



SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Draft Long Term Plan

2018 - 2028

SUBMISSION BOOKLET THREE
Submissions 100203 - 100302



[100203] -Hyde Productions Mr Adam Hayward

Address: 97 Waltham Road Christchurch 8023

Postal Address: 97 Waltham Road Sydenham Christchurch 8023

Phone (day): 0212309029

Phone (mobile): 0212309029

Email: adam@hydeonline.com

Submission

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)

Hi, My name is Adam Hayward and for the last 17 years i have been working the dance and performance world. As part of this i have been focussing, in recent years more readily, on the desire to increase participation in physical activity amongst our community. There is an abundance of anecdotal evidence that sport and recreation and physical forms of arts activities benefit from close collaboration and i am currently trying to secure buy in to demonstrate this as empirical and create plans for the arts and sport and recreation sectors to collaborate in order to increase participation. One of the major achievements has been the inclusion in the Christchurch City Council's 'Metropolitan Sports Facility' of 750+ sqm of designated studio space for dance and circus. My submission to the Selwyn District Council LTP is to consider this ability to co-locate arts and sports facilities under the same roof when planning not only your indoor courts and sports hub but also any future building plans you may have for provision to the performing arts and sports and recreation sectors.

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

In addition to the above i think it is important that, with the growth in district forecast, facilities for the performing arts are considered more seriously. There is an opportunity to look at new methods of space provision in both temporary, transitional and permanent with co location and integration into other builds as examples. The district will need an arts space in the near future and at this time i do not see any evidence of this but i see the potential to develop the argument for what could and should be provided in the near future. again, this is something i feel is so important for the well being of a community, a space for creativity in partnership with other sectors.

i thanks you for consideration of this submission and look forward to speaking to it should the opportunity be available.

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

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The lack of such facilities is noted although the Rolleston College facilities could be an option.

At some point in the near future, the Rolleston Community Centre will be repurposed and it maybe more suitable to have performing arts located there

[100204] - Ms Jade Arnold

Address: 8 Taumutu Rd Southbridge 7602

Postal Address: 8 Taumutu Rd Southbridge

Phone (day): 021 022 54250

Phone (mobile): 021 022 54250

Email: jade.arnold@niwa.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)
The Selwyn Aquatic Centre is a fabulous facility that is of great benefit to many residents, groups and visitors. I wholeheartedly support plans for expansion. I would like to see this facility made more readily available for those with a tighter budget by not increasing entry fees. I would like to see more availability of lanes for lane swimmers. I would like to propose that you consider the idea of the formation of a group/club of registered and "qualified" swimmers who might be able to use the facility with minimum supervision during low usage hours when the pools are normally closed. Club members could self lifeguard in turns and reduce the staffing requirements. This arrangement would benefit people who find it difficult to get to the pool during normal hours (shift workers, evening swimmers), those who find it difficult to swim with noise/kids or high numbers of lane swimmers (sharing a lane).

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) Please include a squash court as well as tennis courts. Indoor netball and multipurpose courts would also be a good idea i think

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 support the chlorination of our water. Other treatment options are available including UV treatment. I think it is abhorrent to introduce a potential health risk (the adverse health effects of chlorination have not been thoroughly investigated) just to make more serious issues of pollution go away. This problem needs to be tackled at the source - the source of water contamination rather than covering up the problem. Our water is a precious resource and it should be carefully monitored, preserved, managed and investigated whenever there is a serious problem. Not dealt with lazily with means that will detriment future generations. Water is part of a system and needs to be considered as such. The addition of chlorine/hyperchlorite can not be considered without a great deal of research into the downstream effects on all species and systems that the system affects. I also think it is morally wrong to introduce blanket solutions that force citizens to pay to rectify on an individual level. Surely the sources of the problem should be the ones to be paying to fix what they have broken? and actually fix it - not just mask the problem with chlorine treatment. Many Selwyn people are passionate about water quality and don't want to see chlorine in our water system. This is because we recognize the importance, the fundamental need for great quality water and we recognize what it means to have it threatened. We must deal with the hard part of this problem and not take the easy road - despite cost and difficulty. I am sure you will find much support for this amongst the Selwyn community, perhaps even some willing hands to help.

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) More facilities in the smaller hubs would be appreciated

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 would like to see more cycleways made available to students so that cycling to school becomes a safe option. An example of this is Ellesmere college where students travel from Southbridge and Dunsandel to Leeston. This trip could be made by bicycle or running, if there were a safe option available. The narrow roads and fast traffic have always stopped me from promoting this option to my daughter. I think nurturing an interest in healthy options would be well served by investing in cycleways that apply to young people. I am sure the cycleways would be very much appreciated by other generations as well.

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 encourages Council not to increase fees and to consider allowing the pool to be used by a restricted group outside of public hours . Officers consider health and safety issues associated with this type of arrangement mean it is unlikely to be feasible.

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: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support. In addition to the Leeston - Doyleston Cycleway in 2018/19 the 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy and 20 year transport funding forecasts includes a \$813,000 cycleway between Leeston and Southbridge in 2031/32. A cycleway between Dunsandel and Doyleston would be 16km long with an estimated cost of \$2.4 million. At this length it is unlikely to appeal to students (or anybody else) to bike and overall would have a low use rate.

[100205] - Mr Colin Guild

Address: 508 High Peak Road R D 2 Darfield 7572

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 03 3186851

Phone (mobile): 0274387544

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) No
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) any cost with this should be NIL to ratepayers in outlining areas who do not use this Aquatic centre
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) Same as above
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) A waste of money.this huge building should have been correctly designed in the first place,make do with what you have got.
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: This road gets a high traffic volume and is in poor condition.Recent se-sealing is a start but is not wide enough and an eneven surface.It should be se-ealed entirely and widened.

Snowdon and High Peak roads:Poorly graded and lacking gravel after recent floods.Some ratepayers have to live and run their businesses on roads such as these and Coucil needs to recognise that we cannot support other expenditure whilst we have to live with this despite repeated complaints to Council and Tony Ward.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submitter proposes that ratepayers from outlying areas should not be rated for pool as submitter considers only Rolleston residents use the pool. Officers advise that pool utilization is not limited to Rolleston residents

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Roding - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Submitters concerns are acknowledged, and as referenced, Council roading staff have already been involved to provide any assistance as determined to be available and appropriate to address issues on Snowdon and High Peak roads which in the hill and high country are a challenge to maintain.

[100206] - Mr Ronald and Sandra de Vries

Address: 39 Liffey Springs Drive Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: 39 Liffey Springs Drive, Lincoln, Christchurch

Phone (day): 0226973540

Phone (mobile): 0226973540

Email: rsdv@snap.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)
We disagree with this proposal. At the time the aquatic centre was proposed there was discussion whether to build two facilities one in Rolleston and one at Lincoln University. The current combined population of the University and township here in Lincoln warrants a stand alone facility located at the Events centre that can be utilised by the schools, university and community and surrounding towns. It would be a fairer use of community funds rather than solely supporting Rolleston.

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

Lincoln has always been the sports HUB of Selwyn and brings a huge amount of benefit to local businesses. It would be unfair to relocate this to Rolleston when we have a new events centre and great sports HUB already here

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 support chlorination of unsecured water supplies - we wish to see the metered rate rolled out to all rural properties connected to a Council supply to better reflect the overall cost of supply. Secure water sources should not 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) Those that benefit from the water race should pay the full cost of maintaining and environmental impact including 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)

these cycle ways should not take away 'on street' park spaces for local businesses - otherwise we support this.

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

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

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

Staff Comments Submission proposes development of an aquatic centre in Lincoln instead of extending SAC. This had been considered previously and decision made to recommend SAC development, however Council is continuing to explore Lincoln aquatics facility with interested parties, as a private 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 in part for a risk based approach.

Below are comments from Council staff.

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

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

who made the following submission [100130] “If chlorine is introduced into the drinking water system in accordance with good industry practice, there is no evidence that it results in any adverse public health effects. In fact quite the opposite - the chances of the community being accidentally infected by water borne disease is dramatically reduced. The science and technology associated with chlorine as a water treatment method is well proven around the world and is generally regarded as good practice by the operators of public water supplies.” The below link provides some further information on this topic. <https://www.cancerwa.asn.au/resources/cancermyths/chlorine-cancer-myth/>

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

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support but cycleways shall not displace on street parking. This is a likely reference to the proposed cycleways on Gerald St relating to the adopted Lincoln Town Centre Master Plan. Council is working on a plan to provide off street public car parks to increase Lincolns parking capacity

[100207] -Gilmours Road residents Mr Grant Smith

Address: 133 Gilmours Road Christchurch 7672

Postal Address: Hollyford 133 Gilmours Road RD 2 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021 338 229

Email: smith.nz@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?

We wish to submit on the Seal extension programme.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Requests the inclusion of Gilmours Rd into the proposed seal extension programme. This request has been received a number of times in the past and declined. The Councils programme is only to address specific strategic network "missing link" seal extensions on high volume main routes or connections to assist in the movement of people and freight. Gilmours Road is a local road that doesn't fall into that category.

[100208] -Lincoln Envirotown Trust Dave Fitzjohn

Address: Lincoln University Lincoln 7647

Postal Address: c/- Department of Environmental Management, Room
718, Forbes Building, PO Box 85084, Lincoln University,
Lincoln, 7647

Phone (day): 03 423 0445

Phone (mobile):

Email: lincolnenvirotowntrust@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)

Lincoln Envirotown Trust supports the introduction of a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves. It is important that there are locally accessible well maintained facilities (both indoor and outdoor spaces) for the health of communities as places for people to connect and come together. Nearby outdoor areas are also important for people to get out to exercise or play team sports to help maintain wellbeing as well as providing the benefits of access to green spaces. We support the ideas that the district wide rating system as it relieves the burden on smaller communities for the upkeep and management of booking the facilities, allows for the upgrading of outdated facilities for more sustainable, cleaner, healthier buildings and yet allows local communities to still feel connected and involved in the facilities provided in their local area. We enjoy the use of a range of halls and community centres around the District for our events and initiatives and place a high value on them.

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

Lincoln Envirotown supports any initiative which encourages people to take exercise for wellbeing and to maintain community links and involvement. Also swimming is a vital skill for all ages. An extension to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre, which is already a first class facility, would enable more people to enjoy exercise, meet with others, and stay safe in the water. Selwyn Aquatic Centre is also a project which scores highly in our Responsible Business Awards because of the sustainable design of the “building” and the processes. We would expect that the same high standards are going to apply to the extensions. We are also particularly impressed with the idea of including a café as many sporting facilities have no “break out space” for people to meet in after their activities. We support this excellent plan unequivocally.

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

Lincoln Envirotown sees the benefit of sporting activity for our population, in terms of wellbeing and the community connections that it develops. This proposal of indoor sporting opportunities and varied activities will encourage more people to take up sport and be involved with community. It is to be fully supported and encouraged. Again we would hope that the building design would minimise power usage, water usage, and have efficient storm water and waste management as well as the landscaping incorporating the use of eco-sourced native plants. Hopefully the indoor mezzanine area would be designed and furnished to encourage people to meet and feel part of the indoor sports community. The district wide rate would be our suggested way of funding this 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)

Whilst it is clear that safe drinking water must not be compromised Lincoln Envirotown is concerned about the root cause of the requirement to keep extending chlorination. If the cause is that pollutants are getting into water that could and should be found at source then Lincoln Envirotown Trust would expect to see action taken to ascertain the cause and prevent the polluting elements in the first place. Chlorinating water to kill bacteria should be an emergency treatment only while the source of the bacterial contamination is found and dealt with. It is a sad state of affairs if New Zealand water requires more and more chlorination because we have been unable to keep it clean. Our position would be that chlorination goes ahead, but with the provision that studies are constantly undertaken to see how it might be reduced in the long run.

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)

Moving to a district wide rate will enable council to pass on regulations to landowner users. For instance fencing or riparian planting to improve or maintain water quality as the water is a community asset. Water races are to be valued for providing habitats for indigenous native species

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)

Charities spend a lot of time and energy on making funding applications. Lincoln Envirotown supports any change in process which makes this more streamlined and understandable. This proposal certainly seems aimed at less duplicity of fund types and subsequently more straight forward processes. This should be good for charitable bodies as it will enable them to devote more energy to the actual achievement of their goals.

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

Lincoln Envirotown's aims have always been sustainable activity and community resilience. Development of new community facilities in smaller towns shows a true sense of whole area connection by the Selwyn District Council. These facilities enable smaller communities to enjoy communal activities close to home and therefore increase access to their own community and feel an identity with 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)

Lincoln Envirotown would note that the actual council building included many features to render it more sustainable in terms of minimising power use etc. We hope that these aims apply to any future extensions of these offices.

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

Selwyn District Council are to be congratulated on persisting with ambitious plans for cycle ways and walk ways. Lincoln Envirotown whole-heartedly supports this approach for many reasons.

Giving people a safe way to walk or cycle around Selwyn encourages our population to get outdoors, to exercise, and to become less car dependent. These cycle ways connect various centres and will hopefully eventuate in workers and school children using them to attend their places of work. Encouraging people to walk and cycle more also decreases the use of motor vehicles reducing our impact on climate change.

However we do have reservations about the longer routes taking a large budget at the expense of smaller projects which might enable people to move around their own communities. For example pupils attending Primary Schools having to go by car for lack of safe walkways and cycle paths. We note that some of these issues are addressed in another part of this report and hope that council is constantly looking at ways to improve cycling and walking mobility in all aspects.

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

Lincoln Envirotown would like to express their very strong support for the “Reconnect” project outlined on page 34. In fact we are disappointed that this does not feature as one of the main projects inviting comment from the public, even though it is listed as a future project. Waste Management has become a major problem throughout the world as the realisation that landfills are not infinite, and that substances such as plastic, disposed of years ago are starting to have a huge impact upon our environment and will ultimately affect our living standards. This “Reconnect” project with its emphasis on reprocessing and repurposing, marks an ambitious but timely project that may become a prototype followed by other councils. We feel that Selwyn District Council should be publicising their commitment in this respect from the outset, so as to maintain the momentum of awareness of this as an essential project and a vitally important issue.

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 encourages continuation of sustainability consideration in new redevelopment and noes community wellbeing and health benefits.

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 thank you for your support for this proposal and your additional comments on protecting source water. Below are comments from Council staff.

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

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

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

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments 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 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: 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 generally correct that the longer off road cycleways can be expensive compared to use however this has to be balanced against providing people a safe and healthier transport alternative who would not normally consider it if

having to ride on the road. These types of projects aligns with the Governments transport and funding priorities. Council also has included in the 2018 LTP a \$400,000 per year discretionary township footpath extension programme so it is considered an appropriate balance has been achieved

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Waste Management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Section 10 - Solid Waste - Reconnect Project. Thank you for your submission supporting this project. We take on board your comments regarding publicity.

[100209] - Mr Blair Homwood

Address: 1568 Leaches Rd, Rd 2 Darfield 7572

Postal Address: 1568 Leaches Rd Rd 2 Darfield

Phone (day): 033186961

Phone (mobile): 0211686436

Email: theholmwoods@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)yes
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)yes
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)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)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? yes Roothing

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

no details provided by the submitter(?)

[100210] - Mrs Sharon Blackburn

Address: 61 Maffeys Road Hororata 7572

Postal Address: 61 Maffeys Road Hororata RD 2, Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0275511021

Email: sharon@cartergroup.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 a 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) I support proceeding with the extensions to the Aquatic Centre. It is already to small for the communities requirements.
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 Comment
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 would prefer for our water to remain unchlorinated.
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)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) We support a new Community facility at Hororata. The community currently has no suitable place to gather indoors, especially with the loss of the Church. The current facility is old and in disrepair and does not meet the needs of the community.
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 extension of the Selwyn Aquatics Centre is noted.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission thank you for your support for this proposal and your additional comments on protecting source water. Below are comments from Council staff.

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

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

Risk of Cancer

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

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

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

Topic: 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.

[100211] -Te Ara Kakariki Ms Lou Drage

Address: 322 McQueens Valley Road Christchurch 7672

Postal Address: 322 McQueens Valley Road RD2 Ataahua Christchurch

Phone (day): 033297226

Phone (mobile): 0272941921

Email: hiddenvalleyfarm@xtra.co.nz

Submission

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)

Through the contestable scheme I would like to see increasing support for NZ biodiversity protection and restoration in the Selwyn District.

I would like to see the formation of a formal biodiversity group to identify opportunities for habitat protection and restoration.

I would like to see increased capacity for staffing as presently there is only one Biodiversity Coordinator role funded within SDC.

In our new parks and reserves I would like large areas set aside for native biodiversity restoration and education.

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support for Community Grants Funding is noted. Submitter proposes greater emphasis on biodiversity protection and restoration in the Selwyn District. It is also noted other submitters proposed "Environmental" Funding sit aside from Community Grants Scheme at this time. Further consideration on pros and cons of both suggestions will occur

[100212] - Mr David Deakins

Address: 27 Waterholes Road, Springston Christchurch 7674

Postal Address: 7674

Phone (day): 21565339

Phone (mobile): 021565339

Email: ddeakins@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)

This is my submission against the introduction of chlorine to the Selwyn water supply We all knew and were told years ago by scientists that the level of dairy farming across the Selwyn district would pollute not only rivers but the aquifers. So, it happened,we're here Instead of looking at the cause and treating the water with respect We pour chemicals in, pathetic Note my extreme anger at this situation As supposed guardians of the district a very very poor performance from council to say the least I say no to chlorination, fix the issue causing the high levels of bacteria

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.”

[100213] -Private person Mr Cleve Prescott

Address: 37 Stonebrook Drive Rolleston 7614 7614

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 033471325

Phone (mobile):

Email: cprescott@snap.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?

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. Submitter proposes a 50 metre pool as the solution to meeting the demands going forward. Further the submitter suggests that if the Council is intending to give money for the Metro Centre in ChCh the additional money held for this purpose could be redirected to this SAC development. 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. Officers advise that current plans are considering future demands and note there are various options to more cost effectively future proof SAC

[100214] - Mrs Cindy Driscoll

Address: 1 Everett Street Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: RD1 Coalgate

Phone (day): 021366606

Phone (mobile):

Email: cindy@hororata.org.nz

Submission

7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton?

I am making this submission as an event professional working and living in the Selwyn District. This is a personal submission, it not on behalf of the Hororata Community Trust.

Community Centres play a major role in fostering the concept of community. Community Centres give people the opportunity to be connected to where they live. Community Centres enable people to congregate providing a hub for cultural experiences and sporting activities.

The rural communities nestled in the Selwyn foothills are filled with passionate and dedicated people who give up their time to run some of the best events in the district. The Hororata Domain is a wonderful venue for large and small events. There are four annual events held on the Domain – Hororata Pig and Possum Hunt, Hororata Swap Meet, Hororata Parish Spring Fair and the Hororata Highland Games. These events are part of the fabric of the community and make the area a great place to live and visit. The recent inaugural Hororata Night Glow was also a huge success, proving yet again what our communities can achieve and just how well the Domain is positioned for large events. The Hororata Domain also hosts a number of smaller events including equestrian competitions with one of the best cross-country facilities in Selwyn and it has been the hub for the Heritage of Hororata and Beyond events for the past three years.

The existing Hororata Hall does not compliment the growing list of events being held on the Hororata Domain, because of its location across a busy road, lack of parking and generally its state of disrepair. The Hall is also not big enough to be useful to these events. The Hororata Highland Games hosts the biggest one day Highland Dancing competition in New Zealand. The existing Hall is the wet weather back up for this competition; it is not big enough to house all the competitors and their supporters.

I support the proposed new Hororata Community Centre being developed on the Hororata Domain. Hororata is fast becoming an event hub for the Selwyn District. A multipurpose Community Centre on the Hororata Domain will not only support existing events but also allow them to grow and develop. The proposed Hororata Community Centre will bring opportunities for new events, both large and small, providing access to more cultural experiences for people living in the rural communities of the Selwyn District.

The new Hororata Community Centre would also provide a hub for community groups to hold meetings. Being involved in organising community meetings, large and small, I am constantly confronted with the challenge of finding a suitable meeting space within the area.

The Hororata Highland Games and Hororata Night Glow prove what the neighboring communities of Hororata, Coalgate, Glentunnel, Whitecliffs, Glenroy, Windwhistle and Lake Coleridge can do when they work together. These events may carry the name 'Hororata' but they would not be possible without all of the communities' involvement. I have no doubt the community has the ability to achieve the fundraising targets required for the new Hororata Community Centre.

The prospect of growing existing events and opportunities for new ones in our community is exciting. These events will contribute to the viability of the Hororata Community Centre.

I sincerely hope that the Councillor's vote in favour of the Hororata Community Centre and look to the future with what this facility will provide for the entire Selwyn District.

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 and that the proposed facility on the domain will create an opportunity for multiple uses.

[100215] - Mr Mike Bowie

Address: 4 Roblyn Place Lincoln 7647

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 4230734

Phone (mobile): 0274326564

Email: mike.bowie@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)
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)

Our water resources should never have been left to get as bad as it has to be in a situation where we have to chlorinate our drinking water. As a ratepayer I feel the rural landowners need to be accountable for restoring our water quality and any cost associated with this.

5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25)
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)

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

We need the cycle lane down the main street (Gerald St) of Lincoln ASAP, before someone dies. It is extremely dangerous having cars parked on left while cyclists have to share the road with large trucks, tractors and other vehicles.

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

It is fantastic to see SDC supporting the restoration of Mahoe Reserve, Reids Pit, Liffey Domain and Tārerekautuku Yarrs Lagoon Reserve. The Canterbury Plains is one the the worst affected in terms of native habitat loss (<0.5% of original vegetation remaining) at yet dryland remnants, small as they may be are still being destroyed. Those that remain e.g. Bankside Scientific Reserve are very small & are in very poor state (and deteriorating) due to the ongoing water and agricultural nutrients flowing into them. These remnants once had high native diversity which is being overrun by exotic grasses and weeds being feed by the nutrients. We need to protect these small, fragile and precious areas better than we

currently do by expanding and planting buffers around them. One example is Tārerekautuku Yarrs Lagoon Reserve which has special significance with historic cultural values, but also very high biodiversity values than could be considerably enhanced through restoration. We have lost many bird, lizard and invertebrate species in Selwyn but with strategic plantings along waterways, roads and both public and private land we can create a spine or stepping stone plantings to bring birds such as bellbirds, kereru, tui back to our plains where they once were in abundance. The council support to Te Ara Kakariki (TAK) is invaluable to this cause as we slowly try to resurrect some of our native communities and the ecosystem functions that they provide to our wellbeing.

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 There are already marked cycle lanes on Gerald St on the western end towards the University. A flush median along Gerald St allows passing traffic to move over if necessary. The upgrade of Gerald St in the adopted Lincoln Town Centre Masterplan will create dedicated separate cycle lanes along the full length of Gerald St starting in 2023/24

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Selwyn District Council is committed to providing ongoing support to the native biodiversity restoration projects at Council reserves such as Mahoe, Tārerekautuku Yarrs lagoon and the Liffey Domain. It is important that these reserves and others, such as the Department of Conservation Banksie Reserve, are monitored and managed relative to the threats that they face – including from nutrient flows and weed species.

The Council recognises that native habitat loss has been considerable over the Canterbury plains 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 will continue to support Te Ara Kakariki and recognises the important work that the Trust does in helping to create suitable habitat for our native flora and fauna, including invertebrate species and moths.

[100216] - Mrs Joanne Southen

Address: 858 Selwyn Rd, RD8 Rolleston 7678

Postal Address: 858 Selwyn Rd RD8

Phone (day): 0212444489

Phone (mobile):

Email: jo@fostercommercial.co.nz

Submission

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

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
I think the current 25 meter pool should be extended to a 50m pool by adding another 28m as I understand have a wall system installed with it which takes up 3m. This would achieve the need by some for a 50m pool and 2 x 25m pools when the 50m isnt 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) Fully support, great facility for the district

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

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

No

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

No

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

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

No

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

No

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? I think a cemetery is needed in Rolleston, there is limited space available at the current cemetery's in Selwyn and this urgently needs to be addressed

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. Submitter proposes a 50 metre pool as the solution to meeting the demands going forward. 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. Officers advise that current plans are considering future demands and note there are various options to more cost effectively future proof SAC.

Topic: 3. Foster Park sports hub - 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 No comments made.

[100217] - Mr Richard Lang

Address: 63 Clifton Terrace Christchurch 8081

Postal Address: 63 Clifton Terrace Sumner Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 379 2430

Phone (mobile): 021 226 3041

Email: richard.lang@duncancotterill.com

Submission

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

I support the proposal. With increasing mobility, reserves and community facilities throughout the district are increasingly available to and used by all ratepayers within the district.

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

I am fully supportive of the proposal to develop a new community centre in Hororata to replace the Hororata Hall, and particularly one located in the Hororata Reserve. I am not a resident or ratepayer within the Selwyn District, however I am the Chairperson of the Hororata Community Trust and as such I have been involved with the local community over recent years and have an interest in the proposal. Through that work I have seen the groundswell of community energy and support (not just in Hororata but also within surrounding districts such as Coalgate, Windwhistle, Glentunnel, Glenroy etc) for a 21st century public community centre in Hororata that is fit for purpose, and I know that that community will enthusiastically support the community centre. I believe that Hororata's relatively central location and the fact that the Hororata Reserve already has momentum as the centre of a number of major events such as the Hororata Highland Games and Hororata Night Glow will mean that such a community centre will be used and enjoyed by a range of people throughout the District. Ideally, the timing of the construction of the community centre would be earlier than that proposed, subject to availability of funding.

I do not have any comments in relation to any of the other proposals in the draft Long Term Plan.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

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 there is a high level of support within the local community for this project and the existing events will help with its feasibility.

[100218] -Springston Community Committee Dr. Rupert Tipples

Address: 399 Ellesmere Junction Road Springston 7616

Postal Address: 399 Ellesmere Junction Road Springston

Phone (day): 03 3295634

Phone (mobile): 0210 072 3127

Email: tipples49@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)

We are concerned that the introduction of district wide rates will kill the voluntary efforts which have been the mainstay of all Springston Committees (Community, Reserve, and Hall). Has the Council thought or budgeted for the replacement of these voluntary efforts by paid Council staff? These council staff will not have the background knowledge of contributing voluntary committee members. What incentives will there be to encourage such volunteers to continue when all the critical decisions will be made by a huge anonymous bureaucratic Council?

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: Funding requests - Corporate

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

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	Springston Toilets and Library Reserve: The Springston Community Committee wish to see the toilets project brought forward from 2024/25 to 2019/20. The timing is based on a priority assessment undertaken for the public toilets programme based on a number of factors. If Council wished to bring this forward it may be at the expense of another project or would have an impact on rates. If TIF funds are secured for the Dunsandel Toilets project Council may wish to reconsider priorities. The committee have requested an additional budget (\$16,000) for the Library reserve landscape work. Staff have been assisting the committee with this project and support it. This could potentially be part funded from Springs Ward reserve development contributions (being development of a new reserve area which is partly required for growth). This would reduce the rate impact.

[100219] - Mr Graeme Woodward

Address: 8/27 Darvel St, Riccarton Christchurch 8011

Postal Address: 8/27 Darvel St, Riccarton

Phone (day): 0272 952 855

Phone (mobile): 0272 952 855

Email: graemew@ieee.org

Submission

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

Very supportive of improved and expanded swimming facilities in the greater Christchurch area. Existing facilities can get very busy, supporting both recreational/family users and athletes using the facilities for training.

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)

Support chlorination of water based upon risk-assessment.

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

I'm excited by the potential to develop a new walking/running cycling route onto Summit Rd along the Port Hills. 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, run and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road. Alternatively, a similar and slightly longer loop using Worseley's Rd and/or Christchurch Adventure Park. It would also provide an alternate route for mountain bikers to access the Living Springs mountain bike trail network (Allendale), by dropping in off Summit Rd once climbing up Burkes Bush Track.

Cycle routes could be encouraged incorporating the existing off-road trail between Rolleston and Lincoln. Further development of this through to Tai Tapu would be a big positive.

The Port Hills are a very important environmental asset to the greater Christchurch area, including Selwyn District. 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 network 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: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does

provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. "Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A "source to tap" regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer's tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents." "Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill." This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] "A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant."

Topic: 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.

[100220] -Canterbury Grasslands Ltd Ms Sarah-jane Doody

Address: 1982 Rakaia Terrace Rd, Hororata 7572

Postal Address: 1982 Rakaia Terrace Rd, RD 2 Hororata 7572

Phone (day): 033186979

Phone (mobile): 021536683

Email: office@grasslands.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)
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)

As a large employer in the Hororata area, we employ approximately 50 staff with almost 80 people living on farm, we fully support new community facilities being developed in Hororata. We feel that it is especially import for our immigrant staff to be able to have a place in the district that they are able to meet.

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 a new community facility in Hororata is acknowledged.

[100221] - Mr Rhys Galt

Address: 3 Bridge Street Southbridge 7602

Postal Address: 3 Bridge Street Southbridge 7602

Phone (day): 027 478 3359

Phone (mobile): 027 478 3359

Email: rhys@galtglobal.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) Yes. Good idea.
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) Yes. Good idea. The Aquatic Centre is a great 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) Yes. Any facility for community use is great.
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. Very bad idea. I - along with when I last looked, 82% of respondents, do not want chlorination of our water supplies. All obviously feel the negatives of chlorination far outweigh the positives. Our water (Southbridge) is very clean & fresh and I/we would rather risk the minimal chance of contamination, and put up with boiling, or buy a filter than have smelly, foul tasting water. There are many negative long term effects on health - such as weakened immune system and increased risk of cancer - and it's worse for Asthma and Eczema sufferers. UV treatment is great and harmless. And probably cheaper. Please, please listen to the people. We do not want Chlorine in our water. We do not want to drink swimming pool water. We do not want to be poisoned, and pay for it. Thank you.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor court facility is acknowledged. The needs analysis for the project supports the submission comments.

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.”

[100222] -Kirwee Community Committee Mrs Ngaire Kent

Address: C/o 1315 Courtenay Road Kirwee 7543

Postal Address: P O Box 67 Kirwee

Phone (day): 03 3181385

Phone (mobile): 0272334609

Email: Kirwee.cc@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)

The Kirwee Township Committee has concerns over a district-wide rate for community centres, halls and for reserves, in that the projected rate starting at \$100 per rate paying dwelling equals some \$60,000, when the Kirwee Hall is not a council owned facility on private land. It was built by the community for the community and is managed by a committee from the community, and as such receives no support from SDC apart from the insurance on the building. Therefore there is no benefit for the ratepayers of Kirwee to pay this projected rate of \$100.00, and these ratepayers funds will be going outside the community where they should be directed to the benefit of the community hall. What advantage is there for Kirwee Community Hall committee by having a 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)

It appears there is little benefit to the residents of Kirwee from this proposal. Clearly the majority of the users will be based in the Rolleston area and as such should they not pay the levy for this facility as being the prime users.

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 there appears to little value to Kirwee residents with this project and again primarily the users will be drawn from the immediate Rolleston area. As such this should be come a user pays facility. Kirwee already has facilities for tennis, netball, rugby, cricket and bowls.

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 Kirwee Township at their last meeting held on 16 April moved that it strenuously opposed the chlorination in Kirwee water supply until such time it has been proven that it is a health necessity.

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)

The primary issue here is that non-users will be charged for something that they do not use or have access to.

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)

This is a positive suggestion.

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

This is a positive development for those areas, however the local communities must support and fund the development from within their own area and not seek funding and support from other districts, who already have their own facilities to fund.

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)

Is this required, are funds available and where are they going to come from? Has sufficient background work been done on this project to warrant this extension.

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

This has the possibility of being a great asset to the future growth and tourism within the Selwyn District.

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

The Kirwee Community committee made submissions in 2017 for the widening of Courtenay Road south from the railway line to the Field Days site. This was to avoid substantial damage to grass verges outside the residential properties in this area. The Field Days have now become a major national event adding a great emphasis to Kirwee. The next Field Days are being held in March 2019 and despite our request over 12 months ago nothing has been reported back on this submission. Is it possible to have something done before this next event.

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: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission proposes that residents who do not live in Rolleston should not pay for the SAC development. Officers note that the pool is used by residents outside of Rolleston.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submission is neutral with regard to support but stresses the view that the facility should be user pays. The proposed Indoor Court facility operational costs will be funded in part from user charges (as per the current aquatics centre). If the user charges were to be applied to the capital cost of the facility as well the cost would be pushed beyond the capacity of the user groups to pay. The submission also points out that the local community of Kirwee already has sports facilities but as shown in the needs analysis for this facility there is a distinct lack of Indoor sport and community space throughout Selwyn and this facility would act as a regional one able to be accessed from community and sports groups and individuals from across the region. The current Selwyn Aquatics facility acts in a very similar way with smaller pools at local level available supplemented by a major regional facility.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] makes the following comment. "We acknowledge that Selwyn District Council recognises the relationship between water and public health and is prioritising upgrades in this area. The CDHB supports the proposals to add UV and chlorination treatment to all drinking water supplies. While the CDHB supports Option 2 to chlorinate all supplies, we accept that this could be introduced in a phased approach with a risk assessment tool used to prioritise the inclusion of supplies over time." This approach is supported by staff. The Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] also supports the specific addition of chlorination for the Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. "The CDHB supports the chlorination of Hartley's Road (Malvern Hills) and Sheffield Waddington water supplies. These supplies have extensive reticulation networks and on site storage. Both these aspects make it more challenging to ensure drinking water reaches the consumer without contamination from pipe breaks, backflow, or compromised onsite storage tanks. Selwyn District Council must ensure water reaches the consumer which is safe to drink. The Sheffield Waddington supply, in particular, has had a number of E coli transgressions over the years." Chlorine Taste The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment in relation to taste. "A number of submitters noted that some communities were opposed to treatment, particularly chlorination which is perceived to produce adverse taste and odour effects. On this question, the Inquiry has concluded that, as Dr Hrudehy has repeatedly emphasised, there is no compelling or credible evidence that chlorination poses any risks to consumers. By contrast, the "natural" pathogens found in drinking water undoubtedly pose significant risks to human health. As to taste and odour concerns, several experts stated that this perception arises because consumers of untreated water often only experience a chlorinated supply when contamination has recently occurred and consequently the system is dosed at a much higher level than usual; there is organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight)." Risk of Cancer The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following comment on the link between chlorine, toxic compounds and some forms of cancer. "During the course of the Inquiry there have been statements made in the press that disinfection using chlorine results in the formation of toxic compounds such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids which have been linked to some forms of cancer. The Inquiry has sought advice on this matter and is satisfied that with groundwater sources the formation of these compounds is likely to be at an

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

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

the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support 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 submitter supports the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton subject to them being locally funded. Council will make a decision on the funding

approach for these facilities in consideration of feedback on the District-wide rate proposal.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support, and presumably specifically relating to the Darfield to Kirwee cycleway

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

[100223] - Mr Kevin Ban

Address: 57 Stonebridge Way, Prebbleton Christchurch 7604

Postal Address: 57 Stonebridge Way, Prebbleton, Christchurch

Phone (day): 021869663

Phone (mobile): 021869663

Email: kevinban1@gmail.com

Submission

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Staff are supportive of this proposal. Pump tracks are increasingly becoming a popular recreational option for young people and are featuring in the future plans of many communities across the country. A budget for a youth facility in Prebbleton in 2020-21 is contained in the LTP and a project of this nature would fit the brief.

[100224] -Glentunnel Museum Inc Mr Tony Airs

Address: PO Box 23 Glentunnel 7646

Postal Address: PO Box 23 Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: ajairs@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)

Agree with the concept of a district wide rate. See it as a way for smaller rate-based communities to gain quality infrastructure such as halls.

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)

Any sporting facility is good for our district. But don't feel that we are in a position to say yes or no owing to our distance from the 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)

Yes, under emergency situations or 'risk'.

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)

There is a case to maintain and preserve some strategic water races for environmental and aesthetic reasons, plus fire control. But more communication between the Council and community is needed. And strategic water races need to be identified.

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)

"Would be very good." Community volunteers would find it much better and easier I suspect applying to the Council or committee for funding. Volunteers are getting hard to find.

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

We would like to see smaller communities obtain modern and purpose-built facilities. See the district-wide rate enabling 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)

Provided that the cost or the extension is reasonable, and the need is to house extra staff, then 'agree'.

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

Is any progress possible with the walkway at the end of Philip Street, Glentunnel - which leads to the tunnel and mining remnants? Would like to see this progressed. Constantly asking why walkway is unused. Surely there is a compromise.

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

The Glentunnel Museum is housed within the Historic former lodge building - now owned by Selwyn District Council, and one of the few remaining early buildings in Glentunnel. Funding is required to preserve the building to a high standard. It requires some external maintenance - repairs and painting to the weatherboards, roof spouting and downpipes.

Plus internal shelving and cabinets to preserve our museum artefacts. Perhaps the contestable fund may help here?

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 Support for sporting facilities is acknowledged. The issue of distance from this facility is also acknowledged although a major regional facility of this nature has potential benefits across the whole of Selwyn for both community and sporting groups (similar to the Aquatics Centre).

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support 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 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 Consultation with Glentunnel Township Committee for the draft 2018 Walk Cycle Action Plan had not raised this previously. As a recreational walk, that is also little used beyond the township boundary, it does not fall into the scope of the discretionarily township footpath extension funding. All the agreed footpath construction work for Glentunnel will be completed in 2017/18

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

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 Glentunnel Museum Maintenance: A budget for "Heritage" buildings in the Property cost centre is provided that is used for maintaining the various small heritage buildings owned by Council. Each building has a maintenance plan which includes painting and general maintenance and painting and other work is planned at Glentunnel Museum in 2018/19.

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Glentunnel Walkway: The walk way has been closed because of land ownership and perceived safety issues. It traverses land in private ownership and local community representatives have been exploring ways to solve the current issue with landowners.

[100225] -Prebbleton Reserve Management Committee Dr. Steve Thomas

Address: 12 Stonebridge Way Prebbleton 7604

Postal Address: 12 Stonebridge Way Prebbleton

Phone (day): 0272682128

Phone (mobile): 0272682128

Email: prebbleton.rmc@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)

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)

We support the development of these facilities.

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

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?

The Prebbleton Reserve Management Committee would like to install 3 stainless steel drinking fountains and water reticulation for public use around the Prebbleton Domain. The approximate cost would be \$12000. There have been a number of public requests for water provision in the Domain. The committee recognise the need, and have been investigating various options but need to have project in the LTP.

We also support the proposal (Mr Kevin Ban) for a pump track in Prebbleton to fill a increasing need for youth activities, not being fulfilled through team sports or other activities in the township. We submit that appropriate funding is provided for feasibility, design and construction. Mr Ban has figures of costs.

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: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

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

Staff Comments Prebbleton Domain Drinking Fountains: The committee wish to provide drinking fountains to service the domain. Staff agree that this is worthwhile initiative. This could be funded from part of the funds unused in the current year for development of the extension (which has been planned to start later).

Prebbleton Pump Track: Staff are supportive of this project subject to a suitable site being determined. Provision has already been made in the draft LTP for further youth/community park facilities in Prebbleton in 2020/21 and this project would fit with that brief.

[100226] -Cass Holdingss Mr Graham Cargill

Address: 29 Cass Settlement road Cass 8041

Postal Address: 23b Westmont Street Ilam Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 3582129

Phone (mobile): 02102776741

Email: gandycargill@xtra.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) Yes. The proposal would increase our rates at Cass by 48% overnight and rising significantly in future years. This information is support by an email from the Selwyn District Council after a request for actual rates information based on the proposed changes. (See attachment.)The nearest community halls located in the villages of Castle Hill or Arthurs Pass are over 25 kms away and we have not used or paid for these community halls before and we don't see why we should start paying for these halls now.

There are no nearby Reserves that the Selwyn Council maintains (nearest one would again be Castle Hill or Arthurs Pass) We maintain our own private green spaces at our expense. We are on rural land and we do not see why we should be paying for services provided to other towns and villages in the Selwyn District.

We oppose the change that will see Ratepayers that do not currently pay for Community halls and Reserves, pay for Reserves and Halls and get no benefit from them due the excessive distance from their dwellings.

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

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) Yes. The proposal would further increase our rates by 15%. The sports courts are located 108 kms from our dwelling and we should not be paying for facilities that are impractical to use. A two and a half hour return trip to a sports hub is just not practical. We support Option 3. Targeted rate paid by Rolleston ratepayers

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

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

Yes. We should not have to pay for water races we receive no benefit from. Stop the cross subsidy.

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 Funding issues only. Refer to answers for Question 1. 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?

Yes We strongly oppose the issues above that would permanently increase our rates by over 65% over 2 years.

The services and facilities would be impractical for us to use which we receive no benefit from and have never paid rates for before.

The proposed changes would make us face our biggest rate increase in the history of the property for no benefit to us whatsoever. Everybody quotes user pays.

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 development of the Indoor Court facility at Foster Park primarily because of the issues of distance (away from the facility) and cost. These issues are acknowledged and will be discussed as part of the LTP decision-making process around District wide rating for community centres and reserves.

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	Not clear of the position expressed in submission but refers to answer to question 1 which opposes rates increase impact, so suggest submission opposes the Community Grants Scheme due to cost

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The Council's proposal is to set a uniform rate on all properties accross the District. As this property currently does not pay a community centre or reserve rate, the impact of the proposal on the rates payable for the submitter is substantial. The alternative approach is to design a rating system with Zones or exemptions. This would substantially complicate the rates system. The Council's aim has been to develop a simple system.

[100227] -Hororata Community Trust Mr Richard Lang

Address: Duncan Cotterill Plaza 148 Victoria Street Christchurch
8140

Postal Address: PO Box 5 Christchurch

Phone (day): 64 3 379 2430

Phone (mobile):

Email: richard.lang@duncancotterill.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)

The Hororata Community Trust (HCT) fully endorses and supports the Council and the local community in its desire to build a new community Centre in the Hororata Reserve. Having provided resources and fully funding the initial feasibility study and investigation into the Community Centre, which has been previously submitted to council, the HCT is fully committed to the completion of this project, with the appropriate council support.

This project receives strength from the wider Hororata Community including Windwhistle Glentunnel, Glenroy, Coalgate, Lake Coleridge and Te Pirita; which is an active and diverse rural community and has united behind this project. The HCT is an active and supportive member of Go Hororata and has over the years conducted multiple community meeting and public consultations around the community centre and community support for this project.

The HCT believes domiciling the community centre in the Hororata Reserve is appropriate given other current infrastructure that resides in the Reserve. The HCT would support the council enabling the sale of the current hall land and reduce the capital burden of this project by allocating the sale funds to the new build.

Hororata is a unique district and continuously demonstrates its initiative and abilities through world class events that put Hororata and Selwyn on the map, such as the Hororata Highland Games and Hororata Night Glow; each attracting in excess of 10,000 participants. A community facility in the Reserve will only enhance the ability to deliver exceptional events big or small for all, as it allows all community groups access to modern fit for purpose facilities not currently provided in the existing Hororata Hall. Given the momentum and place that Hororata now has in terms of events within the Selwyn District which attract people both from across and beyond the district, Hororata is absolutely the right place for a modern community centre which will be used and enjoyed by a wide variety of people from all around the district.

The HCT pledges its support to this project and will assist both Go Hororata and the Council to lead the community fundraising necessary for this project and the further development of the plans for the use of the facility once completed.

The HCT also submits that the current timeframe for the potential funding of this development by council is problematic as the requirements of the community are more urgent than this given the continuing negative impact to Hororata from the damage to infrastructure from the September 2010 earthquakes. The HCT would like to see the timeframe for the development of this new community centre brought forward, and the HCT would be happy to work with the Selwyn District Council to achieve this.

The Hororata Community Trust urges the council to give due consideration to this submission.

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 HTC provides support for this project which is acknowledged. They also wish to bring forward the Hororata Community Facility development and offer to work with Council to see how this could be achieved. 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).

[100228] -ESSS PG Mr Robin Schulz

Address: 2 Foster Street Christchurch 8440 8440

Postal Address: P.O.Box 8394 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0274321844

Email: robin@nimbusgroup.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 ESSS PG submit that the expenditure of \$27,798,317 on the ESSS over the period from 2018 and 2028 with a consequential DC cost of \$5,244 has not been assessed in terms of the provision of the Local Government Act nor taken into account the existing asset and prior charges paid for that existing asset.

Topic: ESSS - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Development Contribution for the Eastern Selwyn Sewerage Scheme has been calculated in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002. It takes into account the capital expenditure and Development Contribution revenue to 30 June 2017 and the estimated capital expenditure and Development Contribution revenue for the remaining capacity life of the scheme.

[100229] - Mr Thomson

Address: 50 Selwyn Lake Rd Leeston 7683

Postal Address: 50 Selwyn Lake Rd RD3 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

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

I don't want rates to go towards a \$500 million Christchurch stadium.

On average I've been to an outdoor stadium once every 4 and a half years. They have little impact on my life. Housing has a far greater impact on me. Other things that matter are the CCC's continued ownership of City Care as I don't see why people should have to pay more than necessary for something core to day to day life of the city.

When evaluating whether I want to move to a place things I tend to think about are housing, transport, and facilities that allow me to develop my interests; something that has very little relevance is the quality of venue for elite sports matches. If I really wanted to go to an event that is not happy to play at the current stadium, then I would be fine with travelling to Dunedin.

If there is a new stadium I don't see why it should have a roof, sure design it so it could have one in the future if a need appears (other than a freak one-off hailstorm), but why waste the money now. I also don't see why we should add another stadium to the mix to compete with other loss-making stadiums.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

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

[100230] -West Melton Rugby Football Club Mr Philip Caunter

Address: West Melton Road RD6 West Melton 7676

Postal Address: PO Box 23-111 Templeton Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 347 4965

Phone (mobile): 021 350531

Email: website@westmeltonrugbyclub.co.nz

Submission

DEVELOPMENT OF THE WEST MELTON RUGBY FOOTBALL CLUB TRAINING FACILITY

The West Melton Rugby Football Club (WMRFC) welcome the opportunity to submit a proposal as part of the Selwyn District Council Long Term Planning review. WMRFC are seeking support and funding to further develop our training facilities by incorporating the current West Melton Scout Den / Council Meeting rooms as part of our Clubroom facilities following the West Melton Scout Group and others vacating the building when the new West Melton Community and Recreation Centre is operational.

Background

WMRFC are a significant user of the West Melton Reserve and in turn contributes to the operation of the reserve. The demand on our existing facilities is growing, both through our own use and the request by rep teams to use the facilities and grounds. We are proud of our facilities and the reserve and wish to continue to enhance them.

As part of the planning for the new West Melton Community and Recreation Centre, WMRFC submitted a request for access for both training and for change facilities. At an earlier planning stage the new Centre was to be positioned on the current tennis court, being adjacent to the WMRFC building. With the Centre now positioned to the North West of the reserve the utilisation of the Centre by rugby is now limited.

WMRFC is in need for extra change / shower facilities, change facilities for referees and space for medical support. In addition we would like an indoor training facility which would support the growing need for year-round fitness training.

Proposed Change

WMRFC would like to utilise the current Scout Den and Council Meeting Room (mostly used by Tennis and Netball) to extend our change / shower facilities, and to develop an indoor training area. We see that this repurposing of the building is a useful way to utilise a vacant building once the Scout Group move to the new West Melton Community and Recreation Centre. We understand Scouts will have sufficient storage space in the new Centre and there will be no need to have both spaces. WMRFC would take over the ground lease for the remaining part of the building.

We are aware that the Scout Den has been partly damaged through many earthquake events. WMRFC are keen to work with SDC on this matter and carry out any remedial work. Some of the space would be refitted to create the changing space we are in need of.

WMRFC is also aware that both Tennis and Netball may transition to the new Centre at a later date. WMRFC has a good working relationship with these clubs and is happy to coexist with them.

The extra space will allow for additional change areas and an indoor fitness facility.

Funding & Building Management

WMRFC is wishing to maintain and operate all of the building area that covers the existing WMRFC clubhouse, Scout Den and Council Meeting Room. We are seeking co-funding from SDC to remedy any earthquake issues in that space, refit to incorporate new change facilities and to create an open fitness area. No budget has been set as yet.

WMRFC believe the repurposing of the building ensures a high level of community value and access, at a minimal cost or effort by SDC. It will further enhance the excellent facilities available at the West Melton Reserve.

Anthony Calder President West Melton Rugby Football Club

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments West Melton Rugby Club - Use of Redundant Buildings at West Melton Domain:
The WMRFC wish to utilize the scouts hall and community room to extend their changing facilities once these are vacated (when the new community and recreation centre opens). Staff support the re-utilization of buildings where this is cost effective and, so long as there is no on-going requirement by existing owners/users. Staff are of the view that this proposal requires further investigation in terms of feasibility (structural strength etc.) before making a recommendation. There are no defined costs or indication of Council contribution at this point and, therefore, staff believe there is insufficient detail to include anything in the LTP. Further investigation is suggested in conjunction with the WMRFC and the West Melton Reserves Committee to ascertain if this is viable and the cost implications. Subject to the outcome of this process it could be considered as part of future Annual Plan processes.

[100231] - Mr Joe Vincent

Address: 7 Tramway Road Springfield 7861

Postal Address: 7 Tramway Road Springfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

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)

I do not support the proposal to introduce chlorination into the water supply for Springfield. I feel it is very much an "ambulance at the bottom of the cliff" approach to water quality. If the existing UV treatment is proving to be insufficient then it seems appropriate to address the source of the problem. In laymans terms, stop the shit getting into waterways to start with. Perhaps working more closely with Ecan and farming operators would be help with that.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Springfield is currently chlorinated. 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.”

[100232] - Mrs Virginia Askin

Address: 2003 Bealey Road Hororata 7544

Postal Address: PO Box 49, Hororata

Phone (day): +6433180198

Phone (mobile): 0211102486

Email: v.askin@scorch.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
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 not seeing any attention to the lack of housing for the elderly in Malvern. Where are the options for elderly to move to when they need to downsize? Haunui is too expensive for many, and Westmar is for the infirm. Small units for rent or to buy for the elderly such as the 4 units sharing a parcel of land on Horndon St, Darfield are an example -more are required. I am also not seeing any attention to social housing of which there has historically been houses designated as such. Even if the Council has no appetite to supervise these, it can partner with people/organisations that are willing to undertake the care of this. The sale of those designated houses should be recycled back into housing within Malvern - or transferred into a Trust specifically to create social housing with it's own Board to run the enterprise.

Topic: Additional Housing - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Community housing is not an activity that this council has ever seen as core to its activities. Affordable housing matters have to date been dealt via RMA approvals or as in the Abbeyfield housing at Leeston, by allocating the Rata Foundation funds that council was granted to that project. A number of other community organisations have provide affordbale/community housing within the District and are arguably best placed to continue to do so. The question of whether the funds from the sale of houses in Ritso Street belong to Malvern has been asked previously. The answer is that the proceeds are District funds and any link to former special funds that may have arisen have been considered and resolved by council decision making that the funds are District assets and are used to support the District's funding needs.

[100233] - Dr. David Askin

Address: 2003 Bealey Road Hororata 7544

Postal Address: PO Box 49, Hororata.

Phone (day): 0210644436

Phone (mobile): 0210644436

Email: dave@getsready.net

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. My belief is that chlorine should not be added as a standard addition, during standard/low rainfall periods. Bore water in those conditions has proven to be of high quality in terms of E. coli.
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) Yes. Hororata seems to be gaining real traction in wider Selwyn - as noted in your own recent publication. A community centre will be well used.
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) Great. Thanks.
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? Yes. Thank you for the opportunity to provide general thoughts. My key thought is that the plan is well conceived and beautifully presented..., but misses a fundamentally important issue. It seems to assume all is well with the households of Selwyn and all we need are external items - community centres, sporting facilities etc. It isn't. It maybe for those who have owned a home most of their lives, heading towards retirement, well placed to retire comfortably. We have many in Selwyn who are not so fortunate - and yet the document appears oblivious to this crucial human welfare concern. Please do not tell me that Council is only concerned about roads, septic issues, community halls and recreational centres and the likes. Council has become wealthy through sub-divisions that have provided amazing, large spaces for the well off-primarily. Unsure of this assertion? Look around. I believe this is true. Please tell me we are bigger than this. I want to hear that we, us, our society are genuinely wanting to create spaces for all - not just the well off. This is at the heart of my concern. I want and hope to live in a district where the less fortunate can live well, in affordable homes. I believe the very vibrant tiny house communities in Christchurch, elsewhere in NZ and around the world have much to offer us here. (Not just tiny!). Selwyn could be a pioneer in alternative housing. It seems to me an obvious opportunity given the many

lifestyle blocks where extra families and individuals could be accommodated if rules were relaxed and technologies (composting toilets, sensible grey water options) used.

I have presented before on this topic. I find myself wondering if anyone is listening, with the intent of going beyond listening to action?

I am concerned that Ritso Street in Darfield - with some social housing units owned by Council (Darfield Community?) are being sold. I hope money from the sale will be used to continue to assist those least well off? How will those funds be used?

Thank you for listening. I'm hoping to see action that is meaningful for all of us, but particularly the less fortunate.

Dave Askin.

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 facility in Hororata is acknowledged.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Submitter is in support

Topic: Additional Housing - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Community housing is not an activity that this council has ever seen as core to its activities. Affordable housing matters have to date been dealt via RMA approvals or as in the Abbeyfield housing at Leeston, by allocating the Rata Foundation funds that council was granted to that project. A number of other community organisations have provide affordbale/community housing within the District and are arguably best placed to continue to do so. The question of whether the funds from the sale of houses in Ritso Street belong to Malvern has been asked previously. The answer is that the proceeds are District funds and any link to former special funds that may have arisen have been considered and resolved by council decision making that the funds are District assets and are used to support the District's funding needs.

[100234] - Mr Michael Reynolds

Address: 20 Railway Terrace Glentunnel 7638

Postal Address: Glentunnel

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

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)

There seems to be a greater risk in consuming chlorinated water than there is in consuming what is, or should be pristine bore water.

Obviously poor engineering and maintenance can cause contaminants to enter what should be a perfect unchlorinated supply. No chlorination and protecting the delivery system is all that is required.

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.”

[100235] - Miss Erin McElroy

Address: 1370 Old West Coast Road Halkett 7671

Postal Address: 1370 Old West Coast Road Halkett Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 3181631

Phone (mobile):

Email: ggriffiths@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)

Oppose - Having nearly paid off the SDC loan for our Community Centre why would we want a new fee structure placed on our rates that will never end and will only ever go up in price. Communities are fully consulted on their new facilities and advised what the cost will be to them, therefore it is that communities decision to build a \$3 million hall or an \$8 million hall. If the SDC and local community build a over-specified and costly facility that is under-utilized than someones planning is too blame, don't put the burden of cost onto a ratepayer 100km away.

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

Agree - Believe the pool should have being bigger right from the start but feel we need a 50m pool, not another 25m pool. Agree to a food outlet but oppose the Fitness/wellbeing space, there are plenty of spaces available around Rolleston for such business and would rather have the \$1.6m budget put into the 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)

Agree - The woeful lack of sporting facilities in SD is incredible but maybe a fairer distribution of such buildings around the district would help clubs more, why have Rolleston as the central hub for all sports. Oppose the new district wide rate to pay for this, if sports hubs were distributed more around the district they could be more use as sports/community halls.

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)

Agree - but only if there is a targeted rate applied to pay for them, the community will then seriously look at the plans supplied and agree to what is really needed.

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 - More carparks please, woefully inadequate parking, have given up trying to find a park on several occasions, especially when raining!

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

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

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter questions why they should be charged a community centre rate for larger facilities when there is no such centre or hall close by. The introduction of a district-wide rate for community centres, halls and reserves reflects that Selwyn residents are increasingly using facilities right across the district - not just in their own neighbourhoods. Facilities like the Lincoln Event Centre and Southbridge Hall, and reserves at Weedons, Rhodes Park in Tai Tapu, and Whitecliffs are examples of local facilities that are frequently used by residents from other communities. Under the current system, however, these users are not necessarily funding the facilities.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for an extension to SAC is noted. Submitter proposes a 50 metre pool as the solution to meeting the demands going forward. 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. Officers advise that current plans are considering future demands and note there are various options to more cost effectively future proof SAC. Submitter proposes not to include gym / wellbeing space . Officers are continuing to investigate gym / wellbeing space options and costs and will consider existing private facilities / usage as part of the investigations

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Conditional support for the Indoor Court proposal is acknowledged. The submission proposes the need for more local facilities rather than a central hub. Staff support the need for a network of facilities including local facilities as well as a regional hub. The regional hub will provide a scale of facilities allowing the holding of major and regional events (as well as supporting local needs) while the smaller community hubs will support local clubs/groups.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter supports the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton subject to them being locally funded. Council will make a decision on the funding approach for these facilities in consideration of feedback on the District-wide rate proposal.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	No comments made.

[100236] - Mr Gavin King

Address: 1207 Rockwood Road Hororata 7572

Postal Address: RD 2 Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: kinggav@scorch.co.nz

Submission

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

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

Good idea

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)

Not yet

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)

Think so

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 not needed. A good hall at Glentunnel not far away. Bigger facility in Darfield when needed. Today we drive, in the past people rode a bike or a horse, or walked. Times have changed.

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 needed go ahead.

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 was the Chairman of the Hororata Acheron water supply for many years. The Committee at the time agreed to upgrade a pipe from the Snowden Rd to the Stop sign at Windwhistle. This work was supposed to have been done two years ago and it hasn't been done. It is important.

We agreed to put a 100mm pipe in beside the existing 85mm pipe so as to get more water to the bottom of the Acheron supply. Needs to be done.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

organic material in the system with which the chlorine interacts; and the supplier is not experienced at chlorinating a system well. Taste and odour problems will be minimal or non-existent in a properly-run and stabilised chlorination system. This may take some months from when chlorination is first introduced, but consumers quickly adjust and there are simple ways to reduce any taste and odour problems during the initial period (such as leaving drinking water to sit in a refrigerator overnight).”

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

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

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet light) treats the water where it enters our supply network providing both bacterial and protozoal disinfection. UV treatment does not treat the water once it is in our reservoirs and pipes. Chlorine does not provide protozoal disinfection but does provide bacterial disinfection and residual treatment in the reticulation system

minimising the impact of any contamination which may enter the distribution system. There is always the potential for contaminants to get into the water reticulation system, for example through pipe failures, third party damage, cracks in the reservoir, back flow etc. Chlorine is provided to mitigate this risk. The Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 makes the following statement. “Following international best practice, a multi-barrier approach to treatment of water supplies should be utilised at all times. A “source to tap” regime should be implemented which begins with the protection of source water quality and ends with the supply of wholesome water to the consumer’s tap with adequate residual disinfectant in the reticulation, such that consumers are protected from infectious agents.” “Treatment should include a residual disinfectant in the reticulation. These conclusions are driven by the compelling need to protect the health of all members of the public, but particularly those who are vulnerable, such as the young, elderly and ill.” This comment is reinforced by the Canterbury District Health Board submission [100270] “A major advantage of chlorination is that it produces a residual disinfectant that is moderately persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter does not believe a new facility is warranted in Hororata as it is already serviced by a modern hall in Glentunnel. On the surface this view has some level of validity. However the proposed Hororata facility replaces the aging and damaged hall that is no longer fit for purpose and provides a new modern multi-use facility that can service both community, cultural and recreation needs. The project is supported by a feasibility study and has strong advocacy from the local community who are also willing to make substantial funding contribution.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments This water supply is currently fully allocated. No additional water is available at this time. Pipe sizing will be considered at the time of pipe renewals.

[100237] - Mr Kevin Alfield

Address: 14 Ocean View Place Rakaia Huts 7683

Postal Address: RD 3 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: jandkatsunset@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)

We think user pays. We don't see why we should be paying for other communities when we pay a small fee for our local community room which our community to the building of it.

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

The Selwyn Aquatic Centre was not built big enough when first constructed. Compare it to the fantastic one in Timaru.

Rolleston was always going to grow at a huge rate, no thing outside the square. Car Parking - they have had to extend already.

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

A great idea, but user pays. Car parking again with new rugby fields at Foster Park - not BIG ENOUGH.

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 need it where we live.

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)

What water race? We don't have one. They were filled in at new subdivision in Leeston. Water race would help stop flooding as not stormwater in Pacific Drive.

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)

Great idea, user pays. We have contributed to Hororata last weekend.

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)

Use the hallways as wasted space. Once again, carparking - a long way to walk for elderly and disabled.

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

Have watched how often the cycleway at Springston - Lincoln is used. Not much. Fix the roads first in all areas, and fill potholes.

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

Rakaia hut - overgrown trees in camp blocking residents views and reserves. Flooding, stormwater, driveways, disgusting.

Water meters on a community funded water system.

18% rate rise for what? No public transport, public library bus not used enough.

"Gambles Estate" - where is the money going?

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 encourages Timaru aquatics as model. Officers have investigated the Timaru facility model and this has informed plans

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submission is supportive of the Indoor court facility but stresses the view that the facility should be user pays. The proposed Indoor Court facility operational costs will be funded in part from user charges (as per the current aquatics centre). If the user charges were to applied to the capital cost of the facility as well the cost would be pushed beyond the capacity of the user groups to pay. The submission also points out the need for additional car parking. Staff are currently investigating options for additional carparking including land purchase although this aspect needs to be kept in perspective. The car parking space available at Foster Park is only under stress during the winter season for around 4 hours on a Saturday morning. As with the large majority of sports venues around the country Council will never be able to cope with this peak Saturday morning demand for on-site parking and there is sufficient capacity for street parking within 5mins walk of this facility to cope with peak demand.

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 noted. The submitter also mentions user pays and it is planned to introduce a structured fee system that will be applied to these facilities for all users.

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 believes the Springston to Lincoln cycleway is not used much.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Campground trees will be checked to see if they need tidying as suggested.

Topic: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Water metering is an important part of ensuring a fair rating structure. Users pay for the water they use. Use less - pay less.

[100238] - Mr Owen Sharland

Address: 1276 Couertenay Rd Kirwee 7543

Postal Address: PO Box 69,Kirwee.

Phone (day): 0274401515

Phone (mobile): 0274401515

Email: owen.sharland@gmail.com

Submission

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

Yes. I do not believe the proposal is in the best interest of Kirwee ratepayers. Approximately 60,000 dollars collected, very little going back to the Kirwee community hall. I believe another unnecessary contributing factor to the high rate increase to Kirwee ratepayers.

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 do not believe in chlorination of Kirwee's water supply. In the 28 years I have lived in Kirwee there have been no issues to my knowledge. Proper council monitoring is all we need as we have had in the past. Chlorinated supplies still get boil water notices. I believe across the board chlorination is just another unwarranted ratepayer expense. I do believe council needs to look closer at the reasons our ground water supplies are likely to be compromised.

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?

Yes. I do not believe Kirwee needs to be connected to a hugely expensive sewerage and wastewater scheme. I believe the septic tanks required now are totally adequate and effective. Surely council can see that the kirwee communities septic tank discharge pales in comparison to the increasing intensive agricultural dairying practices discharges occurring in close proximity to the township now.

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: 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: Darfield & Kirwee Wastewater - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

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

[100239] - Russell & Barbara Jolly

Address: 10 Pacific Driv RD 3 7683

Postal Address: Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: rakaiahuts10@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)

Rated for local areas only - user pays.

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

Not needed with Christchurch planning large facilities.

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)

Not needed with big facilities being built in Christchurch - user pays.

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)

Try all other options first.

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 do not have a water race in our area, so I do not agree to a district rate - user pays.

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

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

Great idea - user pays.

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)

Too much to spend on little used facilities.

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

The money from Gambles Estate should be given back to the Rakaia Huts community as written in the original will? We do have a copy of the original will.

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 no need for this facility with the plans CCC has for additional facilities

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff do not support the rationale of this submission which proposes that the Indoor courts are not needed due to the development of the Metro Sports centre in Christchurch. The needs analysis conducted as part of the Indoor Court proposal clearly shows a need in Selwyn for this facility in addition to the proposed Metro sports centre. This view has been supported by a regional study of the need for sports facilities across the region conducted by Sport Canterbury. This study placed the proposed Indoor facility at Foster Park as a high priority given the lack of Indoor capacity across the region. Staff have been conscious of the need to ensure that the Foster park facility is designed in way to compliment and not duplicate the Metro facility particularly around ensuring the facility is community sport level focused (as opposed to high performance).

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: 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 noted. The submitter also mentions user pays and it is planned to introduce a structured fee system that will be applied to these facilities for all users.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter considers little value for money in the walk cycle proposals

Topic: Investment opportunities and requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100240] - Mrs Shelia Neal

Address: 2406 Homebush Road Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: 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 was this not built big enough in the first place, as another \$12m on top of \$14m just seems like a lot of money when many people will never use the 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 definitely do not want our water chlorinated. We have two grandchildren with skin problems and one who has had cancer, and the chlorinated water would certainly affect them when they visit.

Also, we have stock and dogs who will not drink the water, so it will cause all sorts of problems in the future.

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

The ratepayers of the Selwyn District do not have and endless supply of money that some Councillors see to think

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Submission expresses that the investment is large when some residents will not use SAC

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

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

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

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

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

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

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

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	No comments made.

[100241] - Mr JARED GALLAGHER

Address: 23 KENNAWAY ST RD1 7673

Postal Address: COALGATE

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: jazmology@gmail.com

Submission

District-wide rating for community centres, halls and reserves

The Council is proposing to replace the current system of local, targeted rates with a standard district-wide rate, paid by all ratepayers. Some communities would pay less than they currently do, while some would pay more. All ratepayers would contribute equally to the district network of facilities that are available to everybody. This would spread the cost of larger facilities more widely, and ensure funding is available for improvements to facilities in smaller communities. More details: p.10-13 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I don't support the change to a district-wide rate for community centres, halls and reserves

Any comments?

I am concerned that this change is not fair for all ratepayers. As I live in a more remote area the range of local available community centres, halls and reserves that we use regularly are very limited to us here. We rarely travel to other parts of our district to use community centres, halls and reserves. I think this advantages the highly populated communities especially Rolleston and Lincoln which due to this higher population have a wider variety of community centres, halls and reserves, and these populations enjoy more ready access to these resources due to them being local. I am further concerned as the rates in these more remote areas are indicated to be rising by a significant amount (9% for two consecutive years running in Whitecliffs). This is not sustainable for us as a family and keeping all rates rises to a minimum should be a priority for council over and above other schemes and planning. To conclude, this 'homogenising' of targeted rates made sense with the water as this is a resource all people in the district should have equal access to. In the case of community centres, halls and reserves its not appropriate as we don't all have equal access to the resources in the district and some community centres, halls and reserves in more populated areas will have a higher cost to maintain and develop and these costs can be covered by the higher populations in these areas.

Selwyn Aquatic Centre extension

The Council is proposing to add an extension to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre, including an additional 25-metre, 8-lane programme pool, to help meet the high demand for space for swimming lessons, aquafitness and casual swimmers. The project would also include a fitness programming space and a café. Construction would be completed in 2019. More details: p.14-15 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the proposed extension to Selwyn Aquatic Centre

Any comments?

The need is clear to me given how congested this pool is that this is needed. Why did the council not develop a larger more appropriate complex in the first place? Is this 25m development going to be suitable? What is the real need here (are you

only catering to the lane swimmers/ swim school users or have you considered the needs of the wider user group? Lets truly make this a district that is worth living in. The pool is kind of lame - make it a real attraction - spend some money on this rather than keeping the coffers locked away, peoples lives are happening now not in the future. Also what about other pools in other areas? such as developing the Darfield pool to be a more user friendly place (indoor, spa pools/gym for local users) there seems to be a lack of recreational options in these outerlying wards.

Indoor courts at Foster Park

The Council is proposing to build a multi-purpose indoor courts and sports hub to meet increasing demand for facilities for a range of sports groups. It would include four indoor courts, four covered courts for sports and events, administration areas and a sports hub with changing rooms and amenities. Work on the proposed project would be completed in 2020. More details: p.16-17 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the proposed indoor courts facility at Foster Park

Any comments?

Fantastic idea, but please make it awesome not a boring shed - this council has funds make use of them rather than keeping them locked up. I do not support this to be funded by any general rates increase, or an additional rate to users outside the local area of Rolleston. As a rate payer in an outerlying ward we will rarely use this resource, so I feel that targeted rates to the community local to this area should be how this is funded. Council should prioritise limiting rates rises for families - I think council may of lost touch with the reality that families in the district face and that increasing our rates over and above the rates of inflation puts pressure on families.

Water quality improvements and chlorination

In response to the Government's inquiry into drinking water contamination, the Council is seeking community feedback on options for ensuring we are providing our communities with safe drinking water. Consideration is being given to chlorination of some supplies with a higher level of risk, to minimise the impact of any contamination which may enter drinking water systems. More details: p.18-19 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Which option would you prefer? (skip if not applicable)

No additional chlorination

Any comments?

I strongly oppose Chlorination of our water supply and think the council should explore other options to secure our water supply (the malvern hills hartleys supply). At a recent public meeting the asset manager Murray Washington indicated that there was plenty of funds available to maintain these supplies and I'd like to see some of this money used to maintain the safety of our water supply and all the water supplies in the district in more technologically advanced ways such as better monitoring systems that allow for faster detection over more test sites, adapting the reticulation network to allow for isolation of 'infected' areas. Get our water supply up to date rather than using old school approaches and technology. If we are paying the same rate district wide for our water, I want the same quality of water.

Water race rating review

The Council is proposing to introduce a new rating structure for the water race network. A new standard district rate would replace the current complicated rating structure which has 10 different rating factors across the three water race networks. The new system would ensure that land owners who benefit directly from to water races still fund most of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes, to recognise environmental and aesthetic benefits. More details: p.20-21 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28.

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I don't support the proposed new rating structure for the water race network

Any comments?

I think users should pay the full costs of this system. This proposal does not seem fair and equitable from my perspective as I extremely rarely see or go near a water race system in the district. Lets focus on keeping our streams and rivers safe and healthy instead, these are natural habitats for wildlife.

Changes to Community Grants

The Council is proposing to introduce a new Community Grants Scheme to bring together various existing funding and grants programmes. The new will provide new, contestable grants funding of \$140,000. This will be available district-wide to assist not-for-profit community groups and clubs, as well as communities of interest working for the wellbeing of Selwyn residents. More details: p.22-23 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the proposed new contestable grants funding for community grants

Any comments?

No Answer

New community centres – Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton

Over the next 10 years the Council is proposing to replace three major community centres, in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton. The existing halls in Hororata and Prebbleton are no longer meeting the needs of these growing communities, while Leeston does not currently have a purpose-built community facility. More details: p.24-25 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the proposal to develop new community centres in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton

Any comments?

I think these community centres are really important to our communities and council needs to get this sorted fast, without increasing anybodies rates - I'd rather the council to be poor and people to have a better quality of life that for it to be financially rich and for people within it to be struggling and lacking facilities to live in it.

Rolleston council offices extension and parking

The Council is proposing to add a 385m2 extension to the Council offices in Rolleston, to meet current and future staff requirements, as staff numbers have more than doubled since the offices were opened in 2007. The project will also include improvements to existing customer services areas, and additional car parking space for staff and public. More details: p.26-27 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I don't support the proposal to build an extension to the Council offices in Rolleston

Any comments?

Council workers can use existing offices in the local communities, closer to the wards they work within. Technology allows for easy connectivity between areas and will probably save council money on staff transportation.

Walking and cycling strategy

The Council is seeking community feedback on the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy, which is an update to the current Strategy adopted in 2009. It aims to improve walk/cycle networks within and between townships, and proposes increased funding for annual township footpath extensions and for major cycleway projects. A total of seven major new cycleways are proposed over the 10-year period. More details: p.28-29 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I don't support the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed walk/cycleway projects

Any comments?

I feel that the council needs a bigger picture plan for the walking and cycling strategy before it allocates funding and decides which communities to prioritise. There are opportunities to develop cycleways similar to the existing little river cycleway in many places in the district that will attract walkers and cyclists from the whole area as well as tourists. Also safe options for kids to keep active and cycle/ walk to school as well as keeping closely located communities connected should be a priority when deciding which paths to prioritise. I am strongly opposed to the Kirwee to Darfield path as this is a really long, straight stretch of road that will not be appealing to many walkers or cyclists and I find it hard to imagine any more than 2 or 3 users per day making use of what seems like an expensive pathway.

Rates Rises I am really concerned about the projected rates rises in our area and think that this is not acceptable, fair or equitable. As a parent with a young family it has caused stress to consider two 9% rates rises back to back, this will have a big impact on our families finances. I think council needs to prioritise keeping rates rises to a minimum if at all, and try to keep in touch with what's happening with the people who actually live in their district. Council needs to find other means to fund projects that increasing our rates or hold back on these projects.

Access to larger community centres etc. We live a significant distance from the larger centres and feel that district wide rating for resources that are not easily accessible to me and my family should be covered mainly by the communities that live in these communities and use the resources frequently. This should be reflected in our rates through targeted rates.

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: 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 as well as support for more enhancement of Darfield pool . Some plans for improving experience at community pools in place

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Chlorine options Three options were provided for consultation. These are summarised below: 1. Introduce chlorination, with the associated infrastructure, for water supplies which would receive the greatest benefit from chlorination

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

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

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is not in support and singles out the Darfield to Kirwee Cycleway in particular

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

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

[100242] - Mrs Joanne Christie

Address: 1170 Shands Road, RD 6 Christchurch 7676

Postal Address: 1170 Shands Road RD 6 Christchurch

Phone (day): 0212075150

Phone (mobile):

Email: Joannemorrish@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? I would love to see this extended to a 50m pool so that it is up to international standards. I sincerely hope there will be more changing facilities - especially family rooms.
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) Great to have a facility like this. All of Selwyn definitely needs to contribute to this. I don't see why CHCH shouldn't either as residents will certainly use 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)
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. Submitter proposed 50 metre pool for international competitions for elite swimmers. 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	Support for the Indoor court facility is acknowledged. The needs analysis for the project supports the submission comments.

[100243] - Mrs Kylie Gordon

Address: 33b Leinster terrace Lincoln 7608

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor court facility is acknowledged.

[100244] - Mr David John Neal

Address: 2406 Homebush Road RD1 7673

Postal Address: 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)

It should be user pays - we will never use 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)

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 definitely do not want our water supply chlorinated, also as the scheme is also stock water, we know from personal experience that stock will not drink chlorinated water.

If we have to put a water filter at the inlet tank so stock will drink it we will withhold money out of our water rate to pay for it. Stick to the boil water notice.

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 Submission proposes the development should be funded by users. Officers consider this is not feasible in practical terms.

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.”

[100245] -Small Strokes Synchronised Swimming Club Mrs Fiona Small

Address: 1 Villa Mews Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 1 Villa Mews Rolleston

Phone (day): 033479131

Phone (mobile): 0274905048

Email: johnandfiona@scorch.co.nz

Submission

We support the extension of the Selwyn Aquatic Centre. To make it a great facility to meet the needs of various clubs in the Selwyn District, the synchronised swimming club would support the new pool being a depth of 3m over a length of 25m. Over half of the clubs members live in Selwyn District and there is currently no deep water in Canterbury. As our girls grow older and taller, they are no longer able to properly practice synchronised swimming figures as they hit their heads on the bottom of the pool. This is also a health and safety issue. A pool of this depth would allow us to hold South Island and National competitions in the Selwyn District. We are holding the South Island competition here in Christchurch this year for the first time since the earthquakes. We are holding it at Jellie Park and have had to advise the other clubs of the shallow depth of water as it is dangerous to have competitions in less than 3m. It is not ideal but gives Dunedin and Invercargill a break from holding the competition every other year. A deep water pool would also benefit other sports such as underwater hockey and water polo.

Canterbury is desperate for a 50m pool for our competitive swimmers. We would also support a 50m pool.

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 proposes a 25 metre pool of 3 metres to accommodate synchronized swimming and this depth would allow hosting of South Island and National competitions in the Selwyn District. Submitter proposes. a deep water pool would also benefit underwater hockey and water polo.

[100246] - Mr Robert Scott

Address: not provided Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: pugcity66@gmail.com

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)

I have Parkinsons and am on very heavy medication. I need lots of water when taking the pills. Putting chemicals in our drinking water against our will is a breach of human rights, is it not?

It concerns me what the chlorine is doing to my body combined with the meds. If the Government told you to jump off a cliff, would you? Leave our water alone, and stop playing God.

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.”

[100247] - Mrs Wilma Webster

Address: 34 Railway Terrace East Sheffield 7500

Postal Address: Sheffield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

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)

First of all, the Council doesn't provide community centres and halls. Most have been established by local communities. Council has taken over some, I think to cover insurance, but have done minimal upgrades over the years. I DO NOT agree to a 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)

It's always for Rolleston. How about a Malvern covered 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 do not agree with district-wide 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)

I DO NOT agree with chlorination of our local 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)

It's not needed - just get rid of half of the idiots you employ.

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?

Small towns in Malvern should be rated lower than Rolleston as our amenities are less and not much regrowth forecast.

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 an indoor pool in Malvern. This is not currently in plan for network

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submission is silent re support or otherwise re the Indoor Court project at Foster Park. The submission does not support a district rating structure for this facility which is acknowledged.

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: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

No comments made.

[100248] -Rolleston College Mr Steve Saville

Address: Rolleston Rolleston 7658

Postal Address: PO Box 86045 Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: steve.saville@rollestoncollege.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)

Although not as important to us as a College as the Foster Park development, we see the development of the Aquatic Centre as providing our learners with more opportunities to growth and accept challenges.

As a College we are determined to build partnerships and offer our learners opportunities beyond the confines of our school. To have a larger aquatic centre and the sports facilities at Foster Park developed is very exciting for us.

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)

Rolleston College sees this development as being vital. As we grow the need to provide opportunities for our young people will grow to a point that we can't fully cater for within the confines of our school.

Our learners are active and adventurous and the opportunity to develop partnerships with external providers and the Council as we work towards meeting their needs, is vital.

The Foster Park development is a key here. We would be keen and frequent users of this facility, and strongly urge it to be prioritized.

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)

Although not as important as the Foster Park and Aquatic Facilities developments, this proposal is another examples of how we see learning for our learners extending into the community.

Our learners are active, curious, intelligent young adults and we are determined to develop their learning and personal growth through community involvement.

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 SAC extension is noted with emphasis on schools/student use

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Strong support for this facility is acknowledged. The needs analysis conducted around this facility supports the submission in that local schools would be a significant user group for this facility and that youth in the district would benefit substantially from this facility.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is in support

[100249] -Russells Flat Landcare Group Mr Warren Wright

Address: 497 Bluff Rd Sheffield 7580

Postal Address: 497 Bluff Rd, Sheffield. 7580

Phone (day): 021 343 700

Phone (mobile):

Email: warren.wright@scorch.co.nz

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13)
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17)
4. The Russells Flat Landcare Group have the following concern: That the Malvern Hills Water Sub Committee(before it was disbanded) or the residence under this scheme were not consulted about any chlorination, or permanent chlorination.
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21)
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23)
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.”

[100250] - Mr Duncan Poxon

Address: 20 Riverside Lane, Tai Tapu Christchurch 7645

Postal Address: PO Box 219, Tai Tapu

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)

Please include 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 network on the Port Hills. However within the Selwyn District jurisdiction there is no signposted 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.

[100251] -rate payer Mrs Karen Meares

Address: 680 Downs road Glenroy 7572

Postal Address: RD 2 Darfield

Phone (day): 033186 959

Phone (mobile): 021 147 1824

Email: karen@idadowns.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)

My concern is that once the water is chlorinated it will become harder to find the faults in the system and that chlorine will cover up all. So my issue is the infrastructure maintainence. We have been told that it is already hard to find transgressions in the system.

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

Support

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 building of these facilities

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27)
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29)

We have a walking cycle track Coalgate to Glentunnel and at hororata. The community would like a track that links these two existing track, hence linking Coalgate and hororata. Just because the communities are smaller than other communities asking for walking cycle tracks does not man less use. We get people from all over the district coming to use our tracks for variety.

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

I submit that resurfacing and widening of Leaches road Hororata to Windwhistle is added to the long term plan. This road has a lot of trucks and local traffic on it, tourists and ski traffic. Incidentally why is CPW not helping with maintenance on Leaches road where they have caused severe potholing and damage.

I submit that the roving secretarial services continue to be provided free of charge. This does help communities that struggle to find officers for their committees, it provides much better flow of correspondence between Council and community, minutes are accurately recorded and sent to the council in a timely manner. My main issue is the lack of sharing info between communities, Often the goal/end result is the same and could be achieved with better communication between the different committees. Comment With more people living and the growth in Selwyn District, I feel that more people expect a lot more social development in the district of walkway/cycle way halls etc and other facilities. While these are good to attract people to live in our district the council needs to remember its core activities of roading water reticulation, rubbish, storm water, drainage etc. It seems that these core services may be getting eroded and are fighting for funds in the big pot. The council needs to make sure that these services have their required increases to maintain the district to a high standard and this may be to the detriment of some social services. 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.”

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 submitter’s support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments A Hororata to Glentunnel (Coalgate) Cycleway is not included in the 2018 Walking and Cycling Action Plan as no demand has been identified for such a link previously. It would be 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: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments A \$3.4 million project to fully widen Leaches Rd in 2032/33 is currently in Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast. Council roading staff are engaged with CPWL to encourage their cooperation.

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 proposes no change to the arrangement that only some Committees currently have access to, which is Secretary services funded from Community Services budget. Council is advised that the Officer intent is t for consistency in the approach taken with any paid Committee Secretary role and that the expectation should be that this funding comes out of Discretionary funding of relevant Committee or alternatively volunteer services. Council officer is also exploring ways (outside of direct funding) staff can support Committees by simplifying / standardizing processes, encouraging information sharing between committees and increased cooperation and consistency between committees.

[100252] - Ms lyn Jjackson

Address: 407 halswell road Christchurch 8025

Postal Address: 407 Halswell road christchurch

Phone (day): 322 7611

Phone (mobile): 0212788616

Email: lynj407@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) Although not a resident of Selwyn district, I am a nearby Halswell resident and a regular user of the Kennedy's bush walking track. I would very much like to see it linked to the adjoining Early Valley so that there is another access point to the Summit Road. There are many such paths to the east, but none at all between Halswell and Gebbies Pass. As the population in the Tai Tapu area is rapidly increasing, it is frustrating that there is no way of accessing the hills from this part of the district.
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 request for an extension to Kennedys Bush recreational walking facilities should be made to the Christchurch City Council as it is within their justification. Selwyn is not aware of any such plans for a connection to Early Valley by the City.

[100253] - Mr Martin Lammers

Address: 7 Curries Rd, RD4, Springston Christchurch 7674

Postal Address: 7 Curries Rd RD4 Springston Christchurch

Phone (day): 033295509

Phone (mobile): 021433068

Email: mjfl.lammers@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?

Impact on rates for rural Springs ward. Given the majority of projects outlined in the 2018-2028 plan are geared toward urban growth and development, we consider the rate rise for the rural Springs ward of 13.7% for 2018/19 and 10 yr average of 5.8% to be excessive when compared, for example, with Lincoln township. It is understood that some town based projects will also benefit the rural community (such as the development of the town centre in Lincoln) but the rate rise is disproportionate to the direct benefits the rural community will receive. The plan does not provide adequate justification for such high rate rises in rural areas. The purpose of this submission is to request that any rate rise for Rural Springs ward for 2018/19 and the 10 yr average rate rise be significantly reduced.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100254] -Selwyn United Football Club Ms Sylvia Fidow

Address: 9 BAXTER CRES, ROLLESTON Christchurch 7614

Postal Address: 9 BAXTER CRES ROLLESTON

Phone (day): 0274250455

Phone (mobile): 0274250455

Email: sylviafidow@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)

The Selwyn United Football Club strongly supports the provision of indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park. The proposed courts and sports hub would complement and strengthen the services the club currently offers the wider Selwyn community; and the inclusion of a futsal space would be very well utilized. Furthermore, the Selwyn United Football Club acknowledges the important role a sports hub would play in bringing people together. Players from the ages of four to post fifty play local football, and the hub would provide a space for the players and their families to gather.

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor Court facility is acknowledged particularly from a Futsal need perspective and a social hub for the Selwyn United Football club which serves a wide area of the Selwyn District. The submission supports the needs analysis conducted around this facility re the demand for Futsal space.

[100255] - Mr Paul Comrie

Address: 8 Kildare Terrace Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: as above

Phone (day): 423 0824

Phone (mobile): 027 432 4563

Email: buckcom@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 agree with.

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

I agree with.

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 agree with.

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 don't agree with chlorination.

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

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

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 agree with.

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

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor Court proposal is acknowledged.

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: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

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

Staff Comments

Liffey Domain North Fencing: Staff have investigated this issue and concur with the submitter that there are issues with cars and damage to the grass surface. There is also potential for vehicular traffic to have an adverse impact on the tree root systems through compaction. Staff believe installation of a post and cable fence would be the best option to prevent vehicle access and damage to this area while providing some pull off areas for cars that are properly formed. The cost of this work for Liffey Domain North is estimated to be \$22,600. If the fence was extended down to Liffey Domain South a further \$9,900 would be required. The project would require input from the Lincoln Community Committee.

The project would not be eligible for reserve development contribution funding and would need to be added to the Lincoln Township budget if approved. It is possible that some savings may be found from the reserve maintenance vote in Lincoln with maintenance of some new reserves not occurring as quickly as anticipated.

[100256] -Springston Recreation Reserve Committee Dr. Rupert Tipples

Address: 399 Ellesmere Road Springston 7616

Postal Address: 399 Ellesmere Junction Road, Springston.

Phone (day): 03 3295634

Phone (mobile): 021 072 3127

Email: tipples49@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)

Yes, we are opposed to them because they will disadvantage Springston particularly. Please see the appended submission.

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 District wide rate for halls and community centres The district wide rate will fund the net operating costs of halls and community centres, the renewal and improvement costs as well as new facilities. The new facilities are spread around the district including the recently completed Dunsandel community centre and the proposed new facilities in Hororata and Leeston. The district wide rate proposal reflects that ratepayers benefit from a range of facilities across the district and that residents don't just use their closest facility. Having a mix of different facilities means that the community can enjoy a broad range of events and activities. For example, residents in Springston are very well served by their local hall, the Rolleston Community Centre and the Lincoln Event Centre. It is fair that they contribute to this network of facilities. The Council appreciates the support from its large number of volunteers, and recognises that it is the volunteers that helps local community centres/halls to serve their community so well. Council is keen to have as much voluntarily commitment as we currently have and will encourage them to continue. The committees that currently run the Council's community centres/halls and reserves will have a role to play into the future. They will be an important group for the Council to engage with to ensure the quality of maintenance and service being delivered at each facility remains or improves in the future. They will also be an important group to advocate on behalf of their local community for the needs and interests of their specific population to be met for each facility. Local Committees will have an input into the budget setting process, although the final approval rests with the Council. Hire charges will continue to be levied but the Council will look to make them more consistent. To date, meeting room hires and charges have been at the discretion of each individual committee which has created a range of hires and charges across the district. The Council will consult with Committees to establish a reasonable and equitable schedule of charges. In addition, Council will look to ensure facilities are consistently promoted to increase utilisation. The increase in rates for a typical property in Springston is 6.3% in 2018/19 and 6.0% in 2019/20, with a forecast average increase over 10 years of 3.3%.

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Springston Reserve Committee: Support for the public toilet proposal is noted. The committee have requested additional funding for the shelter belt replacement project. This matter was picked up by staff as part of the LTP development and a further budget of \$7,000 is already included in the draft LTP for this work.

[100257] -Lincoln & Districts Historical Society Inc. Dr. Rupert Tipples

Address: c/- 399 Ellesmere Junction Road Springston 7616

Postal Address: C/- 399 Ellesmere junction Road, Springston

Phone (day): 03 3295634

Phone (mobile): 021 072 3127

Email: a.degroot@xtra.co.nz; tipples49@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)

It is essential to have clear, timely information available about the scheme. An annual review/assessment of distribution is required with adjustment if necessary, as long as the change increases the total amount of funding available!

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)

Topic: Arts, Culture, Heritage - 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 significant SDC investment in archiving community historic documents. Officers are interested in considering how SDC might contribute further to digitization and increasing public access to historic records through its engagement and partnership with community historic and heritage groups. No plans currently for significant storage / archiving facility within Rolleston Library and Community Centre, although planning underway for heritage section and displays throughout facility.

[100258] -Summit Road Protection Authority Mr Mark Saunders

Address: 53 Hereford Street Christchurch 8154

Postal Address: PO Box 73016 Christchurch

Phone (day): (03) 941 6436

Phone (mobile):

Email: mark.saunders@ccc.govt.nz

Submission

SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY SUBMISSION ON THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL'S DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2018-2028

The Summit Road Protection Authority is empowered through the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 to advance the purposes of the Act, which are: (a) to provide for the preservation and protection of the scenic amenity associated with the Summit Road and other roads, walkways, paths, and public open spaces within the protected land: (b) to provide for the preservation and protection of natural amenities associated with land within the protected area: (c) to provide for the improvement of facilities for the public enjoyment of the scenic amenity and the natural amenities. For a number of years the Authority has been extremely concerned about damage to the amenities and facilities of the Summit Road corridor caused by antisocial behaviours mostly occurring at night that discourage the installation of desirable improvements at risk of being vandalised and signal a potential threat to the safety of users of Summit Road. Burnouts, damage to the road surface, signs, and structures, such as the Sign of the Bellbird, have seriously diminished the value of this important Port Hills recreational and environmental asset and reduced its potential for greater and safe public use and enjoyment. The Authority considered that restricting night-time road access to Summit Road under the Christchurch City Council Cruising and Prohibited Times on Roads Bylaw 2014 would have reduced damage, increased safety, and allowed for more effective enforcement, thereby safeguarding existing facilities and potential for further investment that would enhance the Summit Road recreational and environmental experience. Though the City Council at its meeting on 22 March 2018 resolved to not approve the installation of proposed Prohibited Times on Road Restrictions under the Bylaw for Summit Road, it also resolved to request that the Port Hills Management Plan be advanced as soon as possible recognising that the outcomes and objectives of that Plan may assist in achieving positive outcomes for the Summit Road and other affected roads in the area covered by that Plan. The Authority has funds that it can use to enhance signage and interpretation of the Summit Road corridor but has been reluctant to do so given the high potential risk of damage due to vandalism and fire. However, the Authority has signalled its will to install significant entrance signs at one or more strategic locations on the Summit Road dependent on associated costs, trusting that the Port Hills Management Plan will be advanced as soon as possible as the alternative means of addressing the wide-felt concerns for the safety and protection of Summit Road. Additional crime prevention tools would also improve public and landowner safety along the Summit Road, and the Authority on 26 March 2018 resolved to request that the City Council scope and trial crime prevention cameras on the Summit Road. The City Council at its meeting on 22 March 2018, in addition to requesting that the Port Hills Management Plan be advanced as soon as possible, also resolved to request a report to enable consideration of mechanisms that could potentially identify users of the Summit Road for crime prevention purposes, noting that the Police are agreeable to assisting with measures to curb anti-social behaviour on the Summit Road. The Authority requests that the Selwyn District Council in considering its draft Long Term Plan is mindful that the Summit Road is significant to, and partly lies within, Selwyn District also, and so protecting its amenities and recreational and ecological values is the joint responsibility of both Christchurch and Selwyn. At its meeting on 26 March 2018, the Authority signalled its intent to encourage in any matters relating to the Summit Road that Selwyn District Council be involved by the City Council to a greater extent, though the appropriate flip side is that the Authority would encourage Selwyn District Council to involve itself in matters relating to the Summit Road to a greater extent also. The Authority is interested in investing and partnering in the protection and improvement of Summit Road as a key natural asset of Christchurch and Selwyn, and it hopes for Selwyn District Council to be proactive in partnering with, and encouraging, the City Council in the advancement of measures to protect Summit Road. The Authority resolved in

considering submitting on the City Council's draft Long Term Plan that it: Requests that the City Council bring forward the Port Hills Management Plan into the current Long Term Plan round and allocates funding to support its implementation. The Authority makes equivalent submission to the Selwyn District Council draft Long Term Plan, and requests that the Selwyn District Council seeks to advance, partner with, and contribute to, the Port Hills Management Plan, abovementioned crime prevention measures, and other protections and enhancements of Summit Road that the two Councils, the Authority, and other potential partners may devise in the coming decade with appropriate funding, resourcing and cooperation allocated by the two Councils. Selwyn and Christchurch share a unique, special and vulnerable asset in the Summit Road, and as the two territories increasingly develop and share new and significant built assets post-earthquakes, they should also look to actively partner to continue and increase the long history of protecting their key shared significant natural asset that is the Summit Road. The Authority thanks the District Council for receiving this written submission.

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Selwyn District Council recognises the important work that The Summit Road Society carries out regarding the management of native biodiversity and public assess on the Port Hills. Council notes your wish that management of the Summit Road amenities, and recreational and environmental values, be adequately reflected in the Long Term Plan. The Councils acknowledges that SDC should be more closely involved with the CCC in the development of the Port Hills Management Plan and that suitable measures, protections and enhancements are developed and funded by the Council to protect and manage the significant natural asset that is the Summit Road, and its adjoining environment.

[100259] - Mr Chris Salkeld

Address: 13 Cross Street Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: 13 Cross St RD1 Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 027 702 7576

Email: salch609@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.

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.”

[100260] -Rolleston Warriors Rugby League Mrs Demelza Faimalo

Address: 13B Fairfield Way Rolleston 7650

Postal Address: PO Box 92006 Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0274655022

Email: demelzaafaimalo@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 see that there would be an advantage to the community centres that are struggling to maintain the facilities, but also to ensure that those overpriced facilities are mindful of the need for affordable community facilities

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) I agree with extending the facilities, but I do wonder whether the 25m pool is selling ourselves short and actually looking at 50m pools.

3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) There is a need for indoor sports facilities. I do wonder if the parking that has been allocated for these facilities would be sufficient enough. My concern would be, what the cost would be for sports groups to hire these facilities and how would this be managed. I would agree with option 1, as this is not just a Rolleston community facility but a wider Selwyn/Christchurch 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) I do not agree with the chlorination treatment.

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 do not feel I know enough about water races to make 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) It is a difficult time with funding options and as long as these funding streams are equal to the communities need, by population then I see this to be fair

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 this is a good idea for the communities mentioned, to ensure that the facilities are able to be used for multi usage

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) We have all seen the growth of Selwyn rise in numbers that possibly was not anticipated. In order for a district to operate in way that meets the demands of the community it does have to meet the requirements for employees to be connected and to be a facility that is best suited for the growth of Selwyn

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) I am more concerned that there are parts of Rolleston that does not have adequate footpaths and with the increase in school aged children in our community I do wonder whether this is safe for them

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? Rolleston Warrior Rugby League would like to consider an option of moving our grounds from Brookside park to the proposed District park around Weedons Rd. As a new sporting code to Selwyn we are currently utilizing Brookside park and while this is only just currently suitable for our club, we do see that within the near future that we will require not only larger grounds but more suitable playing fields that are upto spec with playing sports at night/winter. Rolleston Rugby League have increased its membership significantly from 2017 to 2018. While the majority of our members are from Rolleston we do have members within Leeston, Rakaia, Lincoln and Prebbleton.

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 requests Council at least consider 50 metre pool. This has occurred and original business case is currently being reviewed and refreshed

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submission support of the Indoor court proposal is acknowledged. Support for the district wide funding option is also acknowledged. The needs analysis for this facility demonstrated that it would operate as a regional sports hub and utilised extensively by ratepayers outside Rolleston. Staff are currently looking at options around additional car parking space although in reality this need is primarily limited to 4 hours on a Saturday morning during the winter season. Extensive street parking is available within 5mins walk of the park.

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 Support for Community Grant Funding Scheme is noted with expectation that funding is equitable to the whole population. This is the intent with the proposed scheme

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 draft 2018 Walking and Cycling Plan includes a progressively delivered \$986,000 footpath upgrade plan for Rolleston.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff are aware of the needs of Rugby league as a growing code in the Rolleston area. The issue of the suitability of Brookside Park for the codes needs need investigation as staff believe an option of upgrading the Park (including adequate lighting) needs to be investigated as the park is currently under-utilised in the winter season. This could provide a better option than the large scale park which potentially is many years away from development. In addition the changing and toilet facilities are already in existence at Brookside Park providing a better cost-effective and shorter term solution. Staff will progress proposals with the club and the Rolleston Reserve Committee that oversees the management of Brookside Park.

[100261] -Chairperson, Te Taumutu Rūnanga Mrs Julie Robilliard

Address: Pohau Road Taumutu 8140

Postal Address: PO Box 3214 Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 3712660

Phone (mobile):

Email: Rose.Nutira@ngaitahu.iwi.nz

Submission

Te Taumutu Rūnanga greatly appreciate and value the relationship with Selwyn District Council that has developed and matured over the past few years. In particular, the Rūnanga wish to thank the Council for the various projects that have been completed around the Taumutu area. Tēnā ra koutou!

With respect to the proposals in your Long Term Plan consultation document we offer the following comments:

District-wide rating for community centres, halls and reserves

We support the change to a district-wide rate for community centres, halls and reserves

Comments: As the only marae in the district and as a highly valued community facility (particularly for schools within the district), Te Taumutu Rūnanga would value future discussions with Council about contributions toward either the planned redevelopment of facilities or ongoing annual running costs that the Rūnanga current subsidises for all groups that visit.

Selwyn Aquatic Centre extension

We support the proposed extension to Selwyn Aquatic Centre

Indoor courts at Foster Park

We support the proposed indoor courts facility at Foster Park

Water quality improvements and chlorination

Introduce chlorination for supplies which would receive greatest benefit, based on a risk assessment

Comments: The Rūnanga expect that providing for and upholding te mana o te wai (both for ground and surface water supplies) would ensure that drinking water supplies would not be compromised to the extent that requires chlorination. Action needs to be taken via District Plan review to manage land use activities to ensure healthy drinking water supplies are protected or restored and the need to treat water is minimised and over time not required. Te hauora o te tangata must have primacy over land use activities.

Water race rating review

We support the proposed new rating structure for the water race network

Comments: Te Taumutu Rūnanga supports the introduction of the district wide rate contribution for maintaining the environmental/public good aspects of water races. In particular, the Rūnanga wish to see the water race that supplements flows into Waikekewai given that this water helps maintain flows through tribally significant water burial sites. In a broader sense, many of the districts water races have replaced streams and wetlands that have long been drained or diverted and have become the sanctuaries for many of our mahinga kai and taonga species that would have otherwise

been lost to us. The Rūnanga would like to see this public rate used over time to also modify the "race/drain" appearances and introduce riffles, planted stream banks (where it does not impede maintenance), connected wetlands etc to enhance habitat variability.

Changes to Community Grants

We support the proposed new contestable grants funding for community grants

Comments: Te Taumutu Rūnanga, as a not-for-profit organisation, look forward to making application to the new fund.

New community centres – Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton

We support the proposal to develop new community centres in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton

Rolleston council offices extension and parking

We support the proposal to build an extension to the Council offices in Rolleston

Comments: Te Taumutu Rūnanga recognise that the growth of the district has required expansion of Council office facilities. It is not appropriate to house staff, long term, in temporary accommodation. The Rūnanga welcome the opportunity to work with the Council to reflect the partnership between the Council and Ngāi Te Ruahikihiki through such things as bilingual signage, design features and artwork.

Walking and cycling strategy

We support the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed walk/cycleway projects

Comment: In time Te Taumutu Rūnanga would welcome discussions with Council about extending the Te Waihora Rail Trail from Lincoln/Motukarara around the western shore of the lake to Taumutu.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support of the proposed Indoor Court Facility at Foster Park is acknowledged.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Your comments will be passed on to the District Plan review team. 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 Support for Community Grant Funding Scheme is noted. Te Taumutu Rūnanga, as a not-for-profit organisation, signal, in submission, their intention to make application to the new 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'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

[100262] -West Melton Reserve Management Committee (Chair) Mr David Heiler

Address: 482 West Melton Rd West Melton 7676

Postal Address: 482 West Melton Rd RD6 CHCH

Phone (day): 03 363 3453

Phone (mobile): 021489232

Email: davidheiler1974@gmail.com

Submission

Submission on behalf of the West Melton Reserve Management Committee David Heiler – Chairman

GENERAL COMMENTS: 1. The Reserve Committee are supportive of the Strategic Objectives presented in the Community Facilities Activity Management Plan relating to the WM Reserve and agree with SDCs vision for their community reserve spaces. 2. The Reserve Committee appreciates the support provided by the SDC in developing the reserve over the last 5 years and planning for the future. This has included the following: a. The purchase of land adjacent to the reserve that has secured the green space the growing community needs for its sport and recreation requirements into the future b. The implementation of pop-up irrigation over fields has resulted in a significant improvement in the condition of playing fields, has reduced water usage and made better use of caretaker time c. The construction of additional parking (soccer field carpark) has assisted in responding to carparking needs d. Plantings around the reserve have improved the amenity of the reserve e. New footpath (currently underway) and recent street lighting improvements along West Melton Rd have improved safety for pedestrians and motorists 3. We are well supported by our excellent Caretaker employed by SDC (Dennis Smolenski) and we appreciate the support of SDC in retaining him and supporting him with his work 4. The Reserve Committee supports initiatives by SDC to create recreation spaces (eg skate parks) on the reserve targeted at the 8 to 18 year age group. 5. We are generally proud of the condition of the reserve but see areas where improvements are required.

OUR PRIORITIES: 1. Maintain and improve the condition of reserve assets 2. Provide facilities that match the needs of resident clubs and the wider community 3. Establish a Reserve Management Plan (Master Plan) with SDC that allows us to plan the development of the reserve and the integration of new areas 4. Assist SDC in integrating new land into the reserve, linking facilities, relocating tennis courts, develop fields and expand pop-up irrigation over new areas 5. Expand carparking around current buildings where parking on the road is still a safety issue.

COMMENTS ON THE LTP AND COMMUNITIES FACILITIES ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLAN: 1. The Reserve Committee is keen to be activity involved in integrating new areas of land into the reserve space. We note funds have been allocated to this and look forward to working with SDC to establish a Master Plan so that these funds are effectively spent. 2. We would like to review the proposed Financial Plan with SDC officers as it may need to be revised to respond to some urgent needs: a. Our playground area has recently been deemed unsafe by SDC and is currently fenced off. This playground is well used, especially when families are playing sport at the reserve. The Reserve Committee has recognised for some time the need to overhaul the equipment and surface of the playground but have been reluctant to spend money in the absence of a Master Plan. We now urgently need to make improvements to the playground to bring it back into use. b. New internal formed paths are required to connect the new Community Centre to existing reserve building. We want to avoid the reserve users needing to drive between existing buildings and the new Community and Recreation Centre. c. Carparking around existing buildings continues to be an issue with overflow cars parking on the road (safety issue). The proposed relocation of tennis courts closer to the new Community Centre would free up parking areas close to existing buildings where parking is an issue. d. A new irrigation well is required (current irrigation well at capacity) to allow the

pop-up irrigation system to be expanded over the new reserve areas. The current system requires budget for on-going maintenance. e. Carpark reseal and drainage improvements need to be brought forward as the pavement in front of existing buildings is giving up. The Committee has been nursing the current surface along with regular pot hole repairs. A full reseal was deferred while there was uncertainty over the layout of buildings and carparks. Now that it has been confirmed that rugby and bowls (tennis in the interim) will retain their existing facilities, investment should go into drainage improvements, reshaping and resealing the carpark around the existing buildings.

Topic: Request for upgrades, repairs or maintenance to existing facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	West Melton Reserve Project Priorities: 1. Master Plan - Council staff will work with the committee on developing a Master Plan for the reserve and extension areas. This is planned for 2018/19 and will be the precursor to any future decision on capital investment for development. 2. Playground improvements - As indicated in the submission there are safety issues with this playground. There is an opportunity to relocate and upgrade the playground as part of the extension development. A total budget of around \$80,000 has already been allocated for this project in 2019/20 and staff believe this is the appropriate timing for this work to be undertaken as part of the extension development. 3. Pathways - \$40,000 has been provided in the draft LTP for pathway construction in 2019/20 and this can be used for the internal paths described in the submission. There is also a total of around \$295,000 for the extension development and this includes path construction. 4. Car parking - The suggestion is to look at using the tennis court space for extra parking and relocating the courts. At this point no provision has been made to relocate the tennis courts but funding has been provided to resurface these in 2026/27 when they reach the end of their economic life. This would be the time to look at relocating the courts and it could be brought forward depending on the how the condition of the courts holds up over the next couple of years. This matter should be addressed through the Master Planning process. 5. New Irrigation Well - This proposal may have some difficulties in obtaining a new consent for irrigation water use. It is likely that a water take for additional capacity would need to be acquired. This matter requires further investigation to assess water requirements and the best means of achieving an on-going water supply to meet irrigation needs. Staff can assist the committee with this issue and it may require additional budgets which can be considered as part of Annual Plan processes. 6. Car park reseal - Staff concur with the committee that this project can now be brought forward. \$24,000 is provided in 2023/24 in the draft LTP and this could be brought forward to 2018/19 for this work.

[100263] - Ms Veronica Robinson

Address: 64 Hudsons Road Lincoln 7674

Postal Address: RD4 Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 3255057

Phone (mobile): 0276279779

Email: veronica.paul@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 would support an extension to the Aquatic Centre. Would also support a 50m pool. Swimming is something people can do for their entire life, it is healthy and relaxing. Swimming is an essential skill for life. A bigger pool creates more jobs in the Selwyn area. So benefits all round.
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) Whichever funding system, it would be beneficial to the Selwyn area if we had at least 4 indoor and 4 covered courts. Tournaments can then be held here, benefitting everyone. The population is now large enough to support this.
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)
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) Leeston has a facility with the rugby club rooms, I would think that should be sufficient.
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) Would be good if there were more cycle ways, particularly different routes between Lincoln, Tai Tapu and Prebbleton, cyclist at the moment use the narrow roads, also cycle ways are useful for walkers.
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 SAC extension is noted . The submitter also promotes 50 metre pool on basis it will provide more employment. Officers suggest there are a number of opportunities for additional employment already in the LTP consultation process

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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 that the Leeston RFC building is sufficient to provide for a community facility for Leeston. This was an option that was explored and is included in the consultation document. The cost to upgrade the building to a modern standard is significant and needs to be considered alongside the cost of providing a new fit for purpose facility.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The 2018 LTP includes \$100,000 project in 2018/19 to provide on and off road cycling links utilising Perymans Rd between Lincoln and Tai Tapu. Edward St and the adjoining subdivisions provides pathways to the Rail Trail that links to Prebbleton and beyond.

[100264] - Mr Mark Morrison

Address: 6 Stables Drive Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: 6 Stables Drive Lincoln 7608

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 027 550 5860

Email: morrisonlincoln@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)

LINCOLN SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THIS AS WE ALREADY HAVE A TARGETED RATES CHARGE AGAINST THE LINCOLN EVENTS CENTRE, YET THE WHOLE OF THE SELWYN DISTRICT UTILISE THE FACILITY

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15)
THE FACILITY MUST INCLUDE A 50 METRE POOL, TO NOT ADD THIS INFRASTRUCTURE AT THIS STAGE WOULD BE VERY SHORT SIGHTED. THIS WAS AN ERROR WITH THE INTIAL FACILITY CONSTRUCTED, I.E. LACK OF 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)

BE VISIONARY, DEVELOP INDOOR AND OUTDOOR COVERED MULTI USE COURTS (NETBALL, TENNIS OTHER)

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 AFTER IDENTIFICATION THROUGH RISK ASSESSMENT, NOT BLANKET CHLORINATION

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

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

SELWYN DISTRICT IS MADE UP OF A SERIES OF SMALL COMMUNITIES, ANY CONTESTABLE PROCESS NEEDS TO BE LIMITED TO WITHIN INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITIES SO THAT EACH COMMUNITY RECEIVES A FAIR AMOUNT OF FUNDING

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 MORE CYCLE WAYS THE BETTER, SELWYN HAS MANY NARROW OPEN SPEED ZONE ROADS

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

MAKE VISIONARY DECISIONS IN YOUR TIME AT THE WHEEL, DON'T MAKE COST CUTTING WEAK VERSIONS OF INITIAL PROPOSALS FOR THE SAKE OF GETTING RE-ELECTED....BUT OBVIOUSLY SHOW SOME BALANCE

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter requests that Lincoln be excluded from the district wide community centre rate as they already pay a targeted rate for the Lincoln Events Centre.

The proposal to move to a district wide rate will reduce the rate currently paid by Lincoln residents from \$293 p.a. to \$100 p.a. in 2018/19 under the new rating structure.

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. Sport Canterbury have confirmed their support for a 25 metre pool. and Minister Megan Woods has confirmed the Metropolitan Sports Centre is back on track with a 50 metre facility and seating in the CCC complex.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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	Support for Community Grant Funding Scheme is noted and the submission highlights importance of district wide access to the fund. This is consistent with the criteria and principles of the proposed fund.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is in support

[100265] -Summit Road Society Mrs Marie Gray

Address: PO Box 37115 Christchurch 8245 8245

Postal Address: PO Box 37115 Halswell Christchurch

Phone (day): 3493409

Phone (mobile): 0274702020

Email: secretary@summitroadsociety.org.nz

Submission

Background information about the Summit Road Society (Inc.)

The Summit Road Society was formed in 1948 to further the vision of Harry Ell for the preservation of the Port Hills and the provision of public access. The Society's mission statement is "Working to enhance, preserve and protect the natural environment, beauty and open character of the Port Hills of Banks Peninsula for people to enjoy".

The Society's goals are: • To help preserve and enhance the native forest, shrublands and tussock grasslands and associate fauna • To develop and maintain tracks and other amenities • To seek to minimise residential encroachment and the erection of intruding structures • To encourage protection by purchase or other means to develop parks and reserves for public benefit • To promote pride in the Port Hills and Summit Road and provide informational services and educational activities • To promote integrated management and inter-agency collaboration for the Port Hills and Banks Peninsula.

The Society owns two areas of land, Ohinetahi Bush Reserve above Governors Bay, and Omahu Bush and the area around Gibraltar Rock in the Selwyn District. Both reserves are subject to QEII National Trust open space covenants. These reserves are managed by Society volunteers who have an ongoing programme of track maintenance and the control of plant and animal pests, with a view to improving biodiversity and enhancing the experience of visitors.

The Summit Road Society has had a long relationship with the Selwyn District Council and we appreciate the financial support the Council has provided over the years.

We support the Council's comments that "People value the district's rural environment, open spaces [and] outdoor lifestyle opportunities". However, we would like to see an increased emphasis in the Long Term Plan on valuing, protecting and enhancing our natural environments and indigenous biodiversity and providing opportunities for public access.

We note the creation of a new contestable Community Grants Scheme that brings together various existing funding and grants programmes. We support streamlining the process but do want to ensure that the environment remains a core priority under this scheme and receives an equitable allocation.

In terms of our Omahu and Gibraltar Rock reserves, key priorities include: • Controlling weed pests such as gorse and broom • Providing habitats for native birds, insects and lizards through native planting • Controlling animal pests and predators such as possums, rats and mice, mustelids, pigs and deer. • Maintaining tracks so that the residents of Selwyn can enjoy this amazing asset

Submission on Community Facilities and Services

As a charitable organisation, the Summit Road Society is reliant on grants and donations to achieve our goals. We appreciate the annual grant that the Selwyn District Council provides however would like to request an increase in this funding. The amount of this annual grant was fixed many years ago and has not been reviewed since. We understand that the formula used was 10c per resident at that time. Given the significant growth in population within Selwyn, we now

receive less than 5 cents per resident. We would ask the Council to give serious consideration to increasing this annual grant to 10c per current resident rate payer in line with the original agreement.

We also want to highlight our Predator Free Port Hills initiative, which was launched in November 2016 and is in line with the Government's stated goal of Predator Free New Zealand by 2050. This initiative calls for saturation coverage of traps to seek to effectively eradicate possums, mustelids and rats from the fringes of the Port Hills.

Predator Free Port Hills is a backyard trapping programme that engages communities and utilises a network of volunteer co-ordinators with local knowledge and contacts. We are focusing on the urban areas from Taylor's Mistake to Halswell, the harbour from Lyttelton to Purau and rural areas from Halswell to Motukarara. Tai Tapu and Motukarara are target areas for this project, in particular properties on or close to the hills. The limiting factor on the growth of this project has been funding. Even a one off grant of \$5000 would greatly assist us to meet the demand and interest from Selwyn residents.

This project has the potential to make a real and meaningful difference in predator numbers within Port Hills and to engage the hearts and minds of everyday people. In addition, Predator Free Port Hills also act as a buffer zone to Predator Free Banks Peninsula.

Submission on the Walking and Cycling Strategy

The walking /cycling section of the Plan overlooks the need for walking / cycling access from the Selwyn District to the Port Hills and in particular the Summit Road.

Within the Selwyn District Council jurisdiction, the Summit Road Society owns and maintains both the Omahu and Gibraltar Rock Reserves and the City Council also maintains reserves such as Ahuriri. Without doubt, 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 thought needs to be given to providing local walking and cycling access.

Christchurch City Council has a well-developed track network on the Port Hills. However, within the Selwyn District there is no sign-posted access to the Summit Road between Kennedys Bush Track and Gebbies Pass at all.

The recent temporary closure of Kennedys Bush Track (under CCC jurisdiction) and the subsequent community-driven response to see it reopened demonstrated the demand for recreational walking and cycling tracks on this section of the Port Hills. It is pleasing to see Kennedys Bush Track open again and in regular use by walkers and mountain bikers.

A partial solution at nominal cost is for the inclusion within the proposed budget for the Selwyn District Council to mark with survey poles and sign posts the line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush 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.

We would like the opportunity to speak to our submission.

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. Submitter proposes SDC increase funding to environment and ensuring it remains a core priority under this scheme and receives an equitable allocation. Summit Road Society proposes SDC continue to fund this group, and request increase in funding. Summit Road Society also want SDC to consider supporting Predator Free Port Hills initiative.

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.

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Selwyn District Council recognises the important work that The Summit Road Society carries out regarding the management of native biodiversity and public assess on the Port Hills. 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.

Council has the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund of approximately \$45,000 (Gst excl) per year for biodiversity protection, enhancement and management – please see our website for more information.

The Councils biodiversity coordinator can work with The Society to help further its biodiversity protection, management and enhancement goals – including weed management and predator control - at its Covenant sites on the Port Hills.

Council staff agree that more work needs to be done in the district to create additional walking and biking access tracks from the base of the Port Hills to the

Summit Road. Such tracks would add to the track network that the CCC manages and operates. Some initial conversations have been had with relevant landowners in this regard, and the Council welcomes The Society to engage with Council staff on this subject.

[100266] - Mrs Tania Croucher

Address: 11 Wedgewood Row Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 11 Wedgewood Row Rolleston

Phone (day): 3478058

Phone (mobile): 0212951873

Email: crouch@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

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

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)

Support. District Wide Rate

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 support

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)

Support

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

Support

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

Given the increase in population of Rolleston over the past 10 years to the point it is now the main township in the Selwyn District it would seem appropriate that Rolleston had a cemetery.

Everyone deserves the right to be laid to rest in the town they call home.

I ask that the Council designate land for a Rolleston Cemetery.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor Court project is acknowledged as is support for a district funding model.

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 submitter is in support

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Cemetery for Rolleston: The submitter would like to see a dedicated cemetery for Rolleston. Currently there will be sufficient capacity in existing cemeteries to meet projected demand based on the death rates and especially with the planned extension to Springston Cemetery. This cemetery is a short drive from Rolleston and will service that need in the medium term. The Large Scale Park land has sufficient area to create a cemetery in the future if this is needed.

[100267] -Ellesmere Heritage Park Mr Grant Clausen

Address: 1618 Leeston Road Leeston 7683

Postal Address: 1618 Leeston Road Leeston

Phone (day): 0272215060

Phone (mobile): 0272215060

Email: grantclausen@outlook.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)

Yes

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)

Yes

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

Yes

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. In addition submitter requests funding of not less than \$220,000 (which exceeds the entire Community Grants Scheme). The submitter also proposes consideration of district wide rating for arts culture and heritage facilities across district (in vicinity of \$3 million) and or district wide rating for the activities of arts culture and heritage groups or alternatively that SDC set aside substantially more Council funding annually for arts culture and heritage groups. Council is advised that officer investigation in to potential models for increasing investment in public arts is currently underway.

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	The Submitter is requesting funding of \$220,000. This would require a one off \$12 rate accross the District.

[100268] - Mr Martin Towers

Address: 20 Robert Street Lincoln Lincoln

Postal Address: 20 Robert Street

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: tinytowers@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)

Yes

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.”

[100269] -Leeston Community Committee Mr Lloyd Clausen

Address: 7 Chervier St Leeston 7632

Postal Address: 7 Chervier St Leeston

Phone (day): 363 9642

Phone (mobile): 0274 360 137

Email: lloyd.clausen@oriongroup.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. 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	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments	Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton Community Facilities: The Leeston Community Committee notes the need for a community facility to serve Leeston and suggests that this project should be brought forward in the 10 year programme. Staff concur with the submitter in terms of the demonstrated demand for a facility to meet the needs of the Leeston community. Currently this project has been timed for commencement in 2025/26 and completion in 2026/27. The timing has been assessed in terms of funding availability and in consideration of other investment decisions noting that Council cannot do everything in the first three years of the programme. The proposed funding plan includes Council contributions in terms of reserves development contributions and a grant as well as a significant loan component. Therefore bringing the project forward would impact on cash flows in accounts and the general rate as well as the timing and magnitude of the district and/or local rate.

Topic: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Thank you for your support for the stormwater upgrade program. We too are looking forward to seeing the completion of this significant flood prevention project.

[100270] -Canterbury District Health Board Ms Kirsty Peel

Address: 310 Manchester Street Christchurch 8140

Postal Address: PO Box 1475 Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 364 1777

Phone (mobile):

Email: kirsty.peel@cdhb.health.nz

Submission

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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 Grant Funding Scheme is noted. Health and wellbeing impacts and important role of community groups 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 CDHB's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in Support. Note the reference to noise aspects has also been included in the draft 2018 RLTP

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

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

No comments made.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets**Staff Recommended Action**

That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

The submitter supports the ongoing role of the School Road Safety Coordinator, subsidised funding has now been obtained from the NZTA to assist in this and related activities going forward. The Council has been undertaking dust suppression trails to help inform a position on this.

Topic: Waste Management - Assets**Staff Recommended Action**

That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Solid Waste S.19 Thank you for your submission and support for the compost plant replacement. The composting system is aerobic based and therefore gas capture and conversion to electricity is not relevant in this instance. That is a feature of much more expensive anaerobic systems. S.20 Thank you for your support for the RFID tag project. Regarding your second point: As growth occurs, Council regularly reviews and extends the Kerbside collection routes. In addition we are investigating localized drop off hubs as a possible option for those households that are off-route. S.21 Reconnect Project. Thank you for your supporting submission. S.22 This is currently being provided for with Community Recycling Days. Additionally, investigation into drop off points (s.20 above) is also being undertaken. Finally, as part of the Reconnect project, a Farm Waste Hub is envisaged. This would tie into possible collection services to farm properties. The aim of this is to recover and recycle as many materials as possible, and to avoid the need for farm pits or burning of waste on farms.

Topic: Water & waterways management - 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.

[100271] -Christchurch City Council Mr Brendan Anstiss

Address: Civic Offices Christchurch 8154

Postal Address: PO Box 73010 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

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.

[100272] - Ms Makere Chapman

Address: C/- 31 McLaughlans Road, Darfield 7510

Postal Address: C/- McLaughlans Road

Phone (day): 0221402529

Phone (mobile): 0221402529

Email: kurawaka1@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)

Do not chlorinate the water.

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.”

[100273] -Ministry of Education on behalf of Beca Limited Jess Bould

Address: Not provided Not provided Christchurch

Postal Address: Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: jess.bould@beca.com

Submission

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - 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 submitters comments relating to the need for safe active and non active transport systems to support schools is acknowledged, however this needs to work both ways and requires the cooperation of the MoE to provide adjoining transport works that are fit for this purpose in the planning, development and operation of new and existing schools sites. It is considered that Councils draft 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy and the 2014 Road Safety Strategy covers the required safety outcomes that need to be collectively achieved.

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. Selwyn District Council values the strong working relationship it has with the Ministry of Education in future planning for educational facilities in the district. With the significant growth Selwyn is currently experiencing and will likely see in to the future, it has been extremely valuable to have early discussions with the Ministry on future planning for educational facilities. The Council certainly sees this collaborative approach to planning for future infrastructure continuing and acknowledges the important role educational facilities play in the community. The Council also acknowledges the work the Ministry is undertaking in providing short and long term solutions to ensure safer journeys to and from schools within the community. The Council is looking to integrate these solutions into master-planning of communities and through consenting processes, particularly in greenfield growth areas.

[100274] -Toimata Foundation Kristen Pice

Address: Grey Street Hamilton 3247

Postal Address: PO Box 4445 Hamilton

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: Kristen.price@toimata.org.nz

Submission

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. Submitter proposes SDC continue to fund "Enviroschools Project" . It is understood SDC is currently funding this initiative and the grant under which it is funded is likely be included in Community Grants Review.

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Council greatly values the work that Enviroschools carries out in the Selwyn District with regard to creating sustainable and resilient communities, and developing holistic responses to the challenges that face our communities today. Our biodiversity coordinator has worked closely with Enviroschools facilitators and children to create and manage a number of native planting sites over the last year. Council will continue to work with Environment Canterbury to invest in the future growth and development of the Selwyn Enviroschools network, including beyond the 17 schools that you currently work with.

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100275] - Mr Jeremy Wilson

Address: 68 Osborn Road Ladbroke Ladbroke 7674

Postal Address: 68 Osborn Road

Phone (day): 0272276031

Phone (mobile): 0272276031

Email: jeremy@directionsltd.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 discuss the situation in Osborn Road and the need to have it sealed now that we have a substantial commercial trucking business damaging the unsealed road.

Topic: Roding - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The request to seal Osborn Rd has been received a number of times in the past and has been declined.

[100276] -Te Ara Kakariki Greenway Canterbury Trust Miss Elizabeth Guthrey

Address: 245 Wilsons Road Christchurch 8023

Postal Address: 245 Wilsons Road

Phone (day): 0211899961

Phone (mobile): 0211899961

Email: lizzyguthrey@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 think this is fair.

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 is a shame to see that ECAN and SDC allow for the degradation of our drinking water to the point that we need to chlorinate it. My hope is that Chlorination is a temporary initiative, and that the greater initiative be to reduce the amount of live stock, in particular dairy cows on our fields, which are causing the pollution of our drinking water ultimately.

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

Getting people out moving is a key priority for the health of our community. I also encourage that the walking and cycling paths are integrated with natural flora re-vegetation, so that citizens can come to learn and appreciate what makes the Canterbury plains so distinct from elsewhere, and develop a sense of natural heritage.

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

Native plant restoration needs to be a key priority for the Selwyn District Council (SDC). It is the only way to insure that the natural heritage is not lost forever in this part of the country. No one is better resourced than to implement a strategy and long term plan for increasing native biodiversity from less than 1% (current) to a stable proportion. It is a struggle for charitable trusts to resource sufficient staff and contractors to plant hundreds of thousands of native plants a year, as is needed, and so we continue to see charitable trust reaching only 10,000 to 15,000 native plants a year with the community, with the handling of multiple small grants to make it happen. The pace is too slow, and our natural heritage remains very fragile. I propose the formation of a formal biodiversity organisation within the council, equipped with ecologists, environmental educators, and restoration planting coordinators, and staff landscapers/ planters, and maintenance staff.

The council is fortunate to have the DOC Motukarara nursery nearby, and should be partnering with DOC to increase the capacity of native plant nurseries like this one, and make a proportion of plants free for schools and community groups. If the Council chooses not to make restoration planning and implementation their own task, then it is essential they provide consistent levels of funding to other organisations to undertake the work for them.

Furthermore, educating children in every school across Selwyn District about the natural heritage of this land is pivotal to developing citizens who care about their natural environment into the future. I encourage there to be more funding and

support for activities such as the Kids Discovery Planouts lead by Te Ara Kakariki Greenway Canterbury Trust and Enviro-schools.

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.”

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support. The majority of pathway networks are more utilitarian in nature alongside roads and hence little opportunity to provide specific native planting. Where they go through township reserves these are landscaped and planted as part of the development. It can be costly to create this type of habitat, e.g. for the new section of Rail Trail south of Lincoln this would cost approx. \$100,000.

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Selwyn District Council notes your wish to see the development of a dedicated biodiversity management unit within Council that is equipped with relevant and skilled staff. Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection, management and enhancement within the district.

The Council recognises the quality of eco-sourced plants that are produced by the Department of Conservation nursery and will continue to provide funding for native planting projects through the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund.

Council will continue to support Te Ara Kakariki and recognises the important work that the Trust does in helping to create suitable native flora and fauna habitat, and in working with our local schools in the Kids Discovery Plantout and Enviroschools programmes.

[100277] -Te Taumutu Runanga Not provided Not provided

Address: not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

Taumutu Rūnanga just submitted the survey 'Fast Forward 2018-2028 (quick survey)' with the responses below.

What ward in Selwyn do you live in?

Ellesmere

District-wide rating for community centres, halls and reserves The Council is proposing to replace the current system of local, targeted rates with a standard district-wide rate, paid by all ratepayers. Some communities would pay less than they currently do, while some would pay more. All ratepayers would contribute equally to the district network of facilities that are available to everybody. This would spread the cost of larger facilities more widely, and ensure funding is available for improvements to facilities in smaller communities. More details: p.10-13 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the change to a district-wide rate for community centres, halls and reserves Any comments?

As the only marae in the district and as a highly valued community facility (particularly for schools within the district), Te Taumutu Rūnanga would value future discussions with Council about contributions toward either the planned redevelopment of facilities or ongoing annual running costs that the Rūnanga current subsidises for all groups that visit. Selwyn Aquatic Centre extension

The Council is proposing to add an extension to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre, including an additional 25-metre, 8-lane programme pool, to help meet the high demand for space for swimming lessons, aquafitness and casual swimmers. The project would also include a fitness programming space and a café. Construction would be completed in 2019. More details: p.14-15 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28 choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable) I support the proposed extension to Selwyn Aquatic Centre

Any comments?

No Answer

Indoor courts at Foster Park

The Council is proposing to build a multi-purpose indoor courts and sports hub to meet increasing demand for facilities for a range of sports groups. It would include four indoor courts, four covered courts for sports and events, administration areas and a sports hub with changing rooms and amenities. Work on the proposed project would be completed in 2020. More details: p.16-17 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28 Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the proposed indoor courts facility at Foster Park

Any comments?

No Answer

Water quality improvements and chlorination

In response to the Government's inquiry into drinking water contamination, the Council is seeking community feedback on options for ensuring we are providing our communities with safe drinking water. Consideration is being given to chlorination of some supplies with a higher level of risk, to minimise the impact of any contamination which may enter drinking water systems. More details: p.18-19 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Which option would you prefer? (skip if not applicable)

Introduce chlorination for supplies which would receive greatest benefit, based on a risk assessment

Any comments?

The Rūnanga expect that providing for and upholding te mana o te wai (both for ground and surface water supplies) would ensure that drinking water supplies would not be compromised to the extent that requires chlorination. Action needs to be taken via District Plan review to manage land use activities to ensure healthy drinking water supplies are protected or restored and the need to treat water is minimalised and over time not required. Te hauora o te tangata must have primacy over land use activities.

Water race rating review

The Council is proposing to introduce a new rating structure for the water race network. A new standard district rate would replace the current complicated rating structure which has 10 different rating factors across the three water race networks. The new system would ensure that land owners who benefit directly from to water races still fund most of the costs, but that the wider community also contributes, to recognise environmental and aesthetic benefits. More details: p.20-21 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28.

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the proposed new rating structure for the water race network

Any comments?

Te Taumutu Rūnanga supports the introduction of the district wide rate contribution for maintaining the environmental/public good aspects of water races. In particular, the Rūnanga wish to see the water race that supplements flows into Waikekewai given that this water helps maintain flows through tribally significant water burial sites. In a broader sense, many of the districts water races have replaced streams and wetlands that have long been drained or diverted and have become the sanctuaries for many of our mahinga kai and taonga species that would have otherwise been lost to us. The Rūnanga would like to see this public rate used over time to also modify the "race/drain" appearances and introduce riffles, planted stream banks (where it does not impede maintenance), connected wetlands etc to enhance habitat variability.

Changes to Community Grants

The Council is proposing to introduce a new Community Grants Scheme to bring together various existing funding and grants programmes. The new will provide new, contestable grants funding of \$140,000. This will be available district-wide to assist not-for-profit community groups and clubs, as well as communities of interest working for the wellbeing of Selwyn residents. More details: p.22-23 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28 Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the proposed new contestable grants funding for community grants

Any comments?

Te Taumutu Rūnanga, as a not-for-profit organisation, look forward to making application to the new fund.

New community centres – Hororata, Leeston, Prebbleton

Over the next 10 years the Council is proposing to replace three major community centres, in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton. The existing halls in Hororata and Prebbleton are no longer meeting the needs of these growing communities, while Leeston does not currently have a purpose-built community facility. More details: p.24-25 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the proposal to develop new community centres in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton

Any comments?

No Answer

Rolleston council offices extension and parking

The Council is proposing to add a 385m² extension to the Council offices in Rolleston, to meet current and future staff requirements, as staff numbers have more than doubled since the offices were opened in 2007. The project will also include improvements to existing customer services areas, and additional car parking space for staff and public. More details: p.26-27 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the proposal to build an extension to the Council offices in Rolleston Any comments?

Te Taumutu Rūnanga recognise that the growth of the district has required expansion of Council office facilities. It is not appropriate to house staff, long term, in temporary accommodation. The Rūnanga welcome the opportunity to work with the Council to reflect the partnership between the Council and Ngāi Te Ruahikihiki through such things as bilingual signage, design features and artwork.

Walking and cycling strategy

The Council is seeking community feedback on the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy, which is an update to the current Strategy adopted in 2009. It aims to improve walk/cycle networks within and between townships, and proposes increased funding for annual township footpath extensions and for major cycleway projects. A total of seven major new cycleways are proposed over the 10-year period. More details: p.28-29 of the consultation document Fast Forward '28

Choose one of the following: (skip if not applicable)

I support the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed walk/cycleway projects Any comments?

In time Te Taumutu Rūnanga would welcome discussions with Council about extending the Te Waihora Rail Trail from Lincoln/Motukarara around the western shore of the lake to Taumutu.

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.”

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 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'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. Note the following comment "In time Te Taumutu Rūnanga would welcome discussions with Council about extending the Te Waihora Rail Trail from Lincoln/Motukarara around the western shore of the lake to Taumutu". It is noted that the Railtrail was established by a specific Trust. It is considered this type of extension is beyond the scope of the Draft 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy as it is purely recreational. Risks with sea level rises from climate change

[100278] -PTA Hororata School Mrs Sarah Williamson

Address: 352 Hawkins Rd Hororata 7544

Postal Address: PO Box 54 Hororata

Phone (day): 0272892654

Phone (mobile): 0272892654

Email: sezzaidesign@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) As a member of the Hororata School PTA we think it would be a real asset to the community to have a community facility and it could bring more events/club into the community and the school will benefit from the building, tennis club, scout groups, pony club, children's parties, private functions etc. The PTA and myself totally support the new hall and feel it would be a real asset to the community.
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.

[100279] -Te Ara Kakariki Mrs Letitia Lum

Address: 93a St Johns Street, Woolston Christchurch 8062

Postal Address: same as above

Phone (day): 0277733262

Phone (mobile):

Email: froggitt@xtra.co.nz

Submission

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

I support this

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

I strongly support this!

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

I am against chlorination in our water supply. I want better protection of our water in the first place, prevent it from getting to the stage we need chlorination.

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

I support an increase in funding and changes that make the grants process more efficient. More funding needed here!

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

I fully support the walking and cycling strategy. Please consider the integration of this with natural areas and plantings.

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

I want local biodiversity to made a high priority. The current situation of less than 1% native cover in the Canterbury Plains is embarrassing and the Selwyn District Council should be putting more funding and effort into increasing native plantings and protecting existing native areas. I want the formation of a dedicated biodiversity department created to focus on improving our local native biodiversity. This should include the employment of an ecologist, restoration adviser, environmental education officer.

I want higher standards set for water quality and better enforcement of current rules and more serious implications for those polluting our waterways. Protect our water instead of trying to clean it up after the fact.

I would also like to see more environmental and native biodiversity education programs and resources available to schools. For example the Te Ara Kakariki Kids Discovery Plantouts. Education of the next generation is crucial to improving and protecting our environment.

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 Strong support for proposed Indoor courts is acknowledged.

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 Grant Funding Scheme is noted however submission proposes that Council significantly increase the funding in the Community Grants Scheme.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter is in support. Also refers incorporation native areas and plantings

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	

The Council recognises that native habitat loss has been considerable over the Canterbury plains 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.

Selwyn District Council notes your wish to see the development of a biodiversity management unit within Council that is equipped with relevant and skilled staff. Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection, management and enhancement within the district. Council will continue to support Te Ara Kakariki and recognises the important work that the Trust does in helping to create suitable native habitat, and in working with our local schools in the Kids Discovery Plantout and EnviroSchools programmes.

The Council will continue to support Environment Canterbury in its efforts to reduce waterway pollution and improve water quality in the district.

[100280] - Mr Mervyn MEREDITH

Address: 49 Sabys Road Christchurch 8025

Postal Address: 49 Sabys Rd Halswell Christchurch

Phone (day): 3227239

Phone (mobile): 0273727318

Email: secretary@peninsulatrampingclub.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)
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 IT'S LTP PROVISION FOR SURVEYING THE ACTUAL LINE OF THE EXISTING UNFORMED BURKES BUSH ROAD, FROM IT'S LOWER POINT OFF EARLY VALLEY ROAD, UP TO IT'S CONNECTION TO THE SUMMIT ROAD, INCLUDING MARKING WITH SURVEY PEGS AND SUBSEQUENT INSTALLATION OF TRACK POLES AND SIGN POSTS, TO ALLOW REGULAR USE BY BOTH WALKERS AND MOUNTAIN BIKERS.

OPENING OF THIS LINK WOULD THEN ALLOW ROUND TRIP ROUTES AT THIS WESTERN END OF THE PORT HILLS, EG., KENNEDYS BUSH - SUMMIT RD - BURKES BUSH TRACK -OLD TAI TAPU RD. HAVING KENNEDYS BUSH TRACK CLOSED OVER THE LAST YEAR HAS EMPHASISED JUST HOW LIMITED WE ARE COMPARED TO FURTHER EAST. BURKES BUSH WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE OUR OPTIONS.

EVEN MORE SO, THE SAME OPERATION ON GERKINS ROAD TO SUMMIT ROAD WOULD REALLY PROVIDE OPTIONS.

IN THE LATER 1980'S A GROUP OF LOCAL TRAMPING AND WALKING INTERESTS LOBBIED THE SDC FOR THIS SAME BURKES BUSH LINK. OUR REQUEST WAS DECLINED ON THE BASIS OF SURVEY COST FOR A RURAL BASED COUNCIL. SINCE THEN, THE OBJECTIVE IS UNCHANGED, BUT THE POPULATION GROWTH IN TOWNS

FROM TAI TAPU TO ROLLESTON HAS MEANT THAT THIS LINK WOULD BE MEETING A VERY MUCH LARGER DEMAND FOR RECREATION

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	Gerkins Rd is formed and maintained by Council for approximately half its length. It then reverts to a semi formed access unmaintained by Council to a unformed and unmaintained road that traverses all types of hill terrain including gullies and wooded areas. The legal section of road stops short of the Summit Rd blocked by a densely vegetated area of DOC reserve. As for Burkes Bush Rd Council will need to decide if it wishes to depart from the Walking and Cycling Strategy's position that paper roads can be used for recreational purposes on a "as is where is basis" and become more involved in resolving these recreational situations. Also as for Burkes Bush Rd there are other impediments relating to the adjoining property owners and their concerns to resolve.

[100281] - Mrs Kay Oxley

Address: 3072 Coaltrack Road Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: 3072 Coaltrack Road R.D. Coalgate 7673

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0212069449

Email: oxleyfamilynz@mail.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 am speaking for my family with this submission. We are completely against the permanent chlorination treatment of water for the Malvern Hills water supply. We have lived in the Selwyn District for nearly 26 years, the first 10 years was in Hororata and the last 15 1/2 years in Coalgate. We have been users of both water supplies in these areas. Not once in the time we have been drinking and using these water supplies have any of our family and visitors to our property been sick due to contaminated water. We have also never boiled water when a boil water notice has come out either. In the past the boil water notice would actually be lifted before we were even made aware there was a boil water notice in place! So much for taking precautions! We realise this is a risk we take, however I am confident in the water supply that the E.Coli levels that the Council reacts to are very low and the boil water notice is a precaution. We understand that there is sometimes the need to do a chlorination flush in certain circumstances (eg certain storm events, earthquakes etc) and are prepared to continue to accept that. Our water is beautiful to drink and to chlorinate it permanently is complete overkill and a 'knee-jerk' reaction. We are encouraged to drink water for our health and it is very easy to do so when the water is as beautiful as ours. To chlorinate the water will have an effect on our ability to drink it. We visit other areas in New Zealand where the water is permanently chlorinated and we need to buy bottled water to be able to keep drinking for our health. As we are accustomed to fresh clean water, we react to the chlorinated water and so therefore will not drink or use it. To permanently chlorinate our water means that we will be charged extra for something that is unpalatable for us in our home. Then to have the insult of having a rates increase to cover this chlorination is appalling. Especially when we will have extra expenses in either buying in drinking water or installing water filters. If we were worried about the water quality, we would certainly already have water filters attached and being used. We do not have any such concerns with our current water supply, and haven't had for all the time we have lived in the Selwyn District. Please can Council publish the figures over the last 26 years (and longer) of all those people who have been reported sick directly from these 2 water supplies and also the number of deaths related to contaminated water from these 2 water supplies, in order for us, as ratepayers, to see what the real risk our chlorine free water supply actually is to the population drinking it. We believe the risk is very low and therefore believe permanent chlorination is a travesty when the money would be better spent in upgrading the infrastructure to ensure our clean green pure water remains just that and caters to the growing population of Selwyn. Please Selwyn District Council, DON'T chlorinate our water over 'what-ifs'. Publish the figures of sickness and death from these water supplies and give us the real truth to the water quality we have. Also publish the number of times the water has been contaminated over the same time period and what the cause of the contamination was as well. That way we get a true record of the real risk our water supply is. DON'T react to something that isn't a real risk and create many other health issues for the population by adding chemicals that are

harmful and just plain taste bad. Permanent chlorination is not needed and the proposed cost of that would be better spent upgrading the water supplies instead.

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. Health statistics are not reliably available. 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.”

[100282] -Doyleston Community Committee Mr Jack Percy

Address: 15 Barley Mow Lane Leeston 7632

Postal Address: Leeston 7632

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: jcpercy@gmail.com

Submission

Submission to Long term Plan 2018 -19

From Doyleston Community Committee and Jack Percy Question 1 Community Rates How can a district rate be fair when you put a Community Hall and Community Centres on the same rate when they do not serve the same functions? Most halls are run by small efficient committees that do most of the work whilst the Community Centres are run by paid staff doing the administration and day to day maintenance. The Reserves are similar but there is a lot of difference between the large and smaller reserves. The latter ones are run by dedicated community committee members. They mow the grounds, in some cases several times a week, and usually on Fridays for the weekend sport. Please note all the above services do not have equal services or outcomes, like water and waste water.

Question 2 Selwyn Aquatic Centre The extensions to the Aquatic Centre need to go ahead. Please supply the rate payer with the costs of running the schools programs in school hours and the money that the schools contribute to the pool complex, including the cost of the coaches, etc. What percentage of the running costs does that cover compared to the Public admission fees?

Question 3 Foster Park The development of indoor courts and a sports hub in Foster Park is a good idea as long there is provision for parking at peak times. I note with dismay that there are no costs mentioned relating to the running costs or the costs of using the different areas. What percentage of the running costs are expected to be covered by the Schools compared to the other users? If the rate is to be District wide it should be calculated the same way as the Aquatic Centre as there is no public transport that covers the whole district so the further you need to travel the greater the cost to the individual.

Question 4 Water Supplys NO to chlorination Chlorination should be only used when there is a problem or when repairs are undertaken. Before Chlorination is installed every thing possible should done to secure the source for all township supplies.

Question 5

Water Races If the services are equal in all the schemes there should be the same rate struck across the three schemes

Question 6 Community Grants Funded by a General Rate, with a possible increase yearly.

Question 7 Community Centres Leeston needs to have a public debate and all the options and costs. The costs to upgrade the Leeston Rugby Club building. The costs of a purpose built Community Centre including what should be included in it, the location and car parking.

Question 8 Headquarters Get on with the extensions. The building was designed to be extended as the District grew and it should be done as soon as possible.

Question 9 Walking and Cycle Ways Please include the eight major Walking and cycling projects in the plan. Especially the Doyleston – Leeston cycleway.

Roading Leeston Road, the intersections at Old Bridge Road and Brookside Irwell Roads need a slip land so the traffic turning right off Leeston Road can be passed safely and stay on the sealed carriageway. This issue has increased with Freedom campers not knowing the road rules and stopping any where looking for the place to turn especially at night.

The other issue is the width of marked car park spaces when large utes and 4x4s do not have enough room to open their doors.

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 requests greater transparency in charges to schools and costs of coaching activity

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the proposed Indoor court facility is acknowledged while a district funding mechanism similar to the Aquatic Centre model is promoted. Staff believe the facility will be used extensively by people outside the Rolleston area. Staff have completed an operational costs analysis as well as a capital cost projection which demonstrates that a small ratepayer subsidy may be required to keep user costs at a reasonable level and promote participation and use by community groups. Staff are currently examining options for additional car parking around Foster Park.

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 Support for Community Grant Funding Scheme is noted as well the submission proposes provision for annual increase in funding levels

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 public debate is required on the proposed facility for Leeston with all costs provided. Costs for options have been included in the LTP consultation document and the community are given the opportunity to provide their views as part of this process to provide Council with some direction. It is anticipated that further consultation will occur as part of planning for the project.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support. Planning and design work on the Leeston to Doyleston Cycleway started in 2017 and alignment for the pathway requires the cooperation of the adjoining land owners to achieve this. Council is continuing to progress the project and overcome its challenges.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The installation of marked car parks are required to follow District Plan and/or Engineering Code of Practice requirements. These follow standard national conventions.

[100283] - Mrs Annemarie Baird

Address: 9 Osborn Road Ladbrooks. RD 4 ChCh 7674

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 033296647

Phone (mobile): 0273484886

Email: ijambaird@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)yes

These courts will only service the needs of Rolleston and its immediate neighbours. The Selwyn Netball Centre in Lincoln currently meets the needs of the wider Selwyn Netball community, and with a growing population, more courts will be needed there. There will be a new primary school in Lincoln along with continued growth at the high school. Please look at these needs 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)
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). Are they really needed. That's a big building.
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) As Osborn Road is not being sealed, could you please make a safe cycle way. I ride this road at least twice a day and I have to divert to the grass areas when vehicles pass to avoid stones being sprayed up and be back away from the dust. Also to avoid the potholes. A smooth cycle way would be great.
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

There is no mention of sealing Osborn Road. Yet both Robinson's Road and Tancreds Road will have 1km sections sealed. Neither of theses roads have the number of landowners that Osborn Road has. Why are they getting sealed???

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submission indirectly supports the proposed Indoor Court facility at Foster Park while also requesting additional courts at Lincoln. Staff view is that the additional court space provided by the Indoor courts will reduce the demand on the Lincoln courts and no additional courts at Lincoln will be required in the foreseeable future.

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 Creating a separate cycleway on a low volume unsealed road such as Osborns Rd is not necessary. This issue relates more to a request to have the road sealed.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The request to seal Osborns Rd has been received a number of times in the past and declined. The Councils programme is only to address specific strategic network "missing link" seal extensions on high volume main routes or connections to assist in the movement of people and freight. Osborns Road is a local road that doesn't fall into that category. Tancred's Rd is in support of the growth of Lincoln northwards and increasing use of this east - west link in the network. Robinsons Rd supports a roading connection relating to Southern Motorway Extension and has agreed to be funded by the NZTA relating to its expected high use.

[100284] - Kim Ashmore

Address: 270 Horndon Street Darfield 8172

Postal Address: 270 Horndon Street Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0272001725

Email: kim.ashmore002@msd.govt.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) YES I strongly disagree with the proposal to chlorinate Darfield water . Chemical in out water will have a negative affect the health of the community . The well is only 30 years old and should be able to support the infrusture. If there is an issue with a well then it should be isolited and dealt with . Chlorination should be the last resort not "just in case" Thankyou.

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.”

[100285] - Ms michelle croft

Address: 9 Robbs Road, RD1 Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: 9 Robbs Road RD1 Coalgate

Phone (day): 0210604212

Phone (mobile):

Email: croftmichelle@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)

This benefits some of the population in the district, the issue of chemicals in our water to make it safe to drink ie chlorine affects ALL from newborns to those at the end of their life. The desirable improvements should wait and the essential issue be addressed and this essential issue is the need for an improved infrastructure to enable pure clean non contaminated or chemically treated water supply to ALL residents and visitors to the ENTIRE 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)

This benefits some of the population in the district, the issue of chemicals in our water to make it safe to drink ie chlorine affects ALL from newborns to those at the end of their life. The desirable improvements should wait and the essential issue be addressed and this essential issue is the need for an improved infrastructure to enable pure clean non contaminated or chemically treated water supply to ALL residents and visitors to the ENTIRE Selwyn District

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 vehemently oppose the addition of Chlorine to any water supply, but especially the one we get water from and that is the Whitecliffs supply. Provision of an infrastructure that provides safe pure clean water to the community is a PRIORITY! The issue of chemicals in our water to make it safe to drink ie chlorine affects ALL from newborns to those at the end of their life.

We were told by the Selwyn District Council Asset Manager that the source of our water in Whitecliffs is clean but it is the infrastructure and back wash issues that make it unsafe, this needs to be addressed.

Clean water is a basic human right and we should have the right to make an informed decision as to what we consume and provide to our children. You are not giving us this choice as individuals if you chlorinate the entire system.

Individuals/households should be able to make an informed decision to boil water, use rain water or buy house filtration systems (this does cost and most will not be able to afford but they may choose to boil water for drinking and subsidies should be provided).

It should not require a 100% objection to the implementation of chlorination for it not to go ahead. At the Glentunnel Hall meeting last week we were told by the Mayor and Asset Manager that if we got 100% response not to chlorinate the water you would honour that and not chlorinate the water. If you got a 100% objection to this you would have to implement other options so why can this not be done instead of Chlorination in the first place? Just because it is the cheapest option is not a good enough answer. Provide robust information on all the options. I am sure I speak the same words as many,

that 'Boil water' notices are preferable to 'permanent chlorination' and for those who don't want the risk of the week wait for the notice to be given following delay in test results can always consistently drink boiled water or invest in filtration systems (subsidy should be provided to those on low incomes).

The damage to the long and short term health of ALL due to the effects of chlorination is a much greater cost to all residents and the Government than it will be to clean up the infrastructure of our water supply. It should go with the majority vote with the options of boiling/rainwater/home filtration systems provided to those who choose to implement them.

As the water at the moment is deemed to be unsafe to drink at the tap, immediate funding for home filter systems or a way to install ultraviolet treatment at house tanks etc... would be a preferred use of funds rather than having chlorination forced upon those who do not want it.

Chlorine is a carcinogen and affects the skin for those with skin conditions such as eczema. I personally was very nauseous and my skin condition flared up for a full month following the addition of chlorine to our water supply (which we were not informed about) until I got a filter which stopped the nausea but not the skin inflammation. The dose of chlorine was too strong and we are one of the first houses getting the treated water at full strength of the dose. A number of children and adults have had their health affected by this recent strong dose chlorination over the past few months (which we were not informed about but could not miss due to the strong odor, taste and effect on our health).

To surmise, we have the right to make informed decisions as individuals. We should have a personal choice of treatment options, not one forced upon us. Please do not chlorinate the system.

Thank you for your consideration of this submission.

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)

This benefits some of the population in the district, the issue of chemicals in our water to make it safe to drink ie chlorine affects ALL from newborns to those at the end of their life. The desirable improvements should wait and the essential issue be addressed and this essential issue is the need for an improved infrastructure to enable pure clean non contaminated or chemically treated water supply to ALL residents and visitors to the ENTIRE Selwyn District.

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

I support this but would like to see Whitecliffs with a cycle/walking path to Glentunnel. Especially at the S bend and to the Domain as mention in point 10.

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

A) I understand the "roving secretary" funding is to be discontinued. I wish to submit a request that this funding support remain in place. This provides the community and the council with a more robust and efficient system of communication and reporting as required for Community Meetings and for the dissemination of information in a timely and efficient manner to the community. B) The Whitecliffs road S bend 'breakneck corner' to the locals, at the Glentunnel end of the road, needs a footpath/cycle path as it is not safe for walkers or children. Children cannot bike to school in Glentunnel

due to the danger of this corner, yes there is a bus but they should be able to bike and it is a healthier option. Also the road to the Whitecliffs Domain is dangerous especially for children walking or on bikes as traffic travels too quickly and there are blind corners, this also needs a walk/cycle pathway in place.

C) The North Rakaia Road at the Main South Road end has no warning of the 45' bend this is a safety hazard. All other bends on this road to Ti Pirita are marked.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission proposes development should wait while chlorination issue is addressed

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comment is made re the proposed Indoor Courts at Foster Park.

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: Roading - General - 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: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission requests additional funding to cover costs of paid Committee Secretary

[100286] - Mr Lex Allan

Address: 158 Rolleston Drive Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 158 Rolleston Drive, Rolleston

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?

Please be aware that all rate increases should be limited to that which is necessary or prudent and not just because it is desirable at this time. Remember, it is not your own money you are spending, it is the ratepayers!!! Councillors, ask yourselves a simple question before approving every item of expenditure, if it was my money, would I pay it or would I look for a less expensive way of achieving what is needed or would I delay the project until better or alternative funding was available? Think carefully!!

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

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

[100287] - Mrs Eleanor Glab

Address: 19 Barewood Grove West Melton 7618

Postal Address: 19 Barewood Grove West Melton 7618

Phone (day): 03 940 2062

Phone (mobile): 021 0377 177

Email: eleanor.venetia@gmail.com

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)

I do not support the chlorination of our water. Chlorination reduces a lot but not all harmful bacteria and even e-coli can be found in chlorinated water. Relying on chlorination is a false guarantee of safe drinking water. It is also unpleasant to taste. 1970s studies found that chlorine and the resulting Trihalomethanes (THMs) are carcinogenic, especially if one considers long term exposure. According to the US BreastCancerFund.org: "One common factor among women with breast cancer is that they all have 50 to 60 percent higher levels of these chlorination by-products (THMs) in their fat tissue than women without breast cancer . . ." There are plenty of more examples of the negative health effects of chlorinated water, especially if it is permanent. This is a meta-analysis of chlorinated water and links to bladder cancer in men: <http://jech.bmj.com/content/57/3/166> The conclusion: "...evidence indicates that long term consumption of chlorinated drinking water is associated with bladder cancer, particularly in men..." We pay our Councils to look after the basics of water and sewerage. That a country and region who has been rightly proud of its clean drinking water is looking at adopting the practices of over-populated cities and developing nations is appalling and suggests that our Councils have been negligent or incompetent - or worse. Under no circumstances do I support the chlorination of our water.

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.”

[100288] - Mr rua pick

Address: 233 Whitecliffs Rd Whitecliffs Ohaumatua 7673

Postal Address: 9 Robbs Road, RD1

Phone (day): 0210604212

Phone (mobile): 0210604212

Email: ruapick@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)
Yes use the money to clean up our rivers lakes aquifers rather than artificial substitutes like aquatic centres, I prefer swimming in a clean river than a chlorinated disinfectant 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) Water is life prioritise this primal issue over lesser concerns.
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)

Ko Waikirikiri Kōpuni Te Awa ~ Waikirikiri Kōpuni is the River.

We are blessed in your waters Waikirikiri Kōpuni so we may walk in peace in life and then we drink from your waters so we do not forget this blessing.

“Tōku awa ko tōku wairua ~ My river is my double spirit”*

Me ka kore he wai ka kore, ka kore he Ao ~ If there is no water there will be no Universe

"Of this they were all obliged to drink a certain quantity," Plato wrote, "and those who were not saved by wisdom drank more than was necessary; and each one as he drank forgot all things."

Kia Ora Tatou Greeting to you all and all our ancestors

To any one residing in or who has an ancestral connection physical or spiritual to the rivers, mountains, valleys etc of Te Waikirikiri Kopuni~ Selwyn district, our sacred waters are been desecrated, Te mauri ora ~ the thymos of these sacred waters from the mountains to sea has been objectified, commercialised, consumed and putrefied progressively by stygian defunct chemical based monocultural practices for some time now (reminds me of H.G Wells book The Time Machine).Now the mountain water in within your private home space is been assaulted by this industrial malaise. Ko tatou nga maharatanga o nga wai ~ We are the memories of the waters. The servants of the public (?) the council only informed the people at a meeting called by some of the people of our hamlet, that we had a weeks' notice to do a submission for our two hamlets and one village, after high level pungent doses of chlorine disinfectant had been introduced to our sacred Maunga Wharariki water for months without public consultation to 100% people in our 3 settlements. This has already affected the health of several children and adults here. Our democratically elected mayor at this meeting informed us that for the submission to be a success it required a 100% No vote from the people to stop permanent chlorination to our water supply. Yet freely admitted that it was going ahead, submission or not as central government have an across the board New Zealand chlorination plan ready to roll out after the tragic debacle at Havelock North despite that towns supply been chlorinated at time of the outbreak. Of the major proposals for consultation Water

Quality is listed 4th, in the glossy brochure entitled Selwyn district Fast Forward 28>>. This is the challenge for the next 10yrs clean water ! Water is life, stop acting so small and prioritise this primal issue over council office extensions, car parking and sports stadiums in Christchurch. "Water is the driving force of all nature" q: Leonardo Di Vinci. This issue will decide the fate of many politicians on how they address this natural treasure now and in next decade. Why are they in denial or pussyfooting around that it is agro chemicals, fertilizers and faecal matter contamination in the surface and underground waters that has been allowed to flourish in the name of progress by successive governments? It was proudly proclaimed by the council's asset manager that New Zealand was now an 89% Chlorination. New Zealanders get to drink chlorinated and sodium fluoridated water while the multinational water bottling companies monopolize the best of our sacred spring waters at an alarming rate up and down our islands, approved by our Public Servants in local and central government (refer to laws in the Netherlands banning private ownership of water resources).

We were told, chlorine (where is it sourced from?) is the cheapest disinfectant option, we were told we would not be subsidized for carbon whole house water filters (which incidentally have increased in price nationally, the gold rush is on!) it will cost us \$2500 -\$3000 for a robust system including a under sink filter for the close partner of chlorine on the periodic table sodium fluoride which generally is introduced with permanent chlorination. Yet a good sodium fluoride filter has to be a resin based one flushed with potassium weekly to clean your water of sodium fluoride (waste product of the aluminium industry) effectively, this is an expensive system. Many families in the district won't be able to afford such prices and their health will suffer from long exposure to these introduced chemicals, as in many overseas long term studies on the occupational hazards of chlorine and sodium fluoride on the health of water sanitation workers. Only 11 countries in the world have more than 50% of their population drinking fluoridated water: Australia (80%), Brunei (95%); Chile (70%), Guyana (62%), Hong Kong (100%), the Irish Republic (73%), Israel (70%), Malaysia (75%), New Zealand (62%), Singapore (100%), and the United States (64%). Most developed nations do not fluoridate their water. In Western Europe, for example, only 3% of the population consumes fluoridated water this includes the Scandinavian countries that are known for their robust health systems. In total, 377,655,000 million people worldwide drink artificially fluoridated water. This represents 5% of the world's population

We were told that our water source is pure but the piping is 30 yrs old which is new he added and it is these pipes that need cleaning and added that at least they were not lead ones like many beneath old Christchurch cities are. Is it a case of bad out of date engineering, management, poorly maintained networks, cost cutting exercises or contaminated water sources? We were quoted dated information on the benefits of chlorination from the world health organisation. We were told that a gold fish was fine swimming in a tank of chlorinated water, where in fact the modern canary for that test would be a frog or a lamprey eel. Both of these sensitive species would have succumbed quickly at the levels of concentration that were poured into our end of the piping system.

The local sheep farmers said they had set up the scheme 30 yrs ago as a government rural subsidized scheme if on proviso it included the villages and said that sheep won't touch chlorinated water so they got rid of the chlorine and put in uv filters instead. Now in 2018 we are expected to drink it, bathe in it, and water our gardens with chlorine disinfectant.

If we wanted chlorine disinfectant washed vegetables we would buy them from the generic supermarkets in town. Is a rain water supply system the only safe source left (?) and only for those who can afford the conversion off the town water supplier. We live in our foot hills hamlet so we can drink in the memories of the sacred mountains swim in the upland reaches of sacred river (despite twice a year consented top dressing chemical fertilisers and aerial herbicides been carpeted across the Malvern hills water catchments ,feeding the toxic algae bloom in the upper Waikirikiri Kopuni river each summer. Above the lowland Frisian forest factory cow and its artificial pasture of imported toxic and ethically suspect sourced fertilizers (royal inquiry?) and its ever increasing advance to this altitude. Above the corporate open cast coal mine and its toxic run off been detected on 14 occasions in our once sacred free flowing river Waianiwaniwa and other waterways. Yet again lowlanders making blanket rules to independent highland folk, first our outside story telling winter fires have been banned now our clean waters too ("water is the elixir of life, it contains medicines". q:Artharva Veda). Our basic human rights / rites are been stripped from us.

Maybe the answer lies within the metal known as silver for water purification and network carrying it, which was used for centuries until it was replaced by chlorine disinfectant a cheaper produced industrial more toxic alternative, silver water purification units are used by nasa, us military and airlines, the central government should subsidize these and other

more biologically safer systems rather than outdated chemical quick fix based ones and protect the wellbeing of the many not the few.

Toi tu te marae a Tangaroa, Toi tu te Iwi If the marae of Tangaroa (Water) survives, so will the people.

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)

Water is life prioritise this primal issue over lesser concerns.

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? Clean water free of chlorine disinfectant

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission suggests money better spent on cleaning up rivers

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comment is made re the proposed Indoor Courts at Foster Park apart from the comment the water quality should be prioritised over all other projects.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[100289] - Ms Lynley Nesbitt

Address: 15 Faringdon Boulevard Rolleston 7615

Postal Address: 15 Faringdon Boulevard Rolleston

Phone (day): 2600520

Phone (mobile): 0275033848

Email: lynley@snap.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)
As someone who can't afford to swim at the aquatic centre I would be very unhappy if my rates went up because of 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)As a person who will get no use from this I would not like my already very expensive rates to go up because of this.
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19)I am appalled at this. Fix the problem! I do not want my body polluted because the council won't make the effort to fix it. This proves that Selwyn has grown too big and the environment and especially water supply is suffering. The council has got greedy for rates money and has become uncaring about the environment. As soon as I moved here there were water restrictions. That is indicative of a system that can't cope.Lake Ellesmeres and the local river woes are not all dairy farmers fault, things got bad when lincoln and surrounding areas populations exploded.
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)Only if its really needed, I think that selwyn should stop growing and concentrate on quality of environment.
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? This whole have a say online thing has been so not user friendly it took ages to negotiate to the point of doing the survey, and what's with the double whammy I spent ages doing the survey and then have to go over it again for the "Official" survey, I bet that stopped a lot of people. Sure you want people to have a say.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission proposes not to fund due to cost

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The lack of support for the proposed Indoor courts is acknowledged. The impact on rates is acknowledged although the issue of non-use could be applied to a multitude of different facilities for different people. Council provides a wide range of facilities and services in the interest of community well-being not all of which are utilised by all residents.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

Topic: 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 concerns with the North Rakaia Bend have been passed onto roading staff to check

[100290] - Mrs Raeann McPherson

Address: 1 Mila Haven Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: Same as above

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0283629312

Email: armcpherson@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)

I think there should be a 50 meter pool built not another 25 mtr it will pay it self off in no time, with competition meets held there, the pool as it is now was to small from the start, spend the extra money make it bigger

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Support is noted. When preparing the business case for the SAC extension, consideration was given for a 50 metre pool. As part of a Canterbury wide network of pools, 25 metres for SAC was considered appropriate to meet the community demand and to efficiently manage the financial investment in aquatics. Sport Canterbury have confirmed their support for a 25 metre pool. and Minister Megan Woods has confirmed the Metropolitan Sports Centre is back on track with a 50 metre facility and seating in the CCC complex.

[100291] - Mr Jakub Glab

Address: 19 Barewood Grove West Melton 7618

Postal Address: 19 Barewood Grove West Melton

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: rallyfreakpl@gmail.com

Submission

Hi,

I strongly disagree with the plan to chlorinate our water. If there is one this I would like this council to achieve is to maintain our great water. One thing!

Kind regards, Jakub Glab

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.”

[100292] - Miss Nadine Huston

Address: 2468 Old West Coast Road Courtenay 7671

Postal Address: 2468 Old West Coast Road, RD1, Christchurch 7671

Phone (day): 0272205400

Phone (mobile): 0272205400

Email: nadineh@orcon.net.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.

[100293] -- Mrs Lynda Gowers

Address: 37 James Street LINCOLN 7608

Postal Address: 37 James Street, LINCOLN

Phone (day): 033253222

Phone (mobile): -

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)

It's time everyone started paying for Lincoln Event Centre. Our rates are so huge and people from all over come and use it, only paying a slightly higher rate to hire. Out-of-Lincoln people should be paying much higher rates to use this facility. People might be in a "Lincoln" club, but live outside the area so are not paying their fair share.

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

Never been. Wouldn't know.

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)

Rate everyone in Selwyn.

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. Daughter, living in Christchurch, says water there not fit to drink now since they chlorinated 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)

If these are for the farmers, then they need to be rated for them. Who else uses them?

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)

Not council 'core' business. Stick to infra structure, water, refuse collection etc. Each society to fund themselves.

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

Probably most Prebbleton people already use Lincoln Event Centre. Where would a big hall go? Co-operate with school hall.

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)

Reduce office staff. Building a big enough, monstrous looking, thing already. In this day and age use of computers, video conferencing etc don't all need to be together in one place as it is. Why not out-source various bits to other communities. Never did understand why AA is in the council building anyway. Put them out and create more space.

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

I walk and cycle. New sub-divisions are already providing good links between them. Plenty of walking opportunities already. Don't need special tracks to walk on.

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 Support for a district funding option for the facility is acknowledged.

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 Submission opposes Community Grants to community groups and proposes that various community groups fund themselves. Community groups generally have a large amount of volunteer contributions and Council funding is proposed to be a contribution only to what is commonly a cost effective / cheap project due to utilisation of volunteers by community groups

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 suggests that a new facility in Prebbleton may not be needed and to look at other opportunities. Initial work has indicated a new modern multi-purpose facility is needed for this growing community. The work carried out on the Eastern Selwyn Community Spaces Plan identified a significant deficit in available space and the opportunity to create a vibrant community precinct for Prebbleton.

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 Does not need "special" tracks. Note the objectives from the Walking and Cycling Strategy have influenced the requirement for those to be provided in new subdivisions etc. that the Submitter is benefiting from.

[100294] -Canterbury Hockey Mr Rod Templeton

Address: 240 Wooldridge Road Christchurch 8543

Postal Address: PO Box 20 143

Phone (day): 033603012

Phone (mobile):

Email: rod@canterburyhockey.org.nz

Submission

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)

Canterbury Hockey's submission is related to the above question but not completely aligned. We would like to provide our views on the need for future hockey facilities in the Selwyn District.

Before we do this, we would like to acknowledge & thank the Council for their considerable support to date. Hockey is growing internationally, nationally & regionally. This is particularly true for Canterbury Hockey & its Selwyn based clubs, Waikirikiri Sport & Malvern Hockey. We note that hockey as a sport, with its gender balance, its age range & its strong family ethos, really does suit the growing population of the Selwyn District.

To grow, we need facilities & the Council's investment at Fosters Park has seen substantial growth in new players to our sport. Waikirikiri was accepted as a fully affiliated member of Canterbury Hockey at the 2017 AGM, having previously been only allowed access to junior grades. We are thrilled with the achievements it has made in the short time it has been in existence, having taken maximum advantage of the hockey turf at Foster Park. While Malvern has been established for some time, it also is experiencing significant growth. We are active in our support of both hockey clubs in the Selwyn District.

Our game does need artificial surfaces as the experience they provide is a large part of the attraction to play hockey. For the Council, artificial turfs are very cost effective as they can be played in all conditions, can handle heavy game usage, have a long life & do not require daily upkeep such as mowing.

Canterbury Hockey is updating its Hockey Facilities Strategy. To date, we have mainly reacted to a post-earthquake environment with a relatively short-term horizon. The construction of the Nga Puna Wai sports hub will provide us with two water turfs, bringing the number of full turfs in our region to seven – Nga Puna Wai (2 water) Nunweek Park (3 sand), Marist Park (1 water) and Waimakariri Hockey Stadium (1 water). Given our current playing number of approximately 6,000 winter players we believe we can deliver effective competitions in the next period. We do believe, that with the growth of hockey, we will need a further full water turf in the near future & our preference would be that it is located at Nga Puna Wai. This is because there is an increasing need to have three turfs in one location for major national tournaments. Also, we can create a sense of hockey community with centralised delivery of our competitions.

However to effectively grow our sport in the short to medium term we will need additional “small turf” capacity across the whole community for club practices & junior games. This may evolve for a need for full size turf capacity in the district in the medium to long term. This is the basis of our submission – that the Council work with us & our local clubs to identify areas of population where smaller turfs can be located to best service the local community & club needs in the short to medium term, and also to consider the long term community needs. This approach has worked very successfully to date & we are keen for it to continue.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff agree with the concept of planning for a an extension to hockey facilities as the code grows in Selwyn. The submission from Canterbury Hockey assists with the vision around the development of small turfs as opposed to full water based turfs. Provision has been made in the long term plan for an additional small synthetic turf in the future.

[100295] - Mrs Fiona Banks

Address: 274 Horndon Street Darfield 7510

Postal Address: 274 Horndon Street Darfield 7510

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0211626242

Email: roger.fionabanks@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).- Our water is of a high standard and is closely monitored. Chlorine should only be used for high risk areas. Chlorine cannot kill all microorganisms and not good for the environment.
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.”

[100296] -Te Ara Kākāriki Greenway Canterbury Trust Mr Craig Pauling

Address: 32 Larsens Road Halswell / Christchurch 8025

Postal Address: 32 Larsens Road, Halswell, Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021874317

Email: otumatua@slingshot.co.nz

Submission

Tēnā koutou e rau rangatira mā o te kaunihera nei o te whenua pakihi o Te Waihora,

Te Ara Kākāriki Greenway Canterbury Trust would like to thank you for your recognition of our Trust and the work we do to restore biodiversity in the Selwyn District. Last year we received funding as part of the annual plan, and wish to see this continued, and if possible enhanced.

Te Ara Kākāriki aims to educate, and assist landowners in the district to plant areas of native plants that can provide habitat for birds, terrestrial invertebrates and can restore our natural heritage. Our vision is to create stepping stones of native green dots across the landscape from the Mountains to the Sea.

The existing native vegetation on the Canterbury plains is less than 1%, so the vision of the trust for a Mountains to the Sea greenway is a long-term plan, from which council support and funding from the annual plan is a vital component.

The trust would have more certainty about where funds are coming from in order to deliver our services to the community. Consequently, the trust will be able to retain valuable contractors, and will have the option to employ a part time staff member.

Through word of mouth, landowners are coming to us and seeking support for restoration advice, funding, and volunteers. With more certainty of funding each year, we can follow up more of the opportunities that come our way with multi-year planning, as well as further development of our monitoring programme.

In previous years we have been a recipient of the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund. Each year we have lead an annual plantout tour, written numerous restoration plans averaging 10 per year, supported landowners from the outset of their restoration project, and with additional funds from elsewhere we have brought hundreds of volunteers to plant at a large variety of sites.

Over 10 years we have planted 57,000 plants at 57 different 'greendot' sites and the demand for further planting both on private and public land continues to grow. We also run the successful Kids Discovery Plantout programme working with schools in the Selwyn District to plant, maintain and monitor Greendot sites throughout the district - many on SDC administered reserves.

As a trust we have updated our strategic plan to include the development of a 'legacy' project - a large scale, long term and strategically placed Greendot to accelerate Biodiversity education, awareness and outcomes. We are currently looking at potential sites for this project and it may require significant investment from multiple partners.

We therefore seek ongoing support to continue the work of the Trust and what we do both on SDC reserves and with ratepayers on their land. We see the potential for further support in terms of increasing demand from rate payers for biodiversity restoration as well as the potential of a legacy project in the future.

Ngā mihi

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Selwyn District Council recognises the important work that Te Ara Kakariki Greenway Trust does in creating native habitat through its very successful Green Dot programme, its ongoing dedication towards working with our local schools in the Kids Discovery Plantout and Enviroschools programmes, and wider biodiversity education efforts.

The Council and will continue to support the Trust and notes the need of the Trust to have financial security into the future. This will allow the Trust to continue to provide restoration advice, funding and volunteers, and the development of an effective site monitoring programme.

The Council supports the notion of a TAK 'legacy project' and its biodiversity coordinator will be available to assist the Trust with this proposed project and funding will be available through the contestable Selwyn Natural Environment Fund.

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The draft LTP allows for a \$25,000 p.a. grant.

[100297] -Waikirikiri Hockey Mrs Lyndal Marshall

Address: 37 Masefield Drive Rolleston 7643

Postal Address: PO Box 148, Rolleston

Phone (day): 7411808

Phone (mobile): 0274399077

Email: waikirikiri.pres@gmail.com

Submission

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submission requests consideration of budget for additional hockey turfs in the long term plan. Some provision has been made in the long term plan for an additional turf (2022-23) which potentially could be brought forward if demand is sufficient.

[100298] -Waihora Ellesmere Trust Ms Denise Ford

Address: 200 Tuam Street Christchurch 8052

Postal Address: 66 Bryndwr Road Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021 052 9720

Email: manager@wet.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)
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)

The Trust supports the retaining of water races in Selwyn because of their environmental and aesthetic benefits. These waterways provide habitat for many native species including the endangered Canterbury Mudfish. They also give refuge for many plant and insect species within a highly modified landscape. We note that the Council is reviewing the rating structure and future management of the drainage network and hope that opportunities to enhance drain management to manage multiple values will be realised.

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)

With respect to the changes to community funding WET supports the council having a contestable fund available for community led incentives. As a “Strategic Community Partner” the Waihora Ellesmere Trust welcomes the proposed funding arrangement for specific community organisations. The Trust is appreciative of previous grant funding and continued funding will allow the Trust to continue their work in supporting the Council to further their community outcomes and service goals

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 Waihora Ellesmere Trust is pleased to note that the role of Biodiversity Coordinator is now a full-time position. In addition, WET would urge the Selwyn District Council to invest sufficient funds to allow mapping of all sites of ecological significance within the catchment. Ground truthing of these sites will give confidence to landowners about the rules that apply to special areas on their land. Therefore, reducing the risk of these areas being disturbed or destroyed through lack of understanding or unawareness of biodiversity values. A dedicated fund for working with landowners is required. A full survey of the catchment is required to understand what rate of ecosystem loss is occurring and to stem the tide. Priority should be given in the first instance to areas around Te Waihora / Lake Ellesmere and the tributaries which flow into it.

WET is supportive of the creation of a Management Plan for the restoration of Yarrs Lagoon and wish to see funding allocated in the Long Term Plan for the development and implementation of this plan.

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 Scheme is noted. Waihora Ellesmere Trust welcomes SDC consideration as a "Strategic Community Partner".

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Your support is noted regarding the Council Biodiversity Coordinator role being made into a full time position. Council concurs with your comment regarding the importance of mapping and ground truthing sites of ecological significance within the district, thereby developing understanding of and reducing the rate of biodiversity loss. Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere, as a taonga of our district, and its tributaries should be a focus of biodiversity work programmes.

Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection, management, monitoring and enhancement within the

district, and a dedicated fund developed for the management of Significant Natural Areas. Council staff appreciate the support of Waihora Ellesmere Trust for the development of the Reserve Management Plan Tārerekautuku Yarrs Lagoon and agree that funding should be made available for the restoration and management of the lagoon.

The Council recognises the good work that the Trust carries out in the district and will continue to support the Trust.

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The draft LTP allows for a \$22,300 grant p.a.

[100299] - Mr Christopher Thwaites

Address: 368 Hororata Road Hororata 7572

Postal Address: RD2. Darfield

Phone (day): 3180190

Phone (mobile): 0273903483

Email: Thwaitesnz.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) In Favour

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

Strongly in favour

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) Strongly in favour

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) Against an extension

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

Strongly in favour of a walking/cycling track between Hororata and Coalgate

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

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 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 A Hororata to Glentunnel (Coalgate) Cycleway is not included in the 2018 Walking and Cycling Action Plan as no demand has been identified for such a link previously. It would be 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.

[100300] -Ellesmere Reserve Board Mr Stuart Brannigan

Address: 19 Willis Road Southbridge 7602

Postal Address: 6 High Street Southbridge

Phone (day): 033242751

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) I have been a committee member of the Board since 1995 and Secretary/Treasurer from 1998. The Reserves we have involvement with are Osborne Park Doyleston, Dunsandel Domain, Ellesmere Domain (includes Ellesmere Motor Racing Club and Ellesmere Golf Course) Southbridge Park, and Leeston Park, along with Gambles Estate. These Reserves have got to where they are today, in the main from many volunteer hours and fund raising by the organisations that use them. Since the targeted rate was established, those Reserves which received it were able to implement their future plans more easily. The Ellesmere Reserve Board have also provided some funding from lease income. The local people in the Ellesmere District take great pride in their Reserves, and provide to the up keep when and where required. If the rating system changes and all ratepayers are to contribute equally as the Reserves are available to everyone, then those Reserves that have a major voluntary input, if not compensated for some how, will be subsidising those Reserves that are looked after by the Selwyn District Council by way of contract. The current targeting rating system could continue but with an extra District wide rate where the funds could be contestable for special projects.

Yours, Stuart Brannigan

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.

[100301] -Squash Canterbury Mr scott gardiner

Address: 117 Holliss ave cashmere Christchurch Christchurch
8140

Postal Address: PO Box 2606 Christchurch Mail Centre

Phone (day): 021990161

Phone (mobile):

Email: scotty2871@gmail.com

Submission

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and halls, and for reserves? (see pages 10–13) - No
2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) - Yes
3. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop indoor courts and a sports hub at Foster Park? Which of the funding options outlines do you prefer?(see pages 16–17) - Yes
4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) - no
5. Do you have any comments on the proposal to replace the current rating system for water races with a standard district rate across all three water race schemes? (see pages 20–21) - no
6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme? (see pages 22–23) - no
7. Do you have any comments on the proposal to develop new community facilities at Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton? (see pages 24–25) - no
8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston? (see pages 26–27) - No
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) - No
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? - No

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the 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 consideration of a squash facility as part of the proposed Indoor court facility or the Aquatics Centre extension. Initial space allocation and potential design budget for the Indoor Courts had indicated that a squash facility would be difficult to include. The needs analysis for the facility had not demonstrated a high need for squash facilities and current facilities available at Lincoln University had been converted to other uses because of lack of demand. While there are undoubtedly some in the community who would like to see a squash facility available in Rolleston the prioritisation of such a facility is hard to justify given other larger sporting needs. Staff will look at the feasibility of including a squash facility within the indoor court complex if it goes ahead.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The need for Squash facilities in Selwyn is acknowledged. The real question is how high in the priority list do they come when so many other sporting facilities are required that will be utilised by larger numbers of residents. A feasibility can be carried re space and budget associated with the Indoor court project at foster Park re inclusion of a squash facility but the demand for squash facilities seems at the lower end of the scale currently in Selwyn. Lincoln University have had squash courts available for some years and have converted them to other uses due to a combination of need for space and lack of demand.

[100302] - Mr Anthony Thwaites

Address: 535 hororata Road Hororata 7572

Postal Address: R D. 2. Darfield

Phone (day): 0212244062

Phone (mobile): 0212244062

Email: Thwaites.aw@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)

In favour

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

In favour

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) Against

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) Strongly in favour

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)

Against

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

Strongly in favour of a walking /cycling track between Hororata and Coalgate

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

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 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 That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

A Hororata to Glentunnel (Coalgate) Cycleway is not included in the 2018 Walking and Cycling Action Plan as no demand has been identified for such a link previously. It would be 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.
