funding. They do pay our insurance.

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

If the Aquatic centre is to be expand then the Rolleston area should pay for this. Also, the users should pay. If it had been built bigger in the first place, you wouldn't now have a problem.

You should be contemplating a 50m pool, not 25m.

This cost should also be paid for by future generations, not just today's rate payers.

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 for the future, this is probably a good idea. But there is nothing mentioned of indoor complexes for the senior citizens e.g. covered bowling greens. This hub should be for all ages.

Targeted 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)

If there is a risk in some areas, that's fine, but our water supply comes straight from a well.

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 these three areas need new facilities, then the ratepayers of these areas should be rated accordingly, not all the Selwyn District.

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 the Council feel there is a need for bigger headquarters, then build. But perhaps they could make better use of the buildings they have.

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

I think this is a great idea. Get more people to bike and walk, which will help our society be healthier and children become more active.

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

Staff Comments Submitter proposes Rolleston targeted rate should pay for facility and also loans. Submitter interested in consideration of 50 metre pool.

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 supports the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton subject to them being needed and 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 in support - references benefits to children

[100143] - Mr Oliver Batchelor

Address: 32 Therese Street Christchurch 8024

Postal Address: 32 Therese Street, Christchurch

Phone (day): 0221621955

Phone (mobile): 0221621955

Email: saulzar@gmail.com

Submission

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

It would be great to be able to use the Burkes Bush Road (unformed legal road) as mountain bike or walking track.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100144] - Ms Amanda Kay

Address: 20 Carrington Close Lincoln 7064

Postal Address: 20 Carrington Close

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0273415332

Email: amandakay@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) I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road. You might like to add something like: The walking /cycling section of the Plan overlooks the need for walking / cycling access from the Selwyn District to the Summit Road and the Port Hills. The Port Hills are a very important environmental asset to both the City and Selwyn. Given the rapid population growth within the Tai Tapu, Lincoln and Rolleston triangle urgent attention needs to be given to providing local walking and cycling access to the Summit Road. Within the Christchurch City Council jurisdiction there is a good track net work on the Port Hills. However within the Selwyn District jurisdiction there is no sign posted access to the Summit Road between the boundaries of Kennedys Track and Gebbies Pass at all!
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: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100145] - Mr Rod Vardy

Address: 24 The Crescent Lincoln University Lincoln 7647

Postal Address: PO Box 85101 Lincoln University Lincoln

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0272017597

Email: thegbu007@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)

We need more multi purpose tracks in the Port Hills

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

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Requests more multi purpose tracks on the Port Hills. As for the discussion on Burkes Bush Road this falls outside the transport function encompassed by the 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy and relates to purely recreation outcomes.

[100146] - Mrs Olivia Cook

Address: 17 Lindsay Drive Christchurch 7604

Postal Address: 17 Lindsay Drive Prebbleton Christchurch

Phone (day): 0210645071

Phone (mobile):

Email: Jolliolli@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)
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) Yes. I support option 3, avoid chlorination of Selwyn drinking supplies and adopt alternative treatment methods (eg UV). UV disinfection is preferred as it does not alter the chemical composition of the water. There are a number of industries and home hobbyists who rely on the supply of unchlorinated water (eg Fish keeping). The addition of chlorination will impose additional costs on ratepayers as follows 1. ratepayers that value a chlorine-free water supply will be required to invest in costly water filtration systems to remove chlorine from the supply. 2. High quality water filtration systems that remove (as opposed to simply reduce chlorine concentrations) , (eg reverse osmosis) are inefficient from a water quantity perspective. On average, for each litre water of pure water produced from a reverse osmosis system, an average of 4 litres of waste water is produced. Thus additional costs are incurred as a result of increased water consumption. Given the water short nature of the Selwyn catchment, the council should not promote treatment methods that, ultimately, will encourage the use of inefficient water filtration systems.

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) 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) Nourish

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

No

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.”

[100147] - Mr Matt Joynes

Address: 338 Whitecliffs Road, Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: 338 Whitecliffs Road Whitecliffs Coalgate RD1

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0274717925

Email: matt.joynes@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)

I'd like to see a shared pedestrian and cycle path established between Whitecliffs and Glentunnel. The route between the two villages is dangerous to use due to the speed limit, size of vehicles and s-bends. I've witnessed several near misses on this stretch of road. During the summer months, we have more people using this road (motorists, pedestrians, and cyclist). It would also be beneficial to the school community in that children and their parents can cycle to and from school without fear of being crushed by a logging truck.

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

I'd like to see more attempts at using crowdfunding to raise capital for community projects rather than borrowing and increasing rates. When people support a project they are passionate and creative. With the increasing costs to ratepayers,

it is time to think outside the box on how funding is raised. It will also help to see which projects are actually important to the community as a whole.

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 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy 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 this is better understood.

Topic: Investment opportunities and requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100148] - Mr Kerry Moore

Address: 16 Isleworth Road, bishopdale Christchurch 8953

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 033595069

Phone (mobile):

Email: moorekj@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)

I want the Selwyn District Council to include within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign-posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain-bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track and Old Tai Tapu Road.

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

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100149] - Mr Stuart Mclean

Address: 18 Quarry hill terrace Christchurch 8025

Postal Address: 18 Quarry hill terrace

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021790411

Email: Stuart@forkrent.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) I request the council provides marker poles and signs for Burke's Bush Road so that the public walkers and mountain cycling can use the road/ track . This would enable a good round trip linking to Kennedy's bush track
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100150] -1992 Mr Michael Everett

Address: Trevor Street, 32 Christchurch 8042

Postal Address: 32 Trevor Street

Phone (day): 0220968171

Phone (mobile): 0220968171

Email: meverett126@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) fix the problem. stop dealing with smoke not the fire. Restrict pollution and water taken from rivers, steams and aquifers. Reduce damage and contamination to he environment from industry like farming (dairy especially). Focus on more sustainable methods and options.
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)

I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road.

The walking /cycling section of the Plan overlooks the need for walking / cycling access from the Selwyn District to the Summit Road and the Port Hills. The Port Hills are a very important environmental asset to both the City and Selwyn. Given the rapid population growth within the Tai Tapu, Lincoln and Rolleston triangle urgent attention needs to be given to providing local walking and cycling access to the Summit Road. Within the Christchurch City Council jurisdiction there is a good track net work on the Port Hills. However within the Selwyn District jurisdiction there is no sign posted access to the Summit Road between the boundaries of Kennedys Track and Gebbies Pass at all!

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

More focus on re-creational areas like cycle lanes in areas that matter. Near schools and in areas like the port hills. Create mixed tracks on existing public/paper road land that have walking access, biking access and access to help fight fires and support pest control.

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 Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100151] -Kirwee Community Hall Committee member. Mr Stuart Begg

Address: 22 Windsor Drive Kirwee Kirwee 7543

Postal Address: PO Box 121 Kirwee

Phone (day): 03 3181847

Phone (mobile): 0272234730

Email: stubeggnz@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 am dead against this district wide rate, as a member of the Kirwee Community Hall committee we get no funding from rate payers other than the insurance of the building. Our community raised over \$400,000 to get our hall to where it is now and still needs to keep raising funds for upkeep and improvements. The councils quite happy to use our hall as a civil defence centre but when it came to wiring the generator into the hall they changed their mind on what was originally promised. So I'm dammed if I want any of my rates going to another community hall when they should be staying here for the benefit of our community.
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: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

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

[100152] - Dr. Kevin Brown

Address: 266 Weedons Ross Rd, RD 5 Rolleston / Christchurch
7675

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 03 347 3458

Phone (mobile): 027 419 9813

Email: kevin@geokem.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)

Supportive of this move

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.

- This rating system appears to be designed specifically to facilitate the shutting down of a large part of the stock water channel network. The rates are high, and proposed to increase over the next 10 years at a rate well above inflation. It seems that the council aims to recover in the order of \$2million, next year alone, to cover the costs of maintaining the current stock water races, but there is no indication of current maintenance costs. So called "users" of the stock water channels (anyone with access) are going to very quickly find these rates unacceptable and petition for the closure of their channels. If all "users" of a stock water channel don't agree to close it, then this will promote disharmony in the community. - The high and diverse values of these old stock water channels should be recognised and supported by the WHOLE community. These channels provide substantial benefits to all people and ecosystems of the water-parched Canterbury plains. They are an important aquatic ecosystem, an aesthetic feature, a heritage feature and could be a focus for revegetation and ecological corridors across the plains. They serve to (partially) replace the water features that have been lost from this area (spring-fed streams and meanders of our large rivers) in response to more intensive land use. - They are also a significant source of recharge to the groundwater system. Claims that CPW irrigation will replace this recharge are false. Modern precision irrigation is designed to provide water to ONLY the upper most levels of the soil profile. The recharge currently supplied by the stock water channels northwest of SH 1 also supports spring-fed stream flow in the lower parts of the Selwyn and Halswell catchments. This will become even more important with predicted extreme climate variations associated with global warming.

- These stock water channels now have multiple uses and values, likely to have been totally unrecognised at the time they were constructed. Their status under the RMA needs to be changed to reflect this. Actions need to be directed to optimise their values, not to shut them down, as we will never again have the opportunity to recreate such a benefit for the water-parched plains.

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)

Support this, if needed

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

Supportive

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

No

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 on this proposal.

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: 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

[100153] - Dr. Pat McIntosh

Address: 35B Beachville Road Christchurch 8081

Postal Address: 35 B Beachville Road Redcliffs Christchurch

Phone (day): 06433766133

Phone (mobile):

Email: patncalum@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)

Chlorination should be a last resort if the safety of the supply cannot be ensured in any other way, However it is unacceptable that any public water supply should not be safe for drinking straight from the tap.

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) I do a lot of walking and cycling around the Port Hills and would like to see the Council signpost and mark the currently unformed legal road which goes via Burkes Bush Road from Early Valley Road to the Summit Road. At present the lack of signed access into the Port Hills is frustrating. This would make possible several loop routes and greatly improve the amenity of the area. It is Council policy to support recreation, walking and cycling and as a doctor I am also aware of the health benefits.

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: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100154] - Mrs Claire Michael

Address: 22 Pollock Place Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 22 Pollock Place Rolleston 7614

Phone (day): 0212588888

Phone (mobile):

Email: benisno1@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)
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?

[100155] - Mr Heiko Mueller-Cajar

Address: 36 Dawn Place Kirwee 7543

Postal Address: PO Box 118

Phone (day): 033181137

Phone (mobile): 0273102178

Email: heiko.muellercajar@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)

The proposal is unfair to ratepayers in townships which funded their own halls (like Kirwee) and get little or no council subsidies for these halls.

I request that the council rates will stay based on the councils contributions respective to the relevant community.

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

Any extension to the Rolleston Aquatic Centre benefits mainly the township of Rolleston. Fine if they are happy to pay for them, but inappropriate to charge the wider community who hardly gets to use these amenities. Council needs to get back to user pays principle.

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)

Again - this should be a Rolleston only affair. If they want and are happy to pay for these facilities, than this is fine. However - it appears inappropriate to expect the population in other centers in the Selwyn District to pay for amenities they hardly get to use given distance and travel cost.

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 may be acceptable on a short term basis during emergencies. In any other situation: good, clean and chemically untreated tap water is a highly valued good. It is quite sad that the council even considers to take this good away from us. Chlorinated water kills fish and sensible plants, tastes terrible and makes hobbies like e.g. home brewing impossible.

If the water is polluted than it would be appropriate to seek for and remove the source of pollution instead of just killing any live germs in the polluted water and than distribute the polluted water into our taps.

Aren't you people supposed to work for us instead of against us?

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)

Should be commented on and funded by the respective communities

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 feel that council (and rates) are in a state of uncontrolled growth. Propose to look into options to reduce the councils "extracurricular" activities and solve its core tasks with the existing workforce.

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?

Just one observation: It appears quite unfair that communities like Kirwee (who get just the basic council services and who sacrificed already their water reserves) are looking forward to higher proposed rate rises than e.g. communities like Rolleston who get all the gold plated amenities.

Wouldn't it be time to reintroduce a user pays system?

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 Submission proposes this facility development be funded by users only. Officers advise this is not feasible. Officers also note patronage of SAC includes patrons from outside area.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter believes the new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton should be locally funded and commented on by locals. 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: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100156] - Mrs Juliet Gray

Address: 190 Kennedys Bush Road Christchurch 8025

Postal Address: 190 Kennedys Bush Road

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: julietg190@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)

I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road.

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

The walking /cycling section of the Plan overlooks the need for walking / cycling access from the Selwyn District to the Summit Road and the Port Hills. The Port Hills are a very important environmental asset to both the City and Selwyn. Given the rapid population growth within the Tai Tapu, Lincoln and Rolleston triangle urgent attention needs to be given to providing local walking and cycling access to the Summit Road. Within the Christchurch City Council jurisdiction there is a good track net work on the Port Hills. However within the Selwyn District jurisdiction there is no sign posted access to the Summit Road between the boundaries of Kennedys Track and Gebbies Pass at all!

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100157] - Ms Vivienne Joyce

Address: 7 Allingham Lane Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 7 Allingham Lane Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0272788020

Email: veejoyce@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 pool and an outdoor pool/ wet area included in the extension. Hydroslices/ wave pool area/ diving boards as an option. Indoor/ outdoor cafe as an option. I don't feel another gym is required unless we're going for one per family in Rolleston. More family changing rooms are a must and PLEASE FIX THE DOOR SITUATION as detouring potential predators past the family changing rooms is an unacceptable and completely unnecessary risk, just get the computers/ monitors encased or encase the reception 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)

Only do it if absolutely unavoidable.

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. Submitter would like consideration for 50m pool , outdoor pool/ wet area, Hydroslices/ wave pool area/ diving boards, more family changing rooms ,Cafe and the door situation by the family changing rooms to be sorted and encase computers and monitors. Submitter does not support gym. As per previous officer feedback

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.”

[100158] - Mr Paul and Fay McOscar

Address: 28 Homebush Road Glentunnel 7639

Postal Address: Glentunnel

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: fayandpaul@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)

Outline: This is a personal submission while noting I am a member of the Coalgate/Glentunnel Reserve Committee. The views stated are my own.

Background: Approximately 9 months ago the Committee wished to replace and upgrade its Kubota ZD260 26hp mower. The Property and Commercial Manager declined to approve a replacement and stepped in advising the committee that the mowing responsibility for all but one area would be reallocated to SICON. Some 6 days later without advising our Committee the total responsibility for the mowing of all areas under the control of the Coalgate/Glentunnel Reserve Management Committee was allocated to SICON. The end arrangements for the sale of the mower also occurred without the Committee's knowledge.

The Asset Manager clearly stated at an earlier site meeting that the standard of mowing and the frequency would not match what the above Committee had set in place and was achieving. Not only has this statement actually been verified, as well the areas mown have been considerably reduced. To justify the mowing responsibility change a comparison of asset, maintenance, labour and operational costs were also prepared from costs faced by the Coalgate/Glentunnel Reserve Committee and set against SICONs, the Committee's costs were well below.

In one area the Homebush Road woodlot mowing was carried out at least once a month during the peak fire season so as to reduce the fire danger. The other benefit of this was to stop the growth of gorse and broom which now will likely require several sprayings each year creating additional expenditure up to \$1500 annually. Further into the woodlot a service track was mown to allow vehicle access to carry out maintenance/pruning and release weed spraying around 7

year old Oregon plantings. As well the area behind the Glentunnel playground under the mature trees was mown (where able due to tree roots) to reduce fire danger and reduce the likelihood of stranger danger should the undergrowth become thick. These areas are no longer mown.

The sports clubs that utilise Glentunnel Domain have advised the Committee (and I assume Council) that they are not happy about the quality and frequency of the SICON managed service and have asked why the mowing responsibility was taken away from the Reserve Committee.

The above voluntary Committee (and its predecessors) have successfully managed the reserves under its control since its inception in 1880 allowing the community to take pride in what it has achieved. What possibly hasn't been said is that centralising mowing with Council taking control will mean an increase in contract management staff and associated salary/admin costs.

We have seen over the past 7 months that the level of service plus quality has dropped considerably. I am unable to comment on the cost benefit of the new system as I am not a party to those figures.

Prior to the Committee purchasing its own mower, with Council staff assistance in 2011 mowing tenders were called. Those received, ranged from \$17,000 to \$24,000. The Committee could not afford these costs but had investment funds available and purchased its own mower, set a labour contract fee and implemented its own mowing regime. Based on 7 years of operation/labour/operational costs the estimated cost to the Committee and Council has been under \$8000 per year. Substantially cheaper than what the Committee would have faced if a tender had been accepted.

Obviously the difficulty Councillors face is achieving a similar efficiency of scale over all the voluntary administrated reserve under its control. Our Committee may have been more cost conscious than some others.

Glentunnel and Coalgate residents I believe have reserves that are substantially bigger than most for such small communities. Glentunnel Domain could be termed a regional park, with a camping ground, senior rugby and cricket wickets and walking tracks that attract people from afar.

It is hard to see how any district wide rate would benefit Coalgate/Glentunnel residents.

I would suggest that Councillors need to ask many more questions about the supposed benefits and end costs of a proposed District wide rate for reserves. I also believe this is a first step towards reducing the voluntary committee reserve management structure that has been in place in our case for over a hundred years.

In summary the new recently implemented mowing regime has shown a substantial drop in the quality and frequency of mowing, plus a reduction in areas maintained and I suspect the true cost that should also include SDC staff supervisory time plus the contractor's fee is substantially higher.

The old adage may apply here: "If it aint broke why fix 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)

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: 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 Submission advocated for Council to take a more active role promoting district as visitor destination with a particular focus on promoting recreational opportunities the district has to offer and targeting travellers travelling between Picton/ Christchurch and Queenstown (inland Scenic Route).

Submission encouraged Council to think about amenities to support freedom campers and

Submission advocated for Council to consider relaxation of rules related to vehicle movement and site effluence for accommodation providers . Officers will consider submission as they develop Economic Development Business Plan.

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 Submission advocated for Council to take a more active role promoting district as visitor destination with a particular focus on promoting recreational opportunities the district has to offer and targeting travelers travelling between Picton/ Christchurch and Queenstown (inland Scenic Route). Encouraged Council to think about amenities to support freedom campers and relaxation of rules related to vehicle movement and site effluence for accommodation providers . Officers will consider this feedback as it develops its economic development business plan

[100159] - Mr David Little

Address: 42 Hillsborough Terrace Christchurch 8022

Postal Address: 42 Hillsborough Terrace

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

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

It's fantastic to see the plans to develop cycling infrastructure throughout the region and I fully support the planned developments. Additionally, I would like to see further recreational development for cycling and walking on the Port Hills. Having lived in Selwyn District previously it was clear how little access to the summit road and the associated walking and bike trails there is, especially when compared to Christchurch.

To help with this, I would love to see you consider putting some resources into developing Burkes Bush Track to allow walking and cycling access to the summit road. This would allow round trips via Gebbies Pass, Kennedy's Bush, or larger trips linking into the Port Hills above Christchurch. The existing tracks are well used and cherished and it would be fantastic to add a new track into the network to allow your residents easier access to recreation.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100160] - Mrs Jo Walker

Address: 11 Acheron Ave, Lake Coleridge Village Darfield 7572

Postal Address: 11 Acheron Ave, CMB 31 Lake Coleridge Darfield

Phone (day): 03 424 2996

Phone (mobile): 0277141017

Email: jo.walkero6@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)
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 poor and dangerous state of Leaches Road. It is in urgent need of widening. This must be a priority for council as the current state leaves drivers at serious risk of being pushed off the road due to trucks that use the road constantly. Pot holes emerge seemingly overnight due to heavy use of the road making it even more concerning. We have been pushed off the side and onto the grass/gravel many, many times simply to make room for oncoming traffic, and this is simply unacceptable in terms of safety and duty of care from council to provide safe roading for our community.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	A \$3.4 million project to fully widen Leaches Rd in 2032/33 is currently in Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast

[100161] - Mr Antoine Fenix

Address: 13 Heathridge Place Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: same as above

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: antoinefenix@yahoo.fr

Submission

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

#1 : I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. As a mountainbiker/walker I often find the lack of access to the Summit Rd from the western side frustrating. I am confident that this road would get significant recreational usage

#2 : As a bicycle commuter I often find that cycleways are often designed by non cyclists for non cyclists. For example between Lincoln and Prebbleton (Birchs Rd) as a cyclist I'm supposed to give way at each intersection while cars on the corresponding road don't. Why should I have to go through 2 chicanes + give way when I should have priority? To prove my point, every single commuting bike I pass or cross does the same : get off the cycleway before the intersection, and get back on after the intersection. There are a few examples like that (cycleway too narrow, dangerous fences...) My point is : ok to spend money on new cycleways, but only if giving a true advantage to cyclists

Note : Council hearings are during workdays so not really an option to come and speak about it

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

The design of cycleways such as the Rail Trail between Prebbleton and Lincoln need to provide for users of all types safely including at road intersections. The construction of the pathway close to intersections allows more experienced cyclists to veer off the pathway and onto the road to circumvent the intersections. Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100162] - Mrs Jennifer Daly

Address: 1295 Leaches Rd, RD2, Darfield, 7572 Darfield 7572

Postal Address: 1295 Leaches Rd, RD2, Darfield

Phone (day): 033286563

Phone (mobile): 0274043887

Email: daly@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)
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 see Leaches Rd widened for safety reasons. In the Winter Leaches Rd is used by a high proportion of skiers going up to Mt Hutt and it is extremely dangerous as a resident travelling along this road. The road is also very busy with large trucks and it is often used as a diversion if the state highway bridge is unusual. The road is very narrow and every year has to be repaired due to potholes. The tyres on our vehicles have had significant damage due to the potholes and having to drive on the grass edge at times due to the narrow road. I'm surprised there hasn't been more accidents on the road due to people overtaking trucks and farm machinery and not having a wide enough road to do so. Please widen Leaches Road!!

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	A \$3.4 million project to fully widen Leaches Rd in 2032/33 is currently in Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast

[100163] - Mrs Diana Innes

Address: 446 Coleridge Road Windwhistle Darfield 7572

Postal Address: Long Spur Cottage, 446 Coleridge Road, RD2 Darfield

Phone (day): 03 3186802

Phone (mobile):

Email: geralddee@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)

They need to be kept separate

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 to develop a community event centre in the Domain at Hororata. It would help fundraising proposals if this proposal came early in the plan. Windwhistle will benefit from this asset.

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)

Infrastructure of public toilets,camping and waste needs to be planned and implemented.

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

Roading: Leeches Road: This road needs to be upgraded and widened all the way. Heavy traffic of milk tankers and logging trucks use this road. The road is a thoroughfare for traffic to the Inland Road and Mount Hutt Ski Field. At present it is too narrow and bumpy for safety. Zig Zag Road This road is too narrow and not graded well enough for the amount of traffic that uses it.

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 Submitter proposes community funding be retained separately. While retaining some funds separately at this time makes sense Council is encouraged to still allow the establishment of the major Community Grants Fund.

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 supports the Hororata Community Facility proposal and wishes to bring forward the 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).

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments A reference to public facilities, toilets etc. needing to provided but this would only relate to longer recreational/tourist cycleways that the Walking and Cycling Strategy does not cover.

Topic: Camping Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Public toilets, camping and waste: The submitter wants to ensure these are well planned. Council has developed a network of public toilets to service the district needs including for visitors, campers and residents with over \$1.8 million spent on new facilities over the last three years. Further toilets are planned over the next 10 years to fill gaps in the network. Council has also provided funds to upgrade waste water systems where required and is seeking government funding to assist with this. A Camping Strategy is being prepared to enable this activity to be effectively managed in the district and to identify future infrastructure requirements.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments A \$3.4 million project to fully widen Leaches Rd in 2032/33 is currently in Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast. Zig Zag Road is a relatively steep local unsealed road which its condition can change quickly. The comments have been passed to Service Delivery to check levels of service. SH77 and Coleridge Rd provides the main sealed road connection between Rakaia and Coleridge etc.

[100164] - Jenni Carter

Address: 1224 Te Pirita Rd Hororata 7572

Postal Address: RD 2 Darfield

Phone (day): 3180858

Phone (mobile): 021706544

Email: jenni.carter56@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)

dont agree with clorinatin when it is used for stock

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)

Hororata needs an updated facility which meets community needs

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?

Leeches Rd needs to be widened. it is so narrow 2 truucks cant pass each other safely and cars are often pushed off the road. It is dangeros for the amount of traffic and the size of vehicles.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Well managed chlorination does not impact on stock drinking the 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 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: 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 Hororata needs a new community facility is consistent with Council's assessment of the situation. Support for the proposal to provide a purpose built facility to service Hororata is noted.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments A \$3.4 million project to fully widen Leaches Rd in 2032/33 is currently in Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast

[100165] - Ms Tracey Watson

Address: 7 Sentinel Place Christchurch 8025

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 0274335722

Phone (mobile): 0274335722

Email: watson@sel.kiwi

Submission

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

I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road.

Please help us get back up there, I used to go up there on the MTB and it is fantastic, it's quiet and FREE. Walking or biking it is a very healthy pass time. I stopped because the farmers started blocking the gates ways with vegetation.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100166] - Ms Chrys Horn

Address: 265 Kennedys Bush Rd Christchurch 8025

Postal Address: 265 Kennedys Bush Rd Kennedys Bush Christchurch

Phone (day): 0272868653

Phone (mobile): 0272868653

Email: chrys.horn@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)

I'd love to see SDC does some work to mark paper roads in the district as welking and cycling resources. I'm particularly keen to see the existing unformed Burkes Bush Rd makred with survey poles and sign posts so that walkers and mountain bikers can use the correct line from Early Valley Road to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road.

The growing population of Tai Tapu, Lincoln and Prebbleton mean that there is a growing need for walking and cycling access from the Selwyn District to the Summit Road and the Port Hills. This is particularly the case given that there is no sign posted access to the Summit Road in the Selwyn District between Kennedys Track and Gebbies Pass at all.

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

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100167] - Mr Graham Batchelor

Address: 41 Kirkwood Avenue Christchurch 8041

Postal Address: 41 Kirkwood Avenue Ilam Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 3481531

Phone (mobile): 0273910673

Email: grahambatch@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)

I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road The walking /cycling section of the Plan overlooks the need for walking / cycling access from the Selwyn District to the Summit Road and the Port Hills. The Port Hills are a very important environmental asset to both the City and Selwyn. Given the rapid population growth within the Tai Tapu, Lincoln and Rolleston triangle urgent attention needs to be given to providing local walking and cycling access to the Summit Road. Within the Christchurch City Council jurisdiction there is a good track net work on the Port Hills. However within the Selwyn District jurisdiction there is no sign posted access to the Summit Road between the boundaries of Kennedys Track and Gebbies Pass at all!

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

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100168] - Mr Steve Harris

Address: 7 Anfield Way Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: steve.harris@outlook.co.nz

Submission

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

I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road.

The walking/cycling section of the Plan overlooks the need for walking/cycling access from the Selwyn District to the Summit Road and the Port Hills. The Port Hills are a very important environmental asset to both the City and Selwyn. Given the rapid population growth within the Tai Tapu, Lincoln and Rolleston triangle urgent attention needs to be given to providing local walking and cycling access to the Summit Road. Within the Christchurch City Council jurisdiction there is a good track net work on the Port Hills. However within the Selwyn District jurisdiction there is no sign posted access to the Summit Road between the boundaries of Kennedys Track and Gebbies Pass at all!

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100169] -High Peak Station Mr Simon Guild

Address: High Peak Station, 546 High Peak Rd, RD2 Darfield
7572

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 033186895

Phone (mobile): 0278682415

Email: simonguild@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?

I am submitting on behalf of the Guild family at High Peak Station. One of the most fundamental functions of council is transport infrastructure. In our case, this means roads. Specifically, we would like to see increased priority on the maintenance and safety of the High Peak Rd, Snowdon Rd, Zig Zag Rd and Leaches Rd.

The first three are gravel roads that over the course of a calendar year can range from excellent condition to incredibly poor condition. It is the long periods of deterioration between maintenance intervals that make these roads unsafe, as exemplified by the current state of the eastern end of the Snowdon Rd.

Leaches Rd is simply too narrow for the volume and size of traffic that regularly use it (e.g. milk tankers, logging trucks, CPW equipment). The edges are constantly eroded and potholed and everyone in the district seems to have a story regarding damage, an incident or a near miss. It needs to be rectified as a matter of urgency.

In context, many of the projects outlined in the Long Term Plan that you have invited comment on seem to be frivolous when faced with marginal roading infrastructure and in our view, way down the priority order.

Regards,

Simon Guild High Peak Station

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter has requested increased maintenance on High Peak, Snowdon and Zig Zag Roads. These are long roads in hill country that are a challenge to maintain with relatively low use and their condition can quickly. The comments have been passed to Service Delivery to check levels of service. A \$3.4 million project to fully widen Leaches Rd in 2032/33 is currently in Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast.

[100170] -Windwhistle District Society Inc Mr Gerald Innes

Address: 446 Coleridge Road, Windwhistle Darfield 7572

Postal Address: 446 Coleridge Road RD2 Darfield

Phone (day): 03 3186802

Phone (mobile):

Email: Geraldee@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)

Submission

The Windwhistle District Society (WWD Soc) supports the Proposal in the Selwyn District Long Term Plan for an event centre to be built in the Hororata Domain for the following reasons: 1. Representing a part of the hinterland of Hororata, we realise the benefits the Hororata Domain brings to the wider district, offering a sports ground (tennis courts, rifle club, scouts den, cross country course and walking track) as well as a suitable area for large events such as Hororata Night Glow, Swap Meets, Fairs and the Hororata Highland Games. 2. We recognise that the Hororata Hall is in need of repair. 3. Windwhistle does not have a large domain. Its residents pay rates to the small hall of Glenroy but enjoys and utilises the Hororata Domain. 4. Culturally and historically, Windwhistle supports Hororata. Windwhistle is part of the large Parish of Hororata that stretches from the Main Divide to Greendale between the Rakaia and Selwyn Rivers. This is not just a religious boundary, it rests in the psyche of residents as part of their heritage.. Presently many members of the Hororata Highland Games, Hororata Night Glow committees and Hororata Parish Vestry are domiciled in Windwhistle. 5. The ability to present large events in Hororata Domain benefits the greater community and presents the Selwyn District to the wider community and the world. 6. Windwhistle recognises the advantages of siting an event centre within the large Hororata Domain, such as safe access, greater parking, availability of larger and smaller meeting areas, a modern kitchen, up to date bathrooms etc. We ask the Selwyn District Council to consider this submission favourably. Gerald Innes Chair Windwhistle District Society Inc

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 Windwhistle District Society provides a compelling case in support of the proposed Hororata facility and note that it will also service that community. Support for the proposal to provide a new community facility in Hororata is acknowledged.

[100171] -Ellesmere Reserve Board Mr Ray Anderson

Address: 19 Willis Road Southbridge 7683

Postal Address: 19 Willis Road Southbridge

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 027 898 2068

Email: raymond.anderson@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)

Our reserve Board does not support the District wide rating

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: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

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

[100172] - Mrs Lorraine Rasmussen

Address: 22 Brook Street Southbridge 7602

Postal Address: 22 Brook Street Southbridge

Phone (day): 324 2832

Phone (mobile):

Email: rassco@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)

I disagree with chlorination of our water as it affects people who suffer from asthma and with skin complaints.

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.”

[100173] -Middle Rock Mrs Lyn Nell

Address: 1160 Coleridge Road, RD 2 Darfield 7572

Postal Address: 1160 Coleridge Road, Darfieldd

Phone (day): +6433186889

Phone (mobile):

Email: nell@xtra.co.nz

Submission

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 support the building of a community centre on the Hororata Domain. The current hall is no longer meeting the needs of this growing community.

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

I would like to support submissions for a complete rebuild of Leaches Rd between Hororata and Windwhistle. This road is in a bad state of repair and short term quick fixes do little to improve it's long term condition.

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

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

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

Camping regulations - that local body rules be reviewed for self contained vehicles.

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.

Topic: Camping Facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Lake Coleridge Public Toilet: The submitter's support for the replacement toilet at Lake Coleridge is noted.

Campervan Dump Stations: The submitter notes the increase in tourist activity in the Lake Coleridge area and requests installation of more dump stations. Council has included budgets in the draft LTP for installing further dump station at key locations and has also sought government funding support for these projects.

Camping Regulations: Council is developing a strategy aimed at improving management of camping activities in the district. This may result in additional controls being put in place where appropriate as well as encouraging responsible camping behaviours.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Lake Coleridge Public Toilet: The submitter's support for the replacement toilet at Lake Coleridge is noted.

Campervan Dump Stations: The submitter notes the increase in tourist activity in the Lake Coleridge area and requests installation of more dump stations. Council has included budgets in the draft LTP for installing further dump station at key locations and has also sought government funding support for these projects.

Topic: Recycling facilities - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Recycling for Windwhistle households: The Council will continue to expand both Kerbside collections wherever possible. For dwellings not on route, nor likely to be on route for some time, Council is investigating the strategic placement of

containerised recycle stations to provide for closer or more convenient facilities in these situations.

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

[100174] -Middle Rock Mr Bruce Nell

Address: 1160 Coleridge Road, RD 2 Darfield 7572

Postal Address: 1160 Coleridge Rd, Darfield

Phone (day): +6433186889

Phone (mobile):

Email: bwnell@hotmail.com

Submission

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 support the building of a community centre on the Hororata Domain. The current hall is no longer meeting the needs of this growing community.

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

I would like to support submissions for a complete rebuild of Leaches Rd between Hororata and Windwhistle. This road is in a bad state of repair and short term quick fixes do little to improve it's long term condition.

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

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

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.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Lake Coleridge Public Toilet: The submitter's support for the replacement toilet at Lake Coleridge is noted.

Topic: Recycling facilities - Assets

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments Recycling for Windwhistle households: The Council will continue to expand both Kerbside collections wherever possible. For dwellings not on route, nor likely to be on route for some time, Council is investigating the strategic placement of containerised recycle stations to provide for closer or more convenient facilities in these situations.

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

[100175] - Mr Gerald Innes

Address: 446 Coleridge Road Windwhistle Darfield 7572

Postal Address: Long Spur Cottage 446 Coleridge Road RD2 Darfield

Phone (day): 03 3186802

Phone (mobile): 0272278031

Email: Gerald@netspeed.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)
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)

They need to be kept separate

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 a proposal to develop an event centre in Hororata Domain

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)

Infrastructure for public toilets, camping and waste should be planned and implemented at the same time

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

Roading: Leeches Road. This is a thoroughfare to the Inland Route and Mount Hutt Ski Field. It is used by heavy traffic, milk tankers, tractors, logging and stock trucks. This Road is too narrow and needs to be upgraded all the way. It has perennial pot holes. This Road needs to be upgraded on the Long Term Pkan.

Zig Zag Road. This Road is too narrow for the traffic that it handles. Nor is it graded often enough. We suggest a programme of more frequent grading for this Road in the Long Term Plan

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 facility in Hororata is acknowledged.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments A reference to public facilities, toilets etc. needing to provided but this would only relate to longer recreational/tourist cycleways that the Walking and Cycling Strategy does not cover.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments A \$3.4 million project to fully widen Leaches Rd in 2032/33 is currently in Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast. Zig Zag Road is a relatively steep local unsealed road which its condition can change quickly. The comments have been passed to Service Delivery to check levels of service. SH77 and Coleridge Rd provides the main sealed road connection between Rakaia and Coleridge etc.

[100176] - Mr Richard Suggate

Address: 16 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour, RD1 Lyttelton
8971

Postal Address: 16 Whero Avenue Diamond Harbour, RD1 Lyttelton

Phone (day): 033293177

Phone (mobile): 0276876242

Email: richard.suggate@gmail.com

Submission

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

I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road.

If this is not a feasible walking and biking route, the Council should negotiate with adjacent landowners to enable the formation of a walking and biking track along the approximate route. The Council should also provide adequate funding to enable the construction and maintenance of a walking and cycling path up the line of Burkes Bush Road. If necessary the Council should close the legal road to motorised vehicle access.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100177] -Prebbleton Heritage Mrs Daphne McAven

Address: 36 Prebblewood Drive Prebbleton 7604

Postal Address: 36 Prebblewood Drive PREBBLETON 7604

Phone (day): 349 8886

Phone (mobile): -

Email: mcavend36@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?

We would ask that the Selwyn District Council make provision for the collection and safe storage of material relating to the history of Selwyn District.

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Preservation of Historical Records: The Council retains some historical records in its current archive system (records mainly relating to Council). Council is exploring options for storage of historical material as part of some of the current community facility projects.

[100178] - Mrs Helen Taege

Address: 11 Malvern Hills Road Sheffield 7500

Postal Address: 11 Malvern Hills Road, Sheffield

Phone (day): 033183792

Phone (mobile):

Email: helen@taege.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)

I believe there are too many chemicals in this world poisoning then killing us slowly. Chlorine gas is used overseas in chemical warfare. I know what is to be introduced to our drinking water is only a very small amount but over time it builds up in our bodies causing illness and sometimes death. Chlorine is a bleach which kills good bacteria in our digestive systems, depletes our bodies of vital minerals and vitamins. For me chlorinated water causes diarrhoea, skin irritations and respiratory problems. There are many people like myself who prefer to be treated with natural remedies. You won't find us in any doctor's statistics saying we are made ill by chlorine, which is why statistics only show a few suffer side effects. The Netherlands have a "disinfectant" free water treatment system which works very satisfactorily.

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.”

[100179] -Selwyn Youth Council Selwyn Youth Council

Address: 2 Norman Kirk Drive Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 2 Norman Kirk Drive

Phone (day):

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 a good idea because everyone in Selwyn is using these facilities, no matter whether they live there or not as people travel all around Selwyn. - The people who don't use the facilities may be frustrated that their rates are increased. - The facilities are for the wellbeing of the whole community, these facilities can improve the wellbeing for everyone.

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

- Hydrosleds (everyone agreed on this) - Fitness area is a good idea, as the people could use equipment such as spin bikes before and after swimming - The cafe is a nice idea but not really necessary, people would be just as happy without it - Having a cafe is also good for the parents who have to take their children to swimming lessons

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)

- Love the walking track idea - Think it's a great idea - Love the toilets - Maximum the floor space - Meeting rooms would be good - Could have a rock climbing wall on a wall of the court rather than dedicating a room to it

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)

- It's better than getting sick - One member said that doesn't like it as we would have to buy bottle water which is bad for the environment - Only want it if we need it

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)

No Comment

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)

- That's great - That is a really cheap price to pay

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

- 100% Leeston has nothing that serves a purpose, the community centre could bring the community together - For emergencies this would be great to give the community somewhere to feel safe and go together as a community - We need to know the numbers are there (for Hororata)

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)

- Want to know if the community has input on the design? - Think it needs to happen as you can't have staff not working in the building and not being in good facilities, we need to look after them - Parking is definitely needed

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

- Think its a lot safer as there a lot of people biking these days "It's the new thing" - Destination cycle way? - Lincoln to Tai Tapu should be made before Leeston to Doyleston - More destination tracks through natural forests - scenic paths - Leeston and places like that need cycleways to get other places however in big towns in Rolleston we just need cycleways inside the town as there is already sufficient transport outside - Would be cool to link a bike track through Rolleston College, Foster Park, the pool, new town centre etc.

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

No Comments

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. Submission proposes a Hydroslide addition for young people and supports gym / wellbeing space but support is divided for a cafe.

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: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for 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 fully supports the provision of a new facility to service Leeston but is unsure about the case for a new facility in Hororata. 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.

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 draws reference to needing higher amenity or recreational tracks however this would come at a additional cost and falls outside the more transport outcomes sought by the 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy. The submitter also refers to connecting paths in the likes of Rolleston however interestingly this network is already there but not clearly defined as such to make this obvious e.g. wider footpaths, Foster Park pathways, links through reserves etc.

[100180] -Leeston Park Committee Mr Richard Taiaroa

Address: High Street, Leeston Leeston 7632

Postal Address: 18 Mountain View Place Leeston

Phone (day): 3243650

Phone (mobile):

Email: c/- bernadette.ryan@selwyn.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?

The Tennis/Netball courts at Leeston Park need to be resurfaced due to cracks that have appeared. These courts have endured a considerable increase in use and the condition for play has become an issue. We request that funding be brought forward to 2018/19.

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 Leeston Park Courts Resurfacing: The Leeston Park Committee have requested that the courts resurfacing budget is brought forward to 2018/19 as a result of deterioration and increasing use. The project is currently planned for 2021/22 (\$95,000). The estimated cost is \$104,200 based on quotes received. Given the court condition staff concur that this project should be brought forward and a slight adjustment made (\$9,200) to cover the estimated cost.

[100181] - Mr Bill Woods

Address: 5509 West Coast Road Springfield 7681

Postal Address: RD1 Springfield

Phone (day): 033184825

Phone (mobile): 0276082030

Email: billwoods@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)

Most definitely, this proposal goes against the very reason that the separate rate for halls and reserves was introduced and it favours the larger townships that have expensive halls, community centres and reserves. The proposal is simply not fair.

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

Yes but they are unprintable.

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)

Only if I am expected to pay for this facility.

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)

my own water supply has been chlorinated since inception but I do wonder why UV is proposed as well.

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 Again this proposal goes against the policy of the council adopted in 1989 that User Pays will be the means of assessing rates. The way the wording is that those on water race schemes will not only pay for the convenience of a water race but contribute to the Public Good rate. With a piped water supply in or out only those that are able to connect and use the scheme can be rated.

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)

Provided the Summit Road Society is included as it owns the largest privately owned native bush in the 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)

if the locals want one and are prepared to take on the responsibility of the major cost just as the other community halls have done in the past.

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 again my comments are unprintable especially at the last election campaign I predicted this would happen but all the other Mayoral candidates denied it would happen as the present building was found to be adequate.

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

No Not really as this topic is so fashionable one would be inviting adverse comment to oppose it.

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

Time more was done in the country areas as we are now progressing at an alarming rate to having a them and us council. Some of the largest individual rate demands are in the rural areas but those ratepayers see little for their rates with most of the money spent being spent in the fast growing areas that demand social services that the rural folk receive no benefit

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 Unclear from submission what position the submitter holds for SAC development

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. UV is used as an additional barrier. Council wants to develop a multi barrier approach to contamination. 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 for Community Grant Funding is noted on proviso that Summit Road Society is included. Unclear what this statement means.

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 appears to support the proposals subject to the major costs being borne by each community. 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 No comment provided apart from being reluctant to comment

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

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

[100182] -Mr Mr Ian and Ruth Warren

Address: 84 Warrens Rd, Greendale 7671

Postal Address: 84 Warrens Road, Greendale, RD 1, Christchurch

Phone (day): 033188876

Phone (mobile): 0273188876

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)

a) This proposal was discussed three years ago and the inequalities which were obvious at that time have only become worse. b) If a community wishes to develop a new Centre or improve an existing one then they should pay for it as a community, as those already existing ones have done and continue to do so. c) Predicted population increases in the larger centres will in time reduce the household costs. d) As it is proposed the smaller communities are subsidising the larger communities. 17 of the 26 centres will be paying substantially more. e) The argument that the larger centres are used across the district is negated through user pays. f) There is adequate room to increase rates in smaller communities to ensure that they are affordable. g) If communities can't afford the development then they are over-specified and too costly! h) Local control and vested involvement is largely removed with committee meetings becoming discussions on the performance of the Council. i) The level of Reserve maintenance will not be achieved by district wide contractors. Greendale has a first class cricket facility that requires expert and timely mowing. j) It cannot be compared with a district wide water services rate as that service has no community input.

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

Agree with this extension in that the present facilities are unable to cope with the demand

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)

Disagree with this in that it is unaffordable and over the top for our district. There are already sufficient indoor hall spaces and there will be greater facilities available in Christchurch which Selwyn could contribute too.

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 - not 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)

Agree with increasing the public component otherwise not affected.

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, agree in principle.

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

Encourage communities to do due diligence on their requirements and then fund them from within their own communities.

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)

Agree to centralize any additional staff requirements.

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

Yes, support this strategy though would like to have it advanced within the time frame.

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

a) Health Hub Proposal. - We have been assured by our Councillor that GP's will not be included in this Hub otherwise it will be in opposition to private business and outside the Council's role. Further how will it give a commercial return from an investment of \$9 million which will require at least \$630,000 annual rent!

b) Transportation. The roads in the west of the district are broken and must be among the worst in NZ. Shingle roads are more mud than shingle, potted and rutted. Sealed roads are broken along the edges and so badly patched that they break almost immediately. Note Bealey Road, Greendale Road. Bridge Road, a school bus route and major road when the river is down, is like driving over a continual judder bar with damage from tree roots. A sign does not fix the damage! 1.8 million for new seal is pitiful. It would only take another \$700,000 to complete Coaltrack sealing so that section joined with the existing seal. Council needs to sort out its priorities.

We apologise for being unable to speak to our submissions as we will be overseas.

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: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your support.

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 believes the new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton should be locally funded and the communities should do due diligence. Council will make a decision on the funding approach for these facilities in consideration of feedback on the District-wide rate proposal. Each facility proposal is supported by feasibility studies either driven by the local communities or with input from them.

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 however requests implementation be advanced which is not practical

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The comment about the health hub is noted. No decision can be reached at this time on whether GP's will be located in this facility when it opens or into the future.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Submitter is concerned with the condition of western roads in the district. Whilst there are challenges with affordability condition indicators do not support they are the worst in the country as stated. A recent audit by the NZTA did not identify any fundamental issues with the levels of services provided by Council on its low volume rural roads. Councils 20 year forecasted transport programme includes the sealing of sections of Coaltrack Rd to north to Bealey Rd in 3 stages between 2024 and 2032 at a total cost of \$1.52 million as part of its "missing link" seal extension programme.

[100183] -Windwhistle District Society Mrs Charlotte Rietveld

Address: Middle Rock Windwhistle 7572

Postal Address: 1391 Coleridge Road R D 2 Darfield

Phone (day): 02102445580

Phone (mobile):

Email: charlotte@middlerock.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?

The Windwhistle District Society requests council consideration for a Windwhistle community building project.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Windwhistle Community Project: The Windwhistle District Society are planning to develop a community facility with some funds derived from forestry operations and have requested Council to allow for this in the LTP. Currently the project is not well defined and no specific costing information has been included in the submission. It is therefore difficult to make an informed judgement on this proposal at this point in time. Staff suggest that further information is obtained in order to ascertain the nature of the project and what funding contribution is being sought from Council.

[100184] - Mr Jules Snoyink

Address: 6 Homebush Road Glentunnel 7638

Postal Address: C/-PDC Glentunnel

Phone (day): +6433182632

Phone (mobile):

Email: rsnoyink@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) Dont Support

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

Do not Support

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)

Do not Support

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 to chlorinating our community supply, the Hartley Hills water scheme, as it has worked perfectly satisfactory for the 20 years we have lived in Glentunnel. Chlorination should be a last resort. It is a free ticket for farm intensification and a license to pollute. Clean up waterways, look after the community supplies at source and maintain the infrastructure. Do NOT chlorinate perfectly clean potable drinking water. This is not the NZ we know or want.

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)

Agree. Maintain the water races as they are important for freshwater biodiversity.

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)

Do NOT agree to a single fund. I request the Biodiversity Fund be increased and kept as a separate fund.

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

Proceed with a targeted rate, same as for Glentunnel

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)

Do NOT agree.

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

I agree to the increase in facilities for walking and cycling.

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

Other matters. I am disappointed that biodiversity is missing in the Consultation Document. There is only .5% native vegetation remaining on the Canterbury Plains. This is a sad indictment on the Council. I wish to see more funding for maintaining, enhancing and protecting native biodiversity in the Selwyn District. This should be a first priority ahead of all the other infrastructural and service projects planned for the next 10 years. Increase the budget for native biodiversity protection.

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 Submitter does not support any aspect of SAC extension

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: 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 This Submitter requested the Biodiversity Fund be kept as a separate fund. and requested additional funding for the Biodiversity Fund.

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 is of the view that costs should be borne by each community. 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 submitter is in support

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Selwyn District Council notes your disappointment that biodiversity is not included in the Long Term Plan consultation document.

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.

[100185] - Mr William Innes

Address: 472 Coleridge Road Windwhistle 7572

Postal Address: 472 Coleridge Rd RD 2 Darfield

Phone (day): 033186929

Phone (mobile): 0274444237

Email: longspur@netspeed.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)
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?

Leaches road needs to be widened and fixed properly. Hororata and wider community would be brought together with an multi purpose community centre

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

[100186] -Engineering NZ in association with Heritage NZ Dr. Terry Heiler

Address: 107 Bells Rd West Melton 7671

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 03 3478365

Phone (mobile): 021 388867

Email: terryheiler@outlook.com

Submission

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

IPENZ (now Engineering NZ) and Heritage NZ presented a proposal to Council regarding the future of the Heritage 2 listed Bankside Fuel Depot.

This submission requests that the Council investigate the issues of allowing public access to a suitably modified Bankside Bunker site and facility. The submitters make no specific proposals as to the nature of that access or likely cost; rather we request that the Council undertake the necessary investigations.

The submitters have researched the facility in depth and have information well suited to providing information to the public on this historically significant heritage site from WW2. Both organisations commit to assisting where appropriate.

Engineers NZ are in a nationwide project to identify and highlight engineering works of historic and heritage importance. The Christchurch Chapter of this project has identified the Bankside Bunker as a priority component of our WW2 history.

-----Original Message----- From: Christine Whybrew [mailto:CWhybrew@heritage.org.nz] Sent: Friday, May 4, 2018 3:50 PM To: terryheiler@outlook.com Cc Subject: RE: SDC long term plan and Bankside Bunker

Dear Terry

Robyn has forwarded your email to me for response.

Heritage New Zealand has already prepared a submission on the draft Long Term Plan for Selwyn District. In our submission we provided support for their continuation of the Selwyn Heritage Fund and the new community grant scheme for celebrating local heritage places. I have just heard that submissions actually close today at 5pm - I trust that doesn't come as a surprise to you.

As we've already made our submission, we request that Heritage New Zealand is are not named as a joint-author of your submission. We continue to support your work on exploring options for improving interpretation and access at the Bankside Fuel Depot. A few weeks ago Robyn and I met with SDC staff on site at Bankside and briefly discussed the need for interpretation and thoughts on possible controlled access, and it seems they have a special interest in this project.

With kind regards, Christine

Dr Christine Whybrew | Area Manager Canterbury/West Coast | Southern Regional Office | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

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 proposal was presented to the Council. The submitter has not provided details of the costs of the proposal. Councillors debated whether the Council would become involved, and if so, to what extent. The following points were raised: • Support for a working party to look into the matter and recommend a way forward. • Support for maintaining the fence so that no-one is put at risk. • Support for an information board in the area but not necessarily for a viewing platform. • Asset Manager's Team to prepare a short report on what the possible implications might be. • Consideration for adding it to a heritage / cultural trail for the District, alongside McHughs Forest. • Asking for Expressions of Interest for the development of the site. The Property and Commercial Manager noted that if Council decided it had sufficient value to be part of a heritage trail it would be prudent to consider a complete strategy which included other sites as well. The Chief Executive was requested to undertake further investigation. He noted this may eventuate in a significant cost once roading, fencing, car parking and health and safety requirements are all taken into account. A report for Council's consideration will be presented at a future meeting.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	An annual maintenance budget of \$7,000 exists to fund mowing, fence repairs at the bankside site which we are very unlikely to use annually. Accordingly if the council wanted to support this proposal some of the funding could be allocated to prepare interpretation boards etc for this site. An allowance of \$20,000 would probably be sufficient to provide funding for boards etc.

[100187] - Mr Terence Hancock

Address: not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: terencehancock@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 don't believe it", all community centres, halls etc to be paid for by all! This proposal really extracts the urine out of the Lincoln community !

Proposals to provide new centres & halls for various communities throughout the district, all OTT of course, has finally made council aware smaller communities cannot sustain such undertakings, so a bubble has come off the think tank, "let's spread the load district wide".

It was okay for the Lincoln ratepayers to pay for the Events Centre for the past 6 years! Another great example of OTT WANTS over NEEDS being sanctioned by this council.

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

Apparently this facility is struggling to accommodate all customer requirements, well that shows the ability of council to project the future when this project was first undertaken, but that is by the way, ratepayers can always stomp up more funding to increase the size! This type of facility never pays & requires considerable funding from ratepayers, like museums libraries etc.

The true cost of this facility is never shown, insurance, council on costs etc are charged to another appropriation centre, not the pool. Fitness programming space (this is a swimming pool, not a gym) & a cafe to be included in the extension, wow aren't council trendy! A considerable rate increase to provide all these posey wants. Could use vending machines for the cafe, but that's not the right image for council. Ratepayers have already contributed considerable finance to this facility & there would be more of them than customers, but of course this council has no problem spending ratepayers funds, there is plenty more where that comes from!

Another classic example of a council rort (to take unfair advantage of something) of the ratepayers.

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)

Another feel good project funded by (\$6m development contribution) & district wide targeted rate.

Question: Is the \$6m appropriation being provided by Rolleston's development contributions only or are other areas DCs included, if so how much & where from?

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)

Option 2 : - Central Government will impose this on Local Government in the future so start planning how it will be funded, could start by cutting back on Wants & concentrate on NEEDS, water is a core function isn't it?

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)

All rateable properties would pay a "public good rate",the intellect of this council continues to astound the mere mortal ratepayer",what on earth does this mean?Why not have a feel good rate! Water races bring other benefits to the community (wider?)including environmental benefit(undefined) & aesthetic benefits(undefined) for SOME residential areas(undefined).Does council employ someone to come up with these rate descriptions or did council think of it themselves?If this rate is imposed I can't wait to flick it on to the Taxpayers Union,they will have a field day! This is another WANT that majority of ratepayers do not NEED!!!!

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)

What is wrong with the status quo,proposal looks like a money grab from interested parties wanting more! To do nothing would result in council saving ratepayers money,now there is a novelty!

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

Would ratepayers class these cycleway projects as a need for Selwyn. Well judging by the thousands of walkers & cyclists fighting to get on the Rolleston to Lincoln cycleway they are definitely not. Nice to have if ratepayers had the cash to splash,but there are far more essential priorities before warm fuzzy ones.

West Belt Lincoln has remained unsealed in the middle of the town since Halley's Comet last visited & this council is talking cycleways! Time to show some real administrative ability in running the district, if council has to attract NZTA subsidy funding & spend more ratepayer funds, use it on core functions & roads, not this rubbish! I am aware NZTA earmarks funding for cycleways,but the downside is council have to spend ratepayers dosh to get the subsidy on these nice to have projects that very few ratepayers use!

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)

This project will no doubt have all the bells & whistles to provide a hatchery for more shiny bottoms to administer the already overburdened Selwyn ratepayer.

It will be OTT & as for providing a better customer services area,it's not exactly New World or The Warehouse,the most people I have seen in this area are carrying their coffees! This Council continues to suffer badly from image anxiety.

Get practical,I doubt you would see farmers cladding their buildings with river stones like this extension will no doubt have.

It's a WANT,not a NEED,try using partitions in some of the underutilized meeting rooms or the elected representatives rooms!

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?

Reality: Rates from 2008 - 2018 increased approximately 170%.

If you extrapolate out the proposed 4% annual rate increase over the next 10yrs,it will,with compounding effect increase rates in excess of over100% in that period.I am sure Councillors would have carried out this exercise with their deliberations,it should also be noted during this period three revaluations will take place,boosting the councils income.This of course will be a nice little earner for council,funds to be used as bonus income!

Question: Can ratepayers continue to sustain the unfettered rate increases this council will inflict on them in the next 10yrs.

With the UAGC almost at its maximum 30% there will not be much room to manoeuvre,so bring on the targeted rates as opposed to operating more efficiently!

What has happened to councils user pays philosophy,it appears all WANTS & NEEDS are to be funded/subsidized by all ratepayers progressively!

Will have to keep an eye on Darfield, do not want to see all ratepayers contributing to the capital costs of a sewerage reticulation scheme!

The obscene council support services for this council continue to increase unabated ,once upon a time councils largest cost was roading, take a look at councils pie chart for operating expenditure, in 2016 council support services were 30%,nearly 1/3 of councils operating expenses more than roading from which ratepayers can at least see something for their rates!The figures are as per Internal Affairs LG Stats. Wonder what the latest % is? No I don't want to know or I will have to start taking medication!

Would rather see rates spent on roading etc than shiny bottoms!

Council is still happy to rip off the residential ratepayer by not introducing a differential on the general rate. Businesses continue to be rated at the same rate as residential ratepayers, businesses being able to offset a 1/3 of their rates as a business expense for tax purposes, residential ratepayers can't!

Councils financial position is strong, dividends ,development contributions, rates etc, but rates continue to increase well in excess of the CPI, perhaps it is to do with the cost of council support services?This strong position never offsets the costs to Selwyn ratepayers, so someone must be benefiting.

Judging by the obscene rate increases imposed over the years there must be a considerable amount of rubber stamping occurring round the council table as opposed to questions & requiring efficiencies.

Question: I have had brought to my attention that council has a policy to pay for staffs optician consultations & also pays for their glasses, can you confirm this for me & if this applies to elected representatives. I have no problem with consultations but paying for glasses, council could be making a spectacle of itself & where would you charge the FBT!

Another complete waste of my time but there will be plenty of questions to ask councillors throughout the coming year!

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 Submission does not support Council funding being spent on this development

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 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	Submission does not support Community Grants Scheme

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: It is assumed the submitter opposes the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton but this was unclear.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	No comments made.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The submitter poses a number of questions and points: "Rates from 2008 - 2018 increased approximately 170%." Rates revenue has increased from \$17,766,000 for the year ended 30 June 2008 compared with projected rates revenue of \$50,769,000 for the year ending 30 June 2018. This is

a 186% increase, however the population of Selwyn has increased dramatically in the last 10 years and the level of service has improved significantly over this time.

"If you extrapolate out the proposed 4% annual rate increase over the next 10yrs, it will, with compounding effect increase rates in excess of over 100% in that period." - Average rates are projected to increase from the current average in 2017/18 of \$2,591 to \$3,644 in 2027/28, which is an increase of 41%. This increase is associated with improved levels of service as well as increases in cost due to inflation.

"Question: Can ratepayers continue to sustain the unfettered rate increases this council will inflict on them in the next 10yrs. With the UAGC almost at its maximum 30% there will not be much room to manoeuvre, so bring on the targeted rates as opposed to operating more efficiently! What has happened to councils user pays philosophy, it appears all WANTS & NEEDS are to be funded/subsidized by all ratepayers progressively!" - The Council seeks to balance community expectations and rates affordability. Selwyn's rates are comparable with other local authorities in the region. The rates increases reflect the improved levels of service as well as increased costs.

"Will have to keep an eye on Darfield, do not want to see all ratepayers contributing to the capital costs of a sewerage reticulation scheme! The obscene council support services for this council continue to increase unabated ,once upon a time councils largest cost was roading, take a look at councils pie chart for operating expenditure, in 2016 council support services were 30%,nearly 1/3 of councils operating expenses more than roading from which ratepayers can at least see something for their rates!The figures are as per Internal Affairs LG Stats. Wonder what the latest % is? No I don't want to know or I will have to start taking medication!" - The Council is committed to undertaking further work in relation to Darfield Wastewater. This will focus on the cost benefit and practical matters involved with any future scheme. There is currently no funding proposal for this scheme.

"Would rather see rates spent on roading etc than shiny bottoms! Council is still happy to rip off the residential ratepayer by not introducing a differential on the general rate. Businesses continue to be rated at the same rate as residential ratepayers, businesses being able to offset a 1/3 of their rates as a business expense for tax purposes, residential ratepayers can't!" - There is currently no business differential and this is inline with Council's long standing policy.

"Councils financial position is strong, dividends ,development contributions, rates etc, but rates continue to increase well in excess of the CPI, perhaps it is to do with the cost of council support services?This strong position never offsets the costs to Selwyn ratepayers, so someone must be benefiting." - The dividends received from Council's investments are used to offset the level of general rate. Development contributions are collected for specific growth related capital expenditure and are not available to subsidise rates.

"Question: I have had brought to my attention that council has a policy to pay for staffs optician consultations & also pays for their glasses, can you confirm this for me & if this applies to elected representatives. I have no problem with consultations but paying for glasses, council could be making a spectacle of itself & where would you charge the FBT!" - Regular assessments of eyesight condition is an important health & Safety preventative measure. Due to the corporate nature

of our work environment staff are subject to increasing periods of time before a computer screen (VDU). Eyesight health checks are important to minimising and managing eye strain. Following the completion of six months' service, an employee who is engaged on Computer (VDU) duties for at least 50 percent of his or her normal working hours per week shall be entitled to an eyesight health check (from the preferred supplier). Further assessments shall be provided at not less than two yearly intervals upon application to the employer.

If assessments disclose that prescription spectacles are required for the normal viewing distance of a computer screen (VDU), or that an eyesight problem has been caused or worsened by use of a computer screen (VDU), the preferred supplier will provide the information in writing to the council stating the requirement.

Then reimbursement cost of lenses up to \$170 (incl gst) will be met by the employer. The reimbursement cost of the frames will be met for employees requiring spectacles for the first time but shall not exceed \$170 (incl gst). Reimbursement costs of subsequent frames will be met up to a maximum of \$170 where employees are required to have a different frame due to a prescribed change to the shape of the lenses.

Authorised reimbursement claims are to be submitted to payroll along with a copy of the receipt, at which time PAYE will be deducted.

Councillors are not covered under this staff policy and no Councillors have been reimbursed for eye test or glasses.

[100188] - Mrs Elma Frijters

Address: 39 Shepherd Ave West Melton 7618

Postal Address: 39 Shepherd Ave West Melton 7618

Phone (day):

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)

Agree, however would like to see that locals would be discounted on hall usage fees.

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

I can see the idea of building a cafe (with view to the pools). But why build a fitness/wellbeing space while these are already present and still being build and opened by private businesses.

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 prefer a multi-purpose community hall/indoor courts building.

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 UV filtration is set-up correctly this should be effective enough. Totally against putting any chemicals in our water. Enough examples in the world where even surface water is used as drinking water and never experience e-colli. If they do it is mainly caused by activities on the infrastructure (digging new lines and waste and drinking water lines too close together).

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)

I support these townships have access to a (small) community hall). We, however, should take into account the cost of building and maintaining these halls. We also have a good community centre/event centre in Lincoln and one planned in Rolleston which could be used for bigger events. Please make sure that ALL our halls could be used as evacuation centers (generators etc).

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)

With the growth going on in the district this is recommendable.

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

In support

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. In regards to the submission not supporting a gym, further cost benefit analyses is taking place to ensure that there is a cost / service benefit . In addition, gym option is only intended to be progressed if deemed to meet an unmet need and alternative models of delivery by other than Council 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](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: 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 as well as ensuring these are of a suitable scale is acknowledged . The new builds meet building standards for evacuation centres and have generator plugs installed.

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

[100189] - Mr James Gardner

Address: 80 Milns Rd Halswell / Christchurch 8025

Postal Address: 80 Milns Rd Halswell 8025

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 02102618317

Email: iamdudley@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)

The cycleway plans look great. The more the better! However, an idea is going around about an unformed legal road up from Early Valley to the Summit Rd. This would make a great mountain biking, running, and walking loop with Kennedy's Bush Rd and the trails around the Sign of the Bellbird. To put it formally, I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road.

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

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support. Burkes Bush Rd is a unformed and unmaintained road that is approx. 5km from Early Valley Rd to the Summit Rd. In places it follows private accessways, crosses farm operations and difficult terrain. Councils 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy identifies that there are a large number of unformed public roads in the district (800km +) and that they are able to be used for recreational activities on a "as is where is basis" with the responsibility on users to traverse them safely and not to disrupt adjoining landowners/activities. It is understood there is some opposition by landowners in this Port Hills area and the situation is contentious. Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Strategy and become more involved in resolving these situations, of which this may set the precedent for other similar requests which falls outside normal transport related funding and outcomes that the Strategy embodies and more to recreation activities which is a separate issue.

[100190] -North Canterbury Rural Support Trust Mr Tim Cookson

Address: 169 Leaches Road, Pinewoods Hororata 7572

Postal Address: 169 Leaches Road Hororata

Phone (day): 0274 344458

Phone (mobile):

Email: tim.lucy@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?

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 facility in Hororata is acknowledged. Staff agree with the view that these facilities help to build strong communities and have a positive effect on rural communities.

[100191] - Mr Richard Muckle

Address: 8 Homebush Road Glentunnel 7673

Postal Address: 8 Homebush Road RD1 Coalgate

Phone (day):

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)

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
Why not future proof the facility with a 50 metre pool ?

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 am totally opposed to the permanent chlorination of the Malvern Hills Hartley Road scheme. The cause of the problem in the scheme should be isolated and fixed, instead of having to chlorinate the resultant water.

As was mentioned by Murray Washington at the public meeting, it appears that the pipe network cannot be trusted as they cross farmland. Why can't there be dedicated pipes to supply the townships? In relation to the turbidity issues at the source, why can't a deeper well be drilled ?

It seems the main reason for the proposed chlorination is because it is the cheapest option, not the best.

Ever since living in the district we have never boiled the water and have not been sick as a result of drinking the 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)

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.”

[100192] - Mrs Hilary Guild

Address: 508 High Peak Rd Darfield 7572

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 03 3186851

Phone (mobile): 0272928220

Email: qhill@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)
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?

The condition of Leaches road is a National disgrace. I am yet to travel on a road in such poor repair. Constant patching of the verges is only making the road narrower and dangerous, as the patches last approx 2 weeks until they break off and another larger hole appears. This is false economy. Resealing by a reputable operator with consideration to camber, drainage and frost condition is well overdue. For a road servicing local residents, schools, tourism, skifields, the dairy forestry and agricultural industries, this road needs to be fit for purpose.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is dissatisfied with the repair works on Leaches Rd. The contractor is responsible for repairing any work that is not of a proper standard. 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

[100193] - Mrs Susan Thornley

Address: 2372 Bealey Road Hororata 7572

Postal Address: 2372 Bealey Road RD 2 Darfield

Phone (day): 3180038

Phone (mobile): 0273480775

Email: thornleys@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) Support district-wide rate to share the burden across the whole Selwyn district for community centres and halls. Valuable asset for every community to have access in their own area to a facility capable of holding community events (weddings, funerals, meetings etc) and retaining a core central identity in an area. Share the rate burden across all areas as people travel from all regions to enjoy the facilities of another areas community asset.

Places like Hororata and Leeston have also experienced growth, just like Rolleston, Lincoln or Prebbleton, but without the large population base to start with their growth seems minimal. As old established towns, their infrastructure is also old and well overdue to modernize and bring up to current safety standards.

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

Build it large enough this time to cater for ongoing demand.

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 building a large multi use facility that encourages sporting and exercise participation.

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)

Council should be supporting the development of community facilities that help maintain a sense of identity in each community. Every area needs a place where they can safely and comfortably come together for events and recreation. In rural areas this is even more important to have a facility that has capacity to host the whole rural community.

Hororata has identified there is local support to build a new community centre. The existing hall is now very old and tired, with heating, decor and kitchen facilities well below optimal condition and comfort. It has sat in a period of limbo since the 2010 earthquakes amid various discussions of repairs and structural strengthening. It also requires extensive upgrading of toilets, kitchen, flooring and re-roofing in the near future. It has been estimated these will total well over \$1,000,000 and will still leave the community with an old style building.

Community consultation has shown there is a demand for a new purpose built facility to accommodate a larger amount of people. Functions have been lost from our community because of the size and drab condition of our current Hororata hall.

Discussion has also focused on relocating a new facility across Hororata Road on to the Reserve. The Hororata Reserve is one of the largest in the Selwyn Council area and is unique for its race track, covered stalls, ornamental lake, walking track and variety of community user groups. All set in established grounds and mature trees, there is further scope to beautify the Reserve with a new Community Centre and increase use with further development of walking track, mountain bike tracks in the old shingle pit area, fitness trails, etc.

Hororata is a proactive community and with events like the Highland Games, Balloon Night Glow and Auto Swap Meet draws a lot of people to the Selwyn region. A new community centre would help enhance our Reserve and reputation as a destination.

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) Support making it safer and attractive to exercise with development of walking and cycleways.

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. The submitter highlights importance of building this development to meet future demands. The intent is for this development to meet future needs.

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's support for the proposal to provide new community facility in Hororata is acknowledged. Staff agree with the view that these facilities help to create a sense of identity and enable rural communities to come together.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support

[100194] - Dr. Stuart Gowers

Address: 37 James Street Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 325 3222

Phone (mobile): 027642 6060

Email: slgowersnz@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)

OK

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

OK

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)

Funding options 1 and 2 are the same. Option 2 should be Zoned targeted rates as with the Aquatic Centre, which I would support.

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 chlorination - or it would have to be a very high risk. The proposal to UV treat all water is good, but then there should be no need for chlorination. Downstream of UV treatment all supplies should be made secure.

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)

OK

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)

OK

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?

4% annual increase compounding over 10 years is 48%, and with the projected rateable properties increase gives a mind boggling rates intake of 93% more than at present.

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. 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	Support for Community Grant Scheme noted.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Council's rates revenue is projected to increase from \$56 million in 18/19 to \$103 million in 27/28. This increase is a combination of inflation, growth in the rating base and increased levels of service. As indicated in the submission the combined increase is around 48% over 10 years. However, without these increases the Council would not be able to deliver improvements to the roading network, water quality and improved community facilities.

[100195] -Lincoln Netball Club Mrs Vanessa Robinson

Address: 610 Weedons Rd Christchurch 7678

Postal Address: 610 Weedons Rd, RD8 Christchurch

Phone (day): 0274445138

Phone (mobile): 0274445138

Email: vrobinson@waterforce.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 - just ensure the fee is reasonable for all
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) We require an Olympic size pool for our budding swimmers to train at - so I am all for extensions if it meets this requirement, which it does not - very disappointing
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 indoor, 4 undercover is not enough courts for the Selwyn Competition all to run on a Saturday, so I would also see another 4 outdoor courts need to be put into the mix with a potential cover being added at a later date. We need to keep this competition on 1 day due to the amount of volunteers required and combination of tasks of individuals wearing many hats on this given day - player/coach/umpire - if you break this mold there is potential to lose players to an already diminishing sport - We need to grow this and be 1 or we will not have enough volunteers to run it and become disjointed like Chch Netball Centre is. If you look at the number of courts Chch have, you are not looking ahead enough that this sport will grow, it could also become a hub for tennis in the summer if you put further courts in, including representative games. Courts need to be all purpose also and not asphalt. All rugby/soccer/hockey is played on a Saturday, don't make us go over multiple nights, it just won't work long term - 1 day of sport for families please. We are all time poor these days.
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 work for an Irrigation Company and would NOT like this to happen, continue with your UV upgrades and regular testing - please don't use chlorine in our water. Don't proceed with chlorination 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) We have a water race on our front boundary, but never access water from it, are you going to charge us for not using it? I'm a little confused on this one, happy to contribute to overall but your R&M on them is pretty lax to be honest, a lot of the sides are declining and are not safe for us mowing alongside them, we are already doing a lot by maintenance/spraying so case by case basis I would ask, some residents do nothing to maintain..
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) Very exciting to see
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) Happy to see this proceed

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

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? Lets get our roads sorted, it's a frustrating time when road works are happening on all main arteries leading to and from Christchurch, better planning needs to happen and more pressure needs to be put on getting this cracking, work 24/7 and get the job done please, I understand they are already 6 months behind, Council please put pressure on LTSA

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 is emphasized by submitter to meet needs of elite swimmers. 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 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 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

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments There will be a period of disruption to traffic on commuters routes while CSM2 is being built. Council is in ongoing contact with the NZTA on ensuring temporary

traffic measures are as effective as possible while still providing safety. The construction of CSM2 is not currently behind schedule.

[100196] - Mr Richard Friedman

Address: 616 Malvern Hills Road RD 1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: ignatz@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)

These should be funded by a targeted rate.

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

We don't use it. It is too far away. We object to paying for it

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)

These facilities are for the use of Rolleston residents and people living close to Rolleston not for all 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)

The Hartley's intake only infrequently has turbid water at the intake. We accept the management of this turbid water is either by a boil water notice, or an application of chlorine. We do not accept permanent treatment by chlorination to cover up operational deficiencies by the Council's contractor.

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)

We have a water race which we use begrudgingly because of the charges. We would like the water race closed and no charge to our property. The proposed increases in water race rates are higher than the rate of inflation. We can sink a well for stock water, operate it, service the capital for less than the annual charge and per hectare rate.

The public good component should be more.

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)

These should be built near the local school or domain to increase utilization.

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 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 This submission does not support paying for SAC development

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: 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: Staff agree with the submitter that these facilities should be located near a school or domain as this creates a community hub. In confirming sites for each facility various sites have or will be considered and all of these are either near a community facility or on recreation reserve.

[100197] - Mr Geoffrey Morris

Address: 2576 Homebush Road Glentunnel 7673

Postal Address: Glentunnel

Phone (day):

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)

Provided the district new rate is apportioned fairly to all ratepayers concerned and is done democratically.

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

Only to proceed from excess funds from the existing facility, justify, e.g. self-funding.

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 believe the scheme of chlorination should not proceed as it presents a new risk to both humans and stock alike.

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)

Should only apply to those who use the water race system for their operations.

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, I don't think this is a good idea as the minority stakeholders, especially those in remote areas will be overlooked, and thereby unfair.

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

All these proposals to proceed provided the community can provide a minimum of 1/3rd expected costs of the new facility, then voted on within Council and the communities concerned.

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)

Only to proceed if justified and funds also to come from self-funded finances, e.g. 1/3rd Government/Council funds with the balance from a long-term bank loan.

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 Submission proposes SAC development should only occur if self funded. This is not practical.

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: 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 Submission opposes the establishment of the Community Grants Fund on the basis that remote areas would be overlooked. Council can be assured that the principles underpinning the proposed Community Grant requires funding decisions to include ensuring district-wide coverage of funding.

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 contends that they should only proceed if a significant contribution is made by the locals and has the majority support of the community via a vote. Each facility has a funding plan based on a variety of sources depending on the funds available and applicable. The Hororata project is based on a significant community contribution (\$2 million).

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100198] -Lincoln University Student Association (LUSA) Mr James Ranstead

Address: Ellesmere Jct Rd, Lincoln 7647 Lincoln 7647

Postal Address: Ellesmere Jct Rd, Lincoln

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: president@lusa.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)

In support of this - mostly.

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

In support - demand for it. We need a deeper pool for sports, and for diving. Need some hot pools. It will be used by students.

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).

In support of this. It needs to be environmentally friendly. in support of the compromised cost - not Ashburton level, but better than a high school

Need a big sports hall - district should fund it. Provided that there is demand for this. Not too sure if the running track is necessary.

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 council should be budgeting money to protect well heads and reticulation.

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)

Like the cycling out in Tai Tapu. Not a lot of connection through to city. Need to fix Prebbleton to Christchurch. In support of bike attraction.

10. Chlorine: Lincoln University likes the idea of the assurance of water quality.

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

We want the council to capture more students to live in the district. Not in Riccarton. Can we have building restrictions for housing that may be denser lowering the flatting cost in Lincoln & Springston? Currently half of 2-4 year students live in CHCH around Canterbury University. Other solutions from a council down would be appreciated.

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 with emphasis on schools/student use and emphasizing benefit of deeper pools and hot pools.

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. Council has budget for source infrastructure upgrades and renewal. Below are additional 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 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: 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. Council staff note your concerns regarding the provision of housing within the district, particularly Lincoln and Springston, to cater for students and at a reduced cost, rather than students locating in Christchurch City. 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 as a matter 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.

[100199] - Linda Burgess

Address: Counter Delivery, Glentunnel Post Centre 14 Farr Street
7638

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

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)
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)

Yes I do have a comment to make - if animals won't drink the chlorination water, what makes you think we should (they seem to have more sense than humans) and long term may indeed affect our health. So a big 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)
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. Animals not drinking chlorinated water does not appear to be a problem on our currently chlorinated water supplies. 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.”

[100200] - Mr Henry Bluck

Address: 3 Victoria Street Glentunnel 7673

Postal Address: Glentunnel

Phone (day):

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)

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)

I oppose chlorination of the water supply based on the following information - "the hidden danger of chlorine in our water" - Andie Klein; and 'dangers of chlorine' - Jerry Smith

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.”

[100201] - Mrs Anne Bluck

Address: 3 Victoria Street Glentunnel 7673

Postal Address: RD1, Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: greg.bluck@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)

I oppose the chlorination of the water supply based on the following information:

'Dangers of Chlorine?' - Dr Andrew Weil; and US Council of Environmental Quality Medical College of Wisconsin, USA

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.”

[100202] - Mr Greg Bluck

Address: 3 Victoria Street Glentunnel 7673

Postal Address: RD 1, Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: greg.bluck@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)

I oppose the chlorination of the water supply based on the following from:

Dr Lane Wallace, US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA); and Medical College of Wisconsin, USA.

Instead of chlorine, how about UV filters at all the reservoirs?

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.”
